OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

---

2 EDWARD VII., 1902

VOL. LVII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TENTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF MAY, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA

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

1902

ERRATA.

VOL. II.

Col. 3696, 16th line from bottom, for 'railroads' read 'elevators.

Col. 3696, 12th line from bottom, for 'railroads' read 'elevators.'

Col. 3701, 32nd line from bottom, for '$25,000,000' read '$35,000,000.'

Col. 3701, 24th line from bottom, for '$240,000,000' read '$232,000,000.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 10, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the names of Messrs. Kaulbach and Loy be added to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of this Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Bill mainly refers to certain classes of appointees in the service of the Post Office Department, known as messengers, packers, sorters, letter carriers and porters. It deals with the mode of their appointment and proposes to dispense with civil service examinations for this class of officers, substituting departmental examinations, such as the department may from time to time establish. It also changes the mode of payment, and in lieu of the present system, adopts a per diem allowance. It also shortens the time necessary for this class of officials to attain the maximum. For example, letter carriers attain the maximum in a period of the ninth year. Under this Bill, if it becomes law, they will be able to attain the maximum in about half that time.

Mr. SPROULE. How would it affect their status under the Civil Service Act as regards superannuation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Any person now appointed to the service does not come under the Superannuation Act. That is it does not apply to any persons hereafter appointed. It was repealed as to future appointments by the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1898. The measure also contains a provision entitling those at present in the service, at their option, to come in under the provision of this measure, instead of the Civil Service Act which applies to these appointees, but it does not exempt any from the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1898 ; that is, under the present amendment, those who elect to come under the provisions of this Act will carry the right and obligation of remaining under the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1898. The measure also provides for the creation of a new office called the superintendent of city post offices. That officer will have the duty of visiting the various city post offices and such other post offices as he may be required to visit from time to time, and to assist the postmasters and their staffs to keep the post offices abreast of the times, and in every way to aid in promoting the efficiency of the various post offices. There is also provision in the measure altering the condition of the indemnity clauses contained in a former amendment of the Act, simply making them more comprehensive and overcoming a defect which has been discovered.

Mr. CLARKE. Who performs the duty of inspecting city post offices now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It can hardly be said that the duty is performed. I believe that the inspectors have the right of performing that duty, but they are not experts in city post office work. Under this measure it is proposed to appoint as superintendent a person who has had many years practical experience, and who may retain the office that he is now filling. I may tell the House that, if the measure goes through and my present intentions are carried out by Council, the person who will be first appointed will be the present assistant postmaster of Toronto, Mr. George Ross. Every one acquainted with that gentleman's merits will admit that he has not his superior in the post office service. Of course, he will not carry two salaries. While he draws the salary of superintendent, he cannot draw the salary of assistant postmaster. There is, it appears, much ad-

vantage, but that is a point which can be better argued, perhaps in the second reading of the Bill—in the superintendent being actually connected with a post office, so that he may have a better opportunity of informing himself of the details, from time to time, in connection with the working of the office, rather than to have to gain information from hearsay, as is the case at the present time where the inspection may be done by inspectors who have, more or less—generally less rather than more—practical acquaintance with the technical working of a city post office.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Why does not the Postmaster General apply the principle to all the departments ? It is an anomaly that a porter and a messenger in the post office department should be removed from the section of the Civil Service Act which at present applies to all the departments, and that they should come under a different rule. If this is an improvement, the hon. gentleman should offer an amendment to the Civil Service Act to make it applicable to all the departments.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will see after it has worked a while whether it is an improvement. I do not know that uniformity is absolutely essential. I do not know anything that does more to depress energy at times than an aim at uniformity. A dead level uniformity, I think, very often discourages the ambitious. However, there is much in what my hon. friend says, that if this measure is good for one department it may be good for another. Perhaps different views may obtain on that point. We will see after it has worked a while whether it is wise to extend it to all the departments.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION.

CONTRACT TO A. I. AUGER.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government given a contract to A. I. Auger, of Quebec, for spruce planks of 2 x 6 and 7 and 8 feet in length at a cost of $11.50 per thousand feet ?

2. Did the government call for public tenders before granting the said contract ?

3. What quantity of such planks should the said A. I. Auger furnish according to his contract ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I would ask the hon. gentleman to let that stand, in the absence of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), because we cannot find any such contract.

Hon. Mr. MULOCK.

PENSIONS TO NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

Bill (No. 40) respecting pensions to officers of the North-west Mounted Police, read the second time ; and the House went into committee thereon.

On section 3,

The PRIME MINISTER. I may inform the committee that this Act is founded upon a similar Act which was passed last year granting pensions to officers of the militia, and this section No. 3 is a reproduction of the provisions which have been applied to all the militia men, with the exception that in the Militia Act the term is 25 years to entitle an officer to superannuation, and here the term is 30 years, for the reason that at present officers of the mounted police force are subject to the disposition of the Act regarding superannuation.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that under this Act a member of the force will be able to have the superannuation part of the Civil Service Act applied to him as well as the pension, and that he will have the superannuation allowance in the event of being retired after 30 years, as well as the pension ?

The PRIME MINISTER. No. There is a disposition at the end of the Act which makes it incumbent upon him to elect whether he will remain under the Superannuation Act or come under this Act. He cannot have the two.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am sorry I was not in the House when the resolutions were adopted on which this Bill was founded. Would the right hon. gentleman state what difference this makes in the law at present in force ?

The PRIME MINISTER. At present, officers of the force are subject to the provisions of the Superannuation Act. They can be superannuated in the same way as an officer of the civil service. They contribute a certain abatement, 3 per cent or 2 per cent, I forget which. Under this Act the abatement they will pay into the treasury, instead of being 2 or 3 per cent, is 5 per cent. The rate of pension is not very much different, but there is one great advantage, and it is this, that under this Act widows and children are entitled to pensions, whereas under the Act heretofore in force widows and children were not entitled to anything. That is the chief advantage we desired to give to the officers of the police force over the present Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no objection to the extension of the Act, I think perhaps it is perfectly right. But here is

another principle that has gone to the winds. We have not only the principle of pension and superannuation applied to parties who have served their country faithfully for a number of years, but we have that principle now extended, notwithstanding the opposition of many supporters of the right hon. gentleman. I do not know whether he himself ever voiced their opinions, but a great many of his supporters have opposed the principle of pensions and superannuation altogether.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think I ever said a word on that subject; in fact, I am quite sure I never did. Moreover it is a growing time and if there is a class of officers in the service of the government who are entitled to be dealt with by the government as fairly and justly as possible, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that it is the officers of the mounted police.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it would be interesting to know how this Act will fare when it goes to the upper House and meets with our old friend McMullen.

The PRIME MINISTER. I hope the curiosity of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will be gratified.

Mr. OLIVER. May I ask as to the interpretation of the word 'may' in the third line of subsection 6 of section 3?

The PRIME MINISTER. The interpretation of the word 'may' is explained in the way I stated a moment ago. At the present time an officer of the force is subject to the Superannuation Act. He will have to elect whether he shall remain under the provisions of the present Superannuation Act or whether he shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and of course, if he elects to come under the provisions of this Act, then, he comes under the disposition of this Act and the provisions we make in subsection 2 of section 4 will apply from the time he has served, and the pension he is paid shall be an abatement or deduction of his pension. I hope I have made myself understood by my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not follow the details exactly, but the point I wanted cleared was whether the use of the word 'may' was to express the privilege on the part of the authorities to extend a pension to a man who had served as a non-commissioned officer or a constable, or whether it will be compulsory.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the man elects to come under this Act it is compulsory.

On section 4,

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman if he has made any calculation to ascertain whether this will be adequate to meet the requirements of the fund, or if not to what extent?

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose my hon. friend means to ask whether or not a calculation has been made?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. To ascertain whether or not this fund will be self-sustaining?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say that we have made a calculation, but I understand that last year when a similar Bill was introduced in regard to the militia, such calculations were made, and it was supposed that the fund would be about self-sustaining, but I am not sure but that we may have to contribute a sum, but if we have to contribute anything it will not be a very large sum.

On section 5,

Mr. OSLER. That clause, I think, should be very well considered, because a case might arise where an officer in the discharge of his duty, who had served three months, or three days of the time when he would be entitled to a pension, might be seriously wounded and incapacitated for further duty, and under this clause he would be compulsorily retired without pension and be obliged to take a very small gratuity. I think that clause certainly ought to be modified to some extent. It might work a very great injustice to men from time to time who are injured in the discharge of their duty.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see the point of the objection of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and it is not without being entitled to some consideration, but the hon. gentleman will realize at once that it cannot apply as an objection to this Bill. This Bill provides that no man shall be entitled to a pension unless he has been a contributor to the fund which is created for the purpose, for a certain number of years. It is expected that he will contribute to that fund for twenty years, that a fund will be created out of which his pension and those of his comrades will be paid, and that the fund will be self-sustaining. If we adopt the principle that a man without paying anything at all, is entitled to compensation, that is a fair proposition to consider, but it cannot be considered in connection with this Bill. It would be beyond the principle that we have in view, bearing in mind that the principle of this Bill is the creation of a fund out of which this pension shall be paid. There is, however, a great deal to be said in favour of the

suggestion which has been made by the hon. member for West Toronto. Here is a man who has been for one or two years in the service, and he has contributed very little to the fund ; but, he has the misfortune to be disabled. Then, the hon. member for West Toronto says, he ought to have a pension. I am not prepared to say that he should not have, and I think the country ought to be rich enough to provide for him. I am sorry to say I have a case for my consideration of a constable who lost his right arm in the discharge of his duty, and a very good man he was. He was disabled, and all we can give is a very small pension of a little more than $100 a year under the provisions of the Act we have. I would like very much if the law permitted me to give him a larger pension, but I am afraid the only way to deal with the case is to come to parliament and ask for an appropriation.

Mr. OSLER. I am not referring so much to an officer who has served one or two years, because his case is a hard one, and I agree that it should be dealt with separately, but I am referring to an officer who has almost or nearly served his full time, when he has been disabled, and when perhaps one or two years of further service would have entitled him to the full pension. Would it not be possible to provide under such circumstances that he might continue to pay his percentage to the pension fund so that he would be entitled to his pension ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will look at the preceding clause he will see that his answer to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) is not an adequate one at all. The previous clause provides that in case an officer becomes entitled to a pension by reason of having been employed in the Civil Service for a certain period, or by reason of having been a non-commissioned officer or constable, from his pension shall be deducted 5 per cent for the necessary number of years. What is the objection to making exactly the same provisions with regard to this ? Suppose an officer is injured in the discharge of his duties, after having served fifteen years, he would be entitled to no pension under the Act as it stands. Why not say, that such a man shall be entitled to a pension but that for the first five years you will make a deduction from his pension, equivalent to the amount he would have paid had he served for the balance of the twenty years ? It seems to me that it is not only perfectly feasible but perfectly fair.

The PRIME MINISTER. The point is not new to me, for I have discussed it with the officers of the department. The difficulty is to draw the line. My hon. friend speaks of a period of fifteen years, but if the man has served for ten years or twelve years he ought to be entitled to a pension on the same reasoning. In the previous Superannuation Act there was a provision under which an officer became entitled to a pension after twenty-five years. That was reduced to twenty years, and now my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) suggests it should be fifteen years. The difficulty is to draw the line. I feel great sympathy with the idea presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and I wish it could be worked out in some way. We have fixed the limit at twenty years and there would be great difficulty in departing from it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In reference to what the leader of the opposition has said, I may say that when we introduced the Militia Pension Bill last year, of which this Bill is a copy, we carefully considered the matter and I felt as he does that twenty years seemed to be a long term. However, we decided that twenty years was a safe period to fix, and that in any case short of that, it should be a subject of special consideration in parliament. The clause under discussion is framed in the interest of the officer, by which if he desires it he may leave the service and get back the money which he has paid in. I may say to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that it does not follow that an officer who is seriously wounded shall for that reason leave the service, because it is quite possible that he may continue to serve out his whole twenty years and get his pension.

Mr. CLARKE. The clause has reference to an officer who is constrained to leave because of bodily injury.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It does not say he must leave. If the government wishes him to leave in the interest of the service, then a special arrangement could be made. This clause is in the interest of the officer to enable him if he so chooses, to take the initiative and get his money back.

Mr. CLARKE. If that is the intention the clause should be made clearer.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Perhaps so.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the practice in the Imperial service ? If an officer has been incapacitated after two or three years service does he get a pension ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think the practice is that in such cases a special pension is arranged. However, the Imperial Pension Act differs materially from this.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not exactly see why you should select a period of

twenty years any more than a period of ten years. Suppose one of these men in the suppression of an insurrection loses an arm or a leg and cannot thereafter perform his duty as an officer ; then if he has served only five years or ten years or fifteen years he gets no pension at all. The committee is handicapped by having no precise statement as to what this is going to cost the country under the present conditions. Unless it would impose a very excessive burden on the country I would be inclined to go the length of saying that any man who is constrained to leave the service by reason of injuries received in the discharge of his duties ought to have a pension—subject, it may be, to the payment of five per cent of his average pay for the remainder of the time which is necessary to make up the twenty years. Some scheme of that kind would be fair. I regret that my right hon. friend has not seen fit to have some actuarial calculation made as to what that would cost. I hesitate to move an amendment in that direction in the absence of precise information as to what it would cost the country. Had I that information I might move to amend the Bill. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman would give us more time for consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is no objection to allow that section to stand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the right hon. gentleman recognizes with me that there is ground for consideration.

The PRIME MINISTER. I see the point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman says that if you fix any period whatever, you will have a man coming within a few months of it, and that a difficulty would arise in that case. I would be inclined to take the bull by the horns, and to say, that if a man is injured in the discharge of his duties he would be entitled to a pension ; the government deducting from his pension 5 per cent for each year until the period of twenty years is made up. I would be inclined to do that, assuming that it would not impose too serious a burden on the country, and as to that I am not in a position to judge at present.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When the Militia Pension Bill was introduced last year, a very careful statement was made by the Finance Department which went to show that taking our previous provision, which was that an officer retiring should receive one-tenth of his pay as a gratuity for every year he had served ; taking that as a basis, and 5 per cent for twenty years, it was calculated that there would be no charge really on the country, in other words that the Militia Pension Bill was costing the country no more than the previous system of gratuity. If there has been no system of gratuity in the mounted police, it is clear from the statement which I refer to, that the expense of this Bill to the country would be equal to one-tenth of the pay of each officer for each year he has served——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot quite follow what the minister has said.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I said that prior to the passing of the Militia Pension Act of last session, a provision was made for the retirement of officers, which was as follows : One-tenth of the officer's pay at the time of his retirement for every year that he has served, is to be allowed ; that is to say, if an officer receiving $1,000 a year has served twenty years, he would get $2,000 on retirement. On the basis of twenty years at 5 per cent contribution per year, under the Bill we passed last year, it would not cost the country anything. If there is no 10 per cent provision in the North-west Mounted Police Act, and I think there is not, then the cost to the country will be exactly that 10 per cent of a man's pay for every year he has served.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much did this gratuity amount to annually in the militia ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I forget at this moment, but I should think that since this government has been in power it has amounted to something like $5,000.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not seem to be a question of what the cost is. It is a question of what is fair and right. If I read the section correctly, it seems to me that it misses the important purpose of a pension. Under the provisions of the Bill we give a pension to an officer who has served his full term in the force for the reason that he has become incapacitated for further service in the force or for earning his living outside the force. The man who is incapacitated by reason of bodily injury received in the discharge of his duty, at whatever period of his term of service, is in exactly the same position as the man who has served twenty-five or thirty years; and I humbly submit that it is not only for his advantage, but in the interest of the country, that he should be dealt with in the same way. If a case arises in which an officer is compelled to risk life and limb, it is only fair that having risked his life and limb in the service of the country, he should not be at a financial loss. The country should stand the financial loss so far as that can be done. I would suggest that this is the purpose of a pension, and, with all due deference, that purpose is not met by this section.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 8,

Mr. OLIVER. This clause is in exactly the same position as clause 5. If the officer loses his life in the discharge of his duty, his family become dependent on the country in one way or another, and it seems to me that the least the government can do is to replace that loss to his family as far as it can reasonably be done.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will find that section 10 provides for a rate of pension for the widow.

Mr. CLARKE. The argument of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is, and I entirely agree with it, that it should not be necessary for a man to serve for twenty years and then to lose his life before his widow or children can receive anything. If he serves only five years or ten years and loses his life in the service of the country, his family should be entitled to some consideration at the hands of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have only to repeat what I said a moment ago, that if the intention of the Bill were to provide pensions for the officers of the mounted police out of the treasury of the country, the remarks made by my hon. friend would apply ; but the object of this Bill is not to create a charge upon the country. It is expected that the fund to be created will be self-supporting, or that it will be supplemented by the treasury in only a limited degree.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I presume that the case my hon. friend from Toronto has in mind is the case of a man who loses his life or is wounded in action. There is a scale of pensions in force which has been in existence since 1885, which is applicable to such a case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I was going to ask the right hon. gentleman if there were any rules or regulations of the department applicable to such cases. This Bill is not to be considered as providing for pensions, but for a savings fund to which each man contributes, and it provides for the distribution of this fund in a certain way. I suppose the right hon. gentleman has had an actuarial calculation made for this purpose. But, besides that, there ought to be some regulation covering such cases as the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) refers to. I think perhaps the Minister of Justice is thinking of the Militia Pensions Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are making that applicable to the North-west mounted police.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That covers the whole thing.

Mr. CLARKE. The clause we are discussing does not deal with pensions, but with gratuities, and there must be a service of twenty years before the widows or children are entitled to consideration. By what rule or actuarial calculation do you ascertain what amounts should be retained which will be the equivalent of the annuities to the widow or orphans of those who lose their lives in the service of the country ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. There seems to be a misconception of the Act. It is not an Act granting pensions to North-west mounted police at all, but a different proposition altogether.

Mr. CLARKE. The title of the Bill is an Act respecting the pensions to officers of the North-west mounted police.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Yes, but this Act is not intended to cover all cases. It applies to contributors who belong to the force, but by the changes suggested, we are making it apply to people who do not contribute their share. I am not expressing any opinion as to whether that is wise or not.

Mr. CLARKE. Section 8 leaves it at the option of the government to determine whether a pension shall be granted at all or not.

The PRIME MINISTER. The Act is intended only to apply to those who contribute to the fund and in the cases referred to, where a man, disabled or killed, has not served his full time, they are dealt with separately by the government. Take, for instance, item 107 of the estimates, 'pensions payable to militiamen and mounted police and others on account of the rebellion of 1885.' This deals with men who were disabled in the service of the country, and in this we have followed the rule which was laid down in the Act of 1885 concerning the militia. I do not know that we can at present deal with such cases in any other way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I can hardly agree in the view expressed by my right hon. friend with regard to the scope of the Act. It does not make the amount of pensions depend on what was paid in, but on the length of the service. Even if there was not a dollar paid in, still those who served their full time would be entitled to a pension on that account. We are not discussing the details of the Act, and it will be quite proper for us to make any modifications which will extend the principle of the Act to the cases mentioned by my hon. friends from Toronto and Alberta. I am not in possession of all the information in the hands of the Minister of Justice, and I would like to know whether, in his remarks, he referred to the provisions of any statute ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I referred to the militia regulations which are made applicable by Order in Council to the North-west Mounted Police.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any statute enabling that to be done ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I presume there must be a statute authorizing the Order in Council to be passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. We take an appropriation every year for those pensions, and by Order in Council we provide the scale on which this fund shall be expended.

Mr. CLARKE. While the right hon. gentleman says that cases such as those I have mentioned are specially dealt with by parliament, or the recommendation of an Order in Council, the clause allowed to stand proposes to deal with them in an arbitrary way. If an officer is obliged to quit the force before a pension can be granted him the Governor in Council may grant him a gratuity of three months pay for every two years he has served. If he has not served the full number of years, he should be entitled to a reasonable pension for the services he has rendered.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. If you allow those to participate who have served shorter terms the scheme will not be self-supporting. There is no doubt we have the power, if we wish, to provide that every mounted policeman who is hurt, shall receive a pension, whether he has been only a short time or a long time in the service. But we have never gone so far, I believe, as to make a general pension applying to the militia or to the mounted police. There have been difficulties in the way. This applies to officers.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is a Pension Act for the men which has been on the statute-book for a long time.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. At all events this applies only to the officers. If we desire to subscribe what is necessary to an enlargement of the scope of any existing scheme, let us do it with our eyes open, let us have some sort of calculation to show what we are to be asked for. The right hon. leader of the government should be ready to say that he is prepared to ask the Minister of Finance for what is necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I regarded the Bill as my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) does, I could not vote for it, for we have no information to indicate that the scheme will be self-supporting. The right hon. leader of the government has not brought down a line or a figure to show that the contributions provided for will make the scheme self-sustaining. I am not regarding it in that light at all, but rather in this way—though it may impose some burden upon the country, and very likely will, it is right and proper to make some provisions for these men and at the same time to make them contribute in as fair and reasonable a way as possible towards the support of the fund. I agree with the hon. member for South Norfolk that if the scheme is to be dealt with as a self-supporting scheme we should have the further information he has referred to.

Mr. OLIVER. I understood the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to say that those receiving injuries in action were provided for under the Militia Act. There have been many injuries received by members of the mounted police force in the discharge of their duties which could hardly be characterized as injuries received in action. So I think it is necessary, if the idea I have is to be met, that there should be provision in this Act to meet the case of those so injured. It seems to me rather strange that an officer who, we will suppose, has successfully dodged danger for twenty or twenty-five years should get a pension, while the dependent relatives of an officer who, in the first years of his term, serves his country by sacrificing life or limb receives nothing. That is surely an unfair proposition, and, what is more, is not in the interests of efficient service, which is the chief purpose to be attained by all such measures as this.

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the right hon. gentleman (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allows clause 5 to stand for further consideration. I would ask that clause 8 be treated in the same way.

The PRIME MINISTER. Stand.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 10,

Mr. OLIVER. Is this amount payable yearly ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). For life ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

On section 11,

Mr. OLIVER. Is this also a yearly payment ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

On section 15,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the fortieth line appears the date 'the thirteenth day of June.' I do not see the significance of the 'thirteenth.' Is this not a misprint for the 'thirtieth' day of June ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I suppose that this is a misprint for 'thirtieth.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This applies to officers, and officers may make option. Now, suppose an officer is 29 years in the service, and would have paid his 5 per cent only one year, would he still be entitled to all the privileges of this Act ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think there is one officer in that category. There are only two officers who have been in the service over 25 years.

Progress reported.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 76) further to amend the Pilotage Act, (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) read the second time ; and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the Minister of Justice would tell us the effect of the change he makes in the present Act.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The change is very simple. It has for its object to extend the operations of the Pilotage Act as it now stands with respect to vessels navigating between the maritime provinces and the Atlantic seaboard north of New York, to vessels that may navigate between Ontario and the great lakes and the ports on the St. Lawrence within the limits of the province of Quebec. As we have it now under chapter 80, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, section 59, it is provided that a certain class of ships shall be exempt from the compulsory payment of pilotage. Amongst these are :

> Ships propelled wholly or in part by steam employed in trading from port to port in the same province, or between any one or more of the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island, and any other or others of them, or employed on voyages between any port or ports in the said provinces or any of them and the port of New York or any port of the United States of America on the Atlantic north of New York; except only in the ports of Halifax, Sydney pilotage district, Miramichi and Pictou—as respects each of which ports the pilotage authorities of the district may, from time to time, determine with the approval of the Governor in Council whether any, and which, if any, of the steamships so employed shall or shall not be wholly or partially, to what extent and under what circumstances, exempt from the compulsory payment of pilotage dues.

That is to say, under the law as we had it previous to 1900, a vessel trading between any one of the Atlantic ports of the United States north of New York or the ports of the maritime provinces, and any port in the province of Quebec was exempt from compulsory pilotage. Then in 1900 the provisions of this section declaring vessels to be exempt were extended to vessels trading from any place in Newfoundland to any one of the provinces I have mentioned. But the committee will notice that there is no provision here for vessels trading between the province of Ontario and provinces mentioned. A vessel trading from Ontario or from any of the ports on the great lakes, down to the maritime provinces, would not be exempt, because there is no reference to the province of Ontario in the Act at present. The amendment therefore is intended to extend the exemption of vessels trading between Ontario and the province of Quebec, or between any port on the great lakes and the province of Quebec. It extends the exemption to vessels trading downwards as well as to vessels trading upwards.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it intended to exempt from compulsory pilotage ? It looks as if it did so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then a vessel coming from the United States or one of the eastern provinces up to the port of Montreal, or going further up to the great lakes, if it is propelled by steam or partly by steam, it is not compelled to employ a pilot.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If it goes from a port in the maritime provinces to a port in Quebec, but if it goes into Ontario, the statute does not provide for exemption. Exemption will apply all over now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In other words, it I understand the minister aright, it allows vessel owners to employ any pilot they choose.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it is in the direction of free pilotage.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) I understand from the minister that the intention of this Act is to enable a vessel propelled wholly or in part by steam, coming from the maritime provinces to Ontario, to be exempted from pilotage dues.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As the law stands now, a vessel coming from the maritime provinces and going up into any port on the St. Lawrence within the province of Quebec is exempt. The object of this Bill is to exempt in the same way vessels that may trade from the great lakes or from any port in Ontario with the St. Lawrence or the other ports below. Vessels trading between Ontario and ports on the great lakes with the other provinces, are to be exempted from compulsory pilotage, as those are now that trade between the maritime provinces and Quebec.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is the law as it now stands.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I notice the Bill does not apply to trans-Atlantic steamers. The principal object ought to be to apply it to them because the general complaint

that is made by the owners of steamships coming from the other side of the Atlantic is, that, as they are compelled to use pilots, and as they have to pay for them, they ought to be allowed to make a free choice of pilots. The provisions of the Bill ought to be extended to steamships coming from the other side.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask some explanation in regard to the last paragraph of that section It seems to me that an exception is made in favour of the port of Halifax, the Sydney pilotage district, Miramichi and Pictou. In these pilotage districts, pilotage dues may be charged or vessels may be exempt wholly or partially from the payment of dues. What is the reason for that distinction ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it would perhaps be wiser for me to ask the hon. member for Victoria, N.B. (Mr. Costigan) to enlighten me as to the intention because this is the law as I found it on the statute-book for many years, and I have simply re-enacted it.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not think I could give the explanation, because, in my ignorance, not being a lawyer, I read what I saw before me, and I read that a certain section had been repealed and that the following had been substituted therefor. I may be too dense to comprehend this if there is no change and the same law is substituted.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not think the hon. Minister of Justice gave a very good reason for the Bill he has introduced. If he does not understand the Bill he introduces or the statute that he proposes to amend, then, he ought to submit a Bill that he does understand so that we can understand the information he gives us.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have introduced a Bill to amend the Pilotage Act. There are certain provisions amending the law in existence and there are certain other provisions which are merely re-enacting the existing law. In reference to the questions of my hon. friend I merely referred him to the explanation of those who introduced and passed the law. At any rate, I took the old law as it was and made changes to the extent I thought necessary.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this Bill apply to British ships ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. To all ships.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I asked for information as to why this last paragraph gave exceptional powers to these districts named. The hon. minister explains that he is making certain changes in the law and re-enacting certain portions of the old law. Consistent with the first question I asked, if it be necessary to change certain portions, what are the different conditions that induced him to change those portions and leave the others unchanged ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have left that portion unchanged which has been in operation for many years, and I assume, that, it having been in operation for many years and no complaint having been made, it is giving satisfaction.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have not yet got from the hon. Minister of Justice the reason why this Act should apply to vessels coming from the maritime provinces and from the American coast and not to trans-Atlantic liners.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not apply it to trans-Atlantic liners at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know. Why do you not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Because this clause is practically to provide for the coasting trade as the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) suggests. But those who understand the meaning of the pilotage laws know that the trans-Atlantic liners are included in the pilotage system and that it is extremely desirable that the whole system should be changed, and I am not quite sure that it is very far from the mind of the minister to do that. I think he is considering the question, because, as I understand it now, compulsory pilotage does not exist. What does exist is the compulsory payment of pilotage dues and compulsory payment of pilotage dues is applicable to trans-Atlantic steamers. As a matter of practice an owner will take a pilot on board his ship but if he did not do so he would be obliged to pay pilotage dues notwithstanding that fact. This is a condition of things that deserves consideration but it is a different question from that which is dealt with by this Bill.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know the Bill does not apply to that question, but the complaint is made by the owners of trans-Atlantic steamers that they have not the option of employing the pilot they choose when they come in. Under the Bill you need not employ a pilot or you may employ the pilot you choose. Why not give the same privilege to trans-Atlantic steamers ?

Bill reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Militia—Pay and allowances, $392,100.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE (South Norfolk). Mr. Chairman, when the militia estimates were up a few days ago their passage was objected to because the report of the Major-General and the other reports were not in the hands of hon. members. They came down very shortly afterwards, and before we take up these estimates, I pro-

pose, with the consent of the committee, to make a few remarks upon the general question of the militia. My desire is to get other hon. members of this House to take an interest in this question other than what they call the colonels. They generally speak of militia day in the House as colonels' day. There are very few militia men in the House and a number of them are now out of the service. I have not now the honour of belonging to the service, because I am long past the age limit and probably my usefulness comes in being able to give some attention to the question and perhaps to offer some suggestions. I think now a very opportune time for us to seriously consider the condition of the militia of Canada, and I want to ask hon. gentlemen who represent this Dominion whether they are going to be content to have three or four, or perhaps half a dozen gentlemen in the House, because they happen to be in the force, assume the responsibility to the country for the estimates and for understanding the wants, the actions and the fitness of the militia and all the different branches of the service ?

If the committee will allow me, I will bring their attention back to forty years ago; a time which marked an epoch in the history of our Canadian militia. At that time a thrill of indignation went through the British empire, because a foreign power saw fit to board a British ship and lay hands upon southern refugees who had sought sanctuary there. In what state were the defences of Canada at that time ? There was scarcely a serviceable rifle or musket, and there was not what we would call today any real organization of our militia. To the great honour of Canada, over 240,000 men answered on the day fixed to the call of their country. That was a larger number than had ever responded to the call of the United States at any fixed day during the war in that country. Up to the time of the Trent affair I do not think there were half a dozen companies in our whole active militia, that were properly supplied with arms or knew anything about the use of them.

It was then that Canada decided to lay the foundation of a military force which would be a credit to the country. That force has since then grown to splendid proportions. We have made progress. Another epoch has now arrived in our military history. The empire for the first time has availed of the colonies to assist her in her struggle against a foreign power. Let us consider if our contribution to the empire is such as is creditable to a great federated country like Canada. We have plenty of spirit and any quantity of men, but I do not think that we seriously consider the position of our military forces. This subject is all the more pertinent in view of the fact that our Prime Minister will meet the Prime Ministers of all the colonies in London to discuss among other things the military defences of the empire. I am getting along past the time of life when I can serve my country in the field, and it is only left for me to give my advice in this parliament in the light of my experience as to what our military force should be. I am afraid I must accuse myself that in the past, like others, I have not taken our militia seriously enough. The time has come when we ought to consider this matter seriously, and when we should give encouragement and support to the boys who are enrolling in our active militia, and to the boys who have gone thousands of miles away to leave their bones on the veldt of South Africa in defence of the empire. I asked the Minister of Militia some time ago to defer his estimates until we had the report of the Major General commanding. We have that report now, and I am not depreciating the able men who formerly have been in command of our militia when I say that the report of the present Major General is perhaps the most thorough and most complete that we have ever had. This report is presented in such a common sense way that it can be understood by every man in this House, whether he has had previous military training or not. With the permission of the House I propose to consider that report briefly and to explain how our defensive force is organized. I shall make my remarks on this subject entirely free from politics, and entirely free from any fault finding, even if there be room for finding fault. It is my opinion, as I have often said before, that the militia should be kept entirely out of politics. It is above and beyond all politics. Of course, it must to some extent have a political bearing because the minister who controls our militia for the time being must belong to one or other of the political parties, but so far as I am concerned I will exclude politics as much as possible from the consideration of this question. If I have any fault to find with the Minister of Militia, or with the manner in which the contingents were despatched to South Africa, I propose to do as the Liberals do in the old country : viz., keep my criticism until the war is over and then bring the minister to account. I intend to show to the people of the world that whatever our political disagreements may be in Canada, we are ready and willing to show a united front in defence of our country and of the empire, and to leave complaint and criticism until we have conquered the enemy.

Now, Sir, the defensive force of Canada is divided into three branches, namely : The permanent force ; the active militia or volunteers ; and the sedentary militia. The means of instruction are under four heads : First, the permanent force or Royal schools of military instruction connected therewith ; second, provisional schools for the examination of officers ; third, the Royal Military

College ; and fourth, camps of instructions or annual drill.

The provisional school and the Royal Military College are only for officers, and the Royal school of military instruction and the annual camps are for non-commissioned officers and men. In regard to the permanent force, I think it is well understood without my explaining it, more than to say that it is a force that is enrolled and kept under military regulations just as if it were composed of so many regular soldiers ; but the instructive feature of the force is very important.

Now, with your permission, I will read what the Major General says about that force, and his recommendations and suggestions in connection with it :

In my report for the year 1900, I adverted to the difficulties against which the units of the permanent forces had to contend by reason of the number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men on service with the contingents in South Africa. This year I have had the opportunity of seeing them under normal condition, and it gives me great pleasure to be able to report that the general result of my inspections was very satisfactory as regards their discipline, training, conduct and administration, but I regret to say that all branches are considerably below their established strength, so much so indeed that I cannot consider them thoroughly efficient, even for instructional purposes. The reason why difficulty is experienced in obtaining recruits will probably be found in the great commercial and agricultural prosperity of the Dominion and the consequent demand for civil labour at a high rate of wages. It is also a matter of common notoriety in the military service that the smaller the establishment the harder it is to maintain it at full strength.

In my opinion the most effectual measure for maintaining the establishment of the permanent units will be a readjustment of the rates of pay so as to bring the emoluments of the soldier, inclusive of his rations, clothing, medical attendance and quarters, more on a level with the wages he could earn in civil employment. The present rate of daily pay is 40 cents, or 10 cents less than is paid to militiamen for annual training and to men serving in the 3rd (S.S.) battalion of the Royal Canadian Regiment at Halifax, N.S., and to this I think may be attributed the desertions that usually occur in the early summer, when the demand for labour is on the increase. In so small a force there is no use for men of inferior stamp. We need the very best, and there appears no reason why the militia should not succeed equally with the North-west mounted police if we compete in the labour market on fairly even terms.

The object for which the permanent force is maintained is primarily to furnish schools of instruction in which officers, non-commissioned officers and men of the active militia can not only be trained in drill, tactics and discipline more fully and practically than with their own units, but also learn the interior administration and the routine of duties pertaining to their respective arms of the service. They should also be able to acquire the habits and demeanour of officers and soldiers, in order that they may serve as models for the corps to which they belong. To this end all ranks of the permanent corps exert themselves and do their utmost to carry out their important duties as far as circumstances will permit, the classes receiving very careful instruction.

Then follow recommendations for the filling up and increase of the permanent troops, concluding as follows :

The foregoing recommendations would entail an increase to the permanent force of about 18 officers and 462 'other ranks,' and consequently clause 28 of the Militia Act would require to be amended so as to provide for the maintenance of permanent troops not exceeding 1,500 men ; but I submit that the enormous increase in the wealth and responsibilities of the Dominion since the Act was passed more than warrant such an increase. In support of these recommendations I would urge that if they are adopted, the country would possess a force of highly trained troops, not only efficient for the purpose for which it is primarily maintained, but also effective in the event of war or internal disturbance, which at the existing establishments it cannot possibly be. If, therefore, it be impracticable to accept this increase in its entirety, I yet hope that the additional 'rank and file' may be granted as a first step towards placing our permanent troops on a more satisfactory basis.

Then he speaks of the provisional schools. I will not trouble the House by reading it, because I can explain it more shortly, and if I went on to read all these extracts, much as I would like to put them on 'Hansard,' it would consume too much time. He recommends the abolition of the provisional schools, for many reasons, the concluding one of which I will read :

I believe the introduction of the provisional schools has had a prejudicial effect on the standard of efficiency attained by many young militia officers, and that in the best interest of the service it is inexpedient to continue to hold them. With this opinion I feel sure the majority of experienced militia officers will concur.

He gives many other reasons, which can be read by those who wish to follow the matter up in detail. As to the Royal Military College, he says :

The commandant comments adversely upon the result of the riding instruction, but the conditions are very unfavourable.

He recommends that the riding part of the instruction be abolished, and that the cadets obtain that experience by being attached to the Royal Dragoons at Toronto. Then he goes on—and I wish to call the particular attention of the Minister of Militia to this :

It is a matter for great regret that this admirable institution, established for the express purpose of securing for the Canadian militia a supply of well trained and capable officers, entirely fails to attain this object. What brought about this state of things it is impossible to say, but one thing seems clear, that in the period spent at the college, the students do not imbibe any soldierly ambition or acquire a taste for military employment, and it is sad to see, year after year, young gentlemen who have received such an excellent military education

at great cost to the state, holding aloof from the service of their country. With a view to secure in some measure a return for the cost to Canada of keeping up a military college, I suggest that before a young gentleman is admitted as a student, he and his parents or guardians should give a joint bond that on graduation he will serve for a specific number of years as a commissioned officer in a corps of the active militia, and I consider that some regulation of this nature should be adopted, if in the future the college is to justify its existence as a military institution.

Now, do not misunderstand this. He does not find any fault with the standard of the college, its possibilities and the admirable way in which it is conducted; but he objects—and I feel strongly with him—to the large expense of that college, if the result is not that for a time at least Canada shall have the advantage of the service of these cadets whom we educate at such great expense.

Now, the active militia or volunteers include, as we all know, infantry, artillery, and cavalry; and I will read what the Major General says of these forces, his appreciation of them, and his suggestions in regard to them :

My inspections of the camps of instruction in military districts No. 1, 2, 3 and 4, 5, 6 and 7 afforded me an opportunity of seeing a great number of the rural corps at their training, and enabled me to gauge their practical efficiency. As in my report last year, I can speak most favourably of the zeal, intelligence and excellent spirit of all ranks, and the administration, cleanliness, good order and discipline maintained in the camps was highly creditable to all concerned. I must also specially commend the manner in which the officers in command and staff officers carried out their duties. I believe that, taken altogether, as much was accomplished in the way of training as existing conditions will permit of. In some districts the results were rather better than in others, which was in a measure due to very adverse climatic conditions, which seriously interfered with tactical instruction, but I can only repeat that in nine working days it is absolutely impossible to impart more than the mere rudiments of a soldier's training. The time does not admit of any practice instruction in the more important branches of 'field training' or 'musketry,' and consequently the net result is very far indeed from being satisfactory as regards the practical efficiency of the Canadian militia. Officers and men, I feel sure, do their very best, but I can only reiterate what I said in my last report, viz.: 'that the troops can never be made even fairly fit to take the field with the limited period of annual drill that they receive under existing arrangements.' The difficulty is greatly accentuated by the fact that, as a rule, quite 60 per cent of the men in the ranks are raw recruits, who retard the progress of the remainder, for, as the strength of a chain is that of its weakest link, so is the instruction of large bodies of troops in advanced modern tactics hindered by the presence of a mass of practically untrained men in the ranks.

The wastage that takes place year after year in our rural corps is perhaps the most serious drawback against which the militia of Canada has to contend, and it is impossible to acquit captains of companies of a considerable share of blame for this unfortunate state of affairs, for many of them seem to consider that so long as they can bring into camp some approximation to their full establishment, the proportion of 'recruits' is of no consequence, neither do they make any efforts to enforce the provisions of the Militia Act against deserters. Apathy on the part of the officers has a most direct influence upon the military spirit of the people who compose the rural companies, and I am quite confident that zealous exertion on the part of the officers would go far to mitigate if it did not altogether remove this evil.

I am still of opinion, however, that the value of the militiaman's services increases in direct ratio to the extent of his training, and that consequently it would be true economy to adopt a scale of pay graduated according to the number of trainings performed.

But even with the recruits reduced to the proper proportion (33 per cent), it is obvious that they should undergo some preliminary training before the bulk of their regiment assembles, so that they might be fit to take their places in the ranks with the older soldiers. Progressive instruction could then be given to all on the same lines, which at present is impracticable owing to the backwardness of the first year men.

Then he proceeds to recommend his remedy. He says :

I therefore recommend that the statutory drill period should be altered to give a maximum of 28 days.

In another part of his report he divides that period up and shows that the recruits should have seven days drill before the others. Then he goes on to say :

It is obvious that such an extension of the training would entail a corresponding increase of expenditure, but not more I conceive than the important interests involved in the defence of Canada would justify, and even demand. I venture to think that this is a question that has never yet been taken seriously, and the time seems ripe that the defence of the country should be dealt with as a practical matter and in a common sense way. It goes without saying that the expenditure on military defence, against troubles from without or from within, must be governed by fiscal considerations, or in other words by what the country can afford, but I would urge most earnestly that it is to the quality rather than to the quantity of our defenders that our efforts should be directed. 20,000 troops thoroughly well officered, trained and equipped would give the country a better return for the money expended on its military forces than 40,000 men on paper, who, under existing conditions, cannot be expected to be efficient for actual and real service in the field. If, therefore, the country is unable or unwilling to extend the annual training of the whole of the active militia, I would urge that the numbers trained annually be reduced so far as may be necessary to secure for those that are trained the time requisite to make them fairly efficient soldiers in discipline, field training and the use of their arms.

This is very startling perhaps with regard to the length of time, and I am inclined to

think that it would be difficult to make the period so long, but I think that three weeks altogether, from the time the men leave, would give a period that would very much improve the capabilities of the soldiers.

The general speaks equally high of the city corps but recommend that they should be compelled every year to assemble in camp so as to enable them to get a knowledge of camp life—to learn how to shoot, to learn field practice and other things. Now comes a recommendation, which I consider most important, and which shows how thoroughly the general has, in a most common sense way reviewed the whole situation. We all know that the number of active militia we have would amount to very little, even if mustered in full force, should we get into war, and he therefore takes up the question of reserves and divides that into two branches. I am going to trouble the House with reading his whole proposition, which shows that the cost of having reserves to fill the ranks or enlarge the force would not amount to anything very considerable. He writes as follows :—

(21.) In the existing organization of the military forces of the Dominion two defects are very conspicuous ; they are:

(1.) That with the exception of the more recently raised units, viz., Field Companies of Engineers, Companies of the Army Service Corps and the Field Hospitals and Bearer Companies, there are no war establishments prescribed for the fighting troops.

(2.) That even were such establishments prescribed, no practical machinery exists for raising regiments, batteries and battalions from a peace to a war footing.

The first of these is a comparatively simple matter to be dealt with by regulations which I purpose to submit, but the second is a very much more important question, demanding most serious consideration and possibly special legislation. The units of the active militia as they now stand in the establishment lists cannot be taken seriously in any scheme for the defence of Canadian territory. Our regiments of eight companies number 306 rank and file, equivalent on a war footing to a little over two companies, and when we come down to the so-called 'regiments' of four companies they practically only amount to one company for fighting purposes ; thus our existing system only provides us with the nuclei of armed forces that must be capable of expansion to render them efficient units in war. The problem to be faced is how to devise a practical scheme for rapidly raising our units to whatever may be prescribed as their war strength, with the least possible disturbance of existing conditions, but one thing is very clear that sooner or later it has to be done, if our militia is to be regarded as a truly efficient defence for Canadian soil.

It would not be possible here to enter into all the details that would require to be provided for in the organization of reserves for the active militia, but the following is a brief statement of the lines upon which I believe it would be practicable to proceed under the powers conferred by the Militia Act.

(a.) That for every squadron, battery or company of the active militia there be raised from the first and second classes of the male population (sec. II) by ballot (sec. 12, (c.) an affiliated unit of 50 men.

(b.) That in time of peace such unit need not be called out for training, but each man must be a duly registered member of a Civilian Rifle Club and must produce, when called upon, a certificate that he has fired his annual allowance of ammunition, under some penalty to be legally prescribed.

(c.) That the captain of the active unit shall be 'ipso facto' the commanding officer of the reserve unit.

(d.) That every man enrolled in a reserve unit shall present himself at company head-quarters to be mustered once a year on a date to be specified by the D.O.C.

(e.) That reasonable travelling allowances for attending muster should be granted to any reservist residing beyond six miles from company head-quarters.

(f.) That non-commissioned officers and men who have served three years or upwards in the active militia be encouraged to voluntarily join the reserve of their own unit, receiving a small gratuity according to their rank on presenting themselves for annual muster.

The foregoing remarks apply more especially to rural corps which are organized on the squadron or company basis, but a similar system would, with perhaps some modification, apply to urban units which are organized regimentally. The question of reserves, so far as personnel is concerned, presents no real difficulty, for the men are there and can be converted into fairly efficient troops in a few weeks. But it is quite a different matter when we come to deal with material. Guns, rifles, saddlery, harness, equipment, clothing, tents and ammunition for the war establishments, &c., cannot be improvised at short notice, and I venture to urge that this is a matter of natural importance deserving of the most serious and careful consideration. No people are free from the sacred obligation to defend their own land from foreign aggression, and I contend that this can only be effectually and economically done by a business-like and gradual preparation in time of peace.

The expenditure on defence should be looked upon as the annual premium on a policy of national insurance, and as money well laid out in securing the independence and prosperity that can only be assured by 'the strong man armed.'

I think that that is a magnificent suggestion, simply and well put. The only objection I see to it is the ballot, but under the circumstances and for the purpose of having a unit of that sort, I am quite prepared to adopt the general's proposition. But I wish to draw this distinction. I do not want the ballot applied to the formation of companies and regiments, and to increase those for the purposes of drill, because that would add largely to our expenditure. But the suggestion is simple and effective. There shall be raised an affiliated unit of 50 men for every squadron, battery or company of the active militia. That would give a large increase at a very limited expense. The time taken is only what would be required for these men to go to headquarters once a year on a day to be mentioned and there present their certificates of the shooting accomplished, and if the men live more

than six miles away their expenses are to be paid coming and going. Probably when the Minister of Militia comes to deal with the matter he will be able to tell us how much that would increase our 35,000 men.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. About 75,000.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. That would add 400 to the eight company regiments and give a very respectable unit. I hope that all hon. members will seriously consider this suggestion and explain in their different localities that this is not a ballot in the ordinary sense. It is not unfair to those who will never go out, but who will benefit by the education given those men who deserve and by the expenses they have to go to. The greatest difficulty will be on the part of those who, owing to the nature of their business, cannot get leave of absence from their employers to go to camp. A much greater number of men will thus obtain a knowledge of how to handle the rifle and to shoot at long range, which is a difficult thing to learn, and on which we must depend for our success in case of war. Most of the fights in South Africa have been decided at long range. This suggestion shows considerable courage on the part of the general because it is rather repugnant to the spirit of our people to be drafted unless when the necessity of war comes upon us. This is rather a casting of lots to see who shall learn how to use the rifle and for how long a time, rather than a ballot, and the services of these men thus balloted will only be called upon in case of war. The fact of their going out for the purpose of getting a knowledge of shooting and obtaining this free ammunition does not make a man liable to turn out except in case the country is put on a war basis to meet some emergency.

Then we require the necessary material in the proper shape to enable us to wage war or to defend our country, and I will therefore read the general's recommendation with regard to magazines and stores. He says :—

(11) I have again to urge the necessity of providing magazine and store accommodation in western Canada.

Decentralization is admittedly one of the principles of up-to-date military administrations, but as yet in Canada we have made little advance in this direction, and as regards ammunition we have but one arsenal and reserve magazine, and that so located at an extremity of the country, as to combine the maximum of inconvenience in peace and of difficulty and danger in time of war. I hold it to be absolutely essential to the efficient defence of Canada that reserve magazines be without delay provided for the supply of the troops in military districts Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 and 10 ; and there is no military doubt that a second arsenal for the manufacture of ammunition is most necessary, the capacity of the existing arsenal working at full power scarcely exceeding that required to meet the annual requirements of the troops.

As regards stores for equipment, the chief superintendent of stores urged in his report last year the provision of new and more extensive buildings at Kingston and Toronto, and in supporting his views I would strongly recommend that the Tete-de-Pont barracks at Kingston, which are very ill-suited for the accommodation of troops, be converted into a depot for clothing, equipment and warlike stores, other than ammunition, for which the existing buildings with slight alterations would be very suitable. If this were done new barracks could be provided for the field artillery school, which I consider to be most necessary, as those now in occupation by the troops are deficient of most of the requirements of a modern barracks, and to bring them up to a reasonable degree of comfort and convenience would, even if practicable, cost so much as to render the construction of a modern and thoroughly sanitary barrack an economy in the end, and moreover, it would, I feel confident, make service in the field artillery much more popular.

While on this subject it is my duty to point out the need of 'mobilization stores' at the headquarters of military districts, in which should be held a complete equipment for each unit in the district, sufficient to enable it to take the field. These stores should be held in charge by the district officer commanding, and without such a distribution of warlike stores and a thorough decentralization of the store branch, rapid and successful mobilization for war is an absolute impossibility.

No matter how well trained may be the personnel of an army its practical efficiency for war must be measured by the rapidity with which it can be brought to a war footing and placed in the field as a perfect fighting machine. This is simply a matter of administration on up-to-date lines in time of peace, and the first step necessary to this end is to locate the necessary material where it is required for issue to the troops, and thus avoid a hurried distribution with, as a rule, confusion and miscarriage, should the emergency arise.

I venture to hope that the great importance of this feature in military administration may commend it to earnest consideration, and that the provision of a western reserve magazine, and, if possible, a secondary arsenal may be provided at the earliest practicable date.

While on this subject, I wish to call the attention of the minister to the report of the superintendent of the Dominion arsenal or cartridge factory. He says :

On different occasions, it has been proposed, by well-meaning but misinformed persons, that another cartridge factory should be erected in the western part of the Dominion. It may be well to explain that our present establishment is equal to meeting all actual requirements, and that orders received are so small it is just possible to keep together an effective working staff. A division of the work, by erecting another factory, would mean starvation and disaster to both. The strategical reasons urged against the situation of this arsenal are not well grounded.

I am glad to say the minister is already committed in his opinion, and it agrees with that of the general, that it is almost indispensable that we should have a western arsenal at the very first possible moment. The superintendent of the factory seems to disagree with both the minister and the general. But I will not take up the time of

the House with giving the reasons for a change in addition to the fact of our one arsenal being so far east. We have had that subject discussed, and any hon. gentleman who wishes to follow it up should consult 'Hansard' of 1900, pages 8320 and 8325, and 'Hansard' of 1901, page 3786. In those discussions there was a concurrence of opinion in favour of the proposal which the general so strongly advocated. And the minister promised to look into the matter carefully at the earliest possible moment. Not only do we want an additional arsenal in western Ontario, but the time will come—and the sooner the better, finances allowing—when we should have one in Manitoba and one in the far west. Let me say, while this is in my mind, that if we have to call out the militia on a war footing it will be a very sudden call, and we shall have to face a mighty force, for our frontier is so long that its defence will always be a serious matter. Therefore, nothing should be left undone, in my opinion, that will improve our position.

Now, one more quotation from the general and I am done. This I give to show how careful and exhaustive has been his consideration of these matters, yet how simple and complete his recommendation. This relates to armouries, and the general recommends a new departure, with which, I must say, so far as my judgment goes, I am in hearty accord :

I have given much thought to the question of whether rural corps should be provided with central armouries, and having consulted all the district officers commanding I have come to the conclusion that the 'company armoury' is more suited to the conditions under which our rural militia is organized.

It is of course obvious that arms and equipment are better cared for, as a rule, in a central armoury, but this is, I conceive, the only important argument in its favour. On the other hand, to deprive the captains of their arms tends to lessen their interest in their companies, and deprives the non-commissioned officers and men of any opportunity of drilling or rifle shooting in the country hamlets and districts, for it can scarcely be expected that people will take much pride or interest in their local company which they never see. I have also observed that where rural regiments have been provided with central armouries, there is a decided leaning on the part of commanding officers to gradually convert their commands into city corps, to the very great detriment of the service, for, however good the city regiments may be, the bulk of our defence force must be the hardy men of our rural units, and anything which has a possibility of weakening that portion of the active militia is, in my opinion, greatly to be deprecated.

I, therefore, recommend that 'central armouries' should cease to be provided for rural regiments, and that, in their stead, plain substantial buildings should be hired, as at present, for company armouries at the company headquarters.

Now, with the permission of the committee, having dealt with the report and and having read some important extracts from it, I will pass from it with one suggestion. I think it will well pay every member of this House to get this excellent report and read it, especially that part of it wherein he deals with the questions of which I have given you a brief view. I propose now to give you briefly my views on the position of militia affairs in this coutry. Now what do we require for defensive purposes ? We require men, training, instruction, arms, supplies and ammunition. What have we now ? We have any number of men of the very best sort. I have explained to you what we have in the way of instruction and training. I think the instructions for the officers is ample. I wish to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to take into, his serious consideration one point with regard to the Royal Military College, and seeing to it that the General's recommendation is carried out, that the young men we educate so well there shall be compelled to serve a certain time, to make arrangements ahead, and if they are not willing to do that, then let them get that sort of military training at their own expense. While it is all right to send as many as we can, and that is only a limited number, to Great Britain, to enter the regular army, yet we need them more here. If the young gentlemen who go there understood that it was a part of the curriculum, if I may use that word, that they should serve afterwards for a certain time in some of the companies, they would become efficient officers. In that way I think the General's suggestion is well worthy of consideration. If we cannot get our young men, coming from the class they do, to take that interest in their own country, I for my part would back up the abolition of that institution, which is a point of his recommendation. Surely if they have the spirit to go there and spend time there, they ought to be willing to devote some of their time, subsequently to serving in the companies, and I am sure that one of the great difficulties the Minister of Militia and Defence finds is in getting qualified officers who are willing to serve. Then as to the camp of instruction, we all know its usefulness. We have now the best arms, clothing and supplies, and a considerable amount of ammunition, and when we come to the estimates, I shall inquire from the minister, and in case I should not be here, I would like some other gentleman to ask the Minister of Militia and Defence to present a statement to this House, showing what ammunition he has got, and where it is located.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question ? What arms have we at present in the country ?

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I cannot tell you how many ; but I know that the improved rifle is sufficient for the soldiers that drill. The minister can tell.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. 40,000 stand.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Just enough for the force. Well, I do not urge hasty action in regard to that point, for this reason, that I understand evolutions are going on all the time in regard to the British arms. When we get the proper kind of arms we ought to have a reserve supply at the different headquarters. And so with regard to what the General says about clothing and supplies, and more especially ammunition. Rifles and men are of no use without ammunition; and we want it distributed so that we can always get it, in case any internal disturbance should arise, but more especially if we are ever attacked from outside. Now what does the General suggest? As I read his suggestion, he proposes, with our present force, calling for no more officers, calling for no more money, to put it on a complete war footing. I think this suggestion is worthy of a gentleman who is worthy to command as Major General any colony of the empire, and especially Canada; and I hope the minister will give it his serious attention. I hope he will do more, that he will have the courage to act upon some of these suggestions, because it requires a certain amount of courage to ask the Minister of Finance for extra money for the militia. But these are growing times, we are told, and if they are, let us take what we want with no niggard hand as long as we are satisfied that it will be well used, as I think it will, in the defence of this country. The men liable under the Militia Act can be mobilized in no other way, and if the time comes it would give us a very respectable force ready to our hand. The General also recommends more days of drill. Well, that is a difficulty too, but I never knew a time in the history of Canada, or of the empire, when this suggestion would be more likely to be accepted in a proper spirit, and that arrangements should be made for an additional amount of training. The decentralization that he speaks of—I am sure the Minister of Militia and Defence will go with him in regard to that. It scarcely requires argument, it simply means that the supply of arms and the organization of the men shall be in such shape that you have not got to go to headquarters for everything, that you can get everything to your hand, and can utilize it in the field at once, and at proper points, with the proper quota of men armed and supplied with ammunition; for we already have the men, the world has no men superior to our Canadian boys in my opinion. I do not know that I have anything more to say. I shall be glad if what I have said will induce the hon. gentlemen who are members of this great legislative body to pay more attention to this subject. We have a country second to none in the world, with the same amount of population, with undeveloped resources sufficient for a hundred millions of people. And the time will come fast now, we see it coming, when the possibilities of Canada and the capabilities of Canada will attract world wide attention. Our great cousins to the south at last have wakened up to the knowledge of it, and good men, and true men, and many men, are coming here, and are taking advantage of it. Let me say that I have visited many parts of the west in my younger days, and sometimes in my older days, and there was no place where I liked to go better than in the wilds of those far off countries. There are hundreds of thousands of men in those far western states (that used to be territories) who will make the best sort of pioneers, and we have this great class to draw upon. You have no conception of the hardships of their lives, because, west of the Missouri river, there is only about 10 per cent of arable land to supply the wants of this vast number of people. These eastern states that we are drawing from now were the richest states of the union, but the people inhabiting them have discovered the wonderful richness of the vast plains and valleys bordering the great rivers of our western country, and they are seeking homesteads there. I will tell hon. gentlemen the reason why these people will become good citizens. They are the kind of men who do not like to live in a country where they do not vote and so that they may exercise the rights of citizenship they will take the oath of allegiance. When they come in under our institutions they will be surprised and delighted to find that our institutions are truly democratic and that our administration of the law is as strict against the rich man as against the poor one. They will quickly lose any affinity with the country from which they come and like the rest of us they will become good, sound, loyal, British subjects.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). Mr. Chairman, I think the members of this committee will feel greatly indebted to my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), who was my predecessor in office, for having given as much attention as he has to this very important subject and for having placed his views before the committee in the very clear and forcible manner in which he has done. I, personally, feel very much indebted to him for the very able address which he has made this afternoon. I quite agree with him that there has been too great a disposition in the past to treat the expenditure on account of the defences of this country in too light a way and not to give the serious consideration to such an important matter that it is deserving of. My hon. friend closed with a few very eloquent references to the present prosperous condition and vast resources of this country. I would simply add to what he said this one observation, with which I am sure every hon. member will agree, that the gifts which we possess, the great natural resources, carry with them their responsibility. Every country which is deserving of the blessings which we en-

joy has the responsibility of being prepared to defend the great gifts which it holds. No government, I hold, is properly discharging its duties which does not give due consideration to the question of defence, and I believe that in our time of prosperity we should not forget to take a portion of the increasing revenues of the country and devote them to the improvement of our defences. Now, I will endeavour, very briefly to refer to some of the matters which the hon. member for South Norfolk has brought before us. In the first place, he has referred to the annual report of the Militia Department, and more particularly to the report of the Major General. I am sure those who will take the trouble to read that report will agree with him, as I do, that he has not spoken in too high terms of praise of it. While, perhaps, in some of its details, or, possibly, in some of the conclusions of the Major General, I cannot literally concur, I say that in the main I approve of all that he has said. I think it is a convenient thing that the Major General, the head of the militia for the time being, should always have a free hand in placing before the people of the country his own views as a professional soldier upon the question of defence, and therefore, during my term of office, and I think it has been the custom in the past, the Major General of the day has had a free hand to express his real and genuine views in reference to the condition of the militia of the country and in reference to what he thinks ought to be done to improve the condition of the militia. The hon. member for South Norfolk has quoted very extensively from the Major General's report. I am glad he has done so; I am glad that there will be placed upon 'Hansard' the very valuable suggestions which the Major General has made. I will not, therefore, trouble the committee further by reading extracts from that report. I consider it unnecessary, but I will proceed to refer to some of the more important matters to which my hon. friend has given prominence. My hon. friend has referred to the permanent force and to the Major General's observations in connection with that force. It will be observed in the Major General's report that in a general way he speaks very encouragingly of the condition of that force and the principal recommendation he has to make is that the force should be increased. At present, under the existing law, the permanent force is limited to 1,000 men. Under the recommendations of the General it is proposed to increase the number to 1,500. I think that is a wise proposal; I think that when the Militia Act is re-enacted, or amended, it will be desirable to take further power to increase the number of the permanent force to 1,500. It is not my intention this year to ask for any amendment of the Militia Act, because I hope at the next session of parliament to introduce a Bill which will really be a re-enactment of the militia law and I may say here that I hope before the next session of parliament to have a Bill ready to be submitted to any members of this House, or any other gentlemen who are interested in such matters, so that we may have the advantage at the next session of parliament of getting the result of a very careful consideration of so important a subject. My hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Tisdale) has next referred to the question of the annual drill, and the desirability of extending the time has been discussed. The Major General advises the extension of the time to twenty-one days, and even to twenty-eight days. I am afraid that under the existing conditions in this country it will be very difficult to get the large number of men that we have now in the militia, some 35,000, to abandon their civil pursuits for so long a time as twenty-one days, not to speak of twenty-eight days. However, I do think that once in three years at least, we might have a longer time in camp than we have now. That will be one of the matters to be considered when the new Bill is being introduced.

The hon. gentleman has referred to what I think is more important, namely, the question of a militia reserve, and in that I am in entire accord with the proposal of the Major General. I may tell the House that at this very moment the suggestion which the general has made is being carried into effect. It is one which will involve very little additional expense, because the extra men who will be required for the purpose of increasing the number up to somewhere near a total strength of 100,000; these men can all be interested in the militia by being brought into the rifle associations, for which provision was made at the last session of parliament. I hope in this way, without any great increase in the annual expenditure, that we shall be able to have what will practically amount to a trebling of the present force of men who will be almost as effective as the 35,000 which we have now. At any rate, it will be composed of men who will have had experience in the art of rifle shooting.

The next item in the estimates is that which provides for the annual drill, and this year that item will be found to include musketry, clothing and stores. In former years the item was simply for 'annual drill,' and under the ruling of the Auditor General the expenditure would be limited to that. In view of the desirability of extending the opportunities of rifle shooting to as large a number of citizens as possible and of utilizing them as a part of the militia reserve of this country, I shall this year ask the House to give me that vote under the heading 'annual drill and musketry'; and to include in that vote, for reasons which I will explain later on, the sum which is ordinarily taken under the heading of

'Clothing and Stores.' It is very desirable that the executive shall have this power. It is impossible for me to say at this moment what amount of money should be used for annual drill and what amount might be more profitably used for the extensive proposals which we are making with reference to the teaching of rifle shooting. In view of the explanations of the object I have in view, I am sure the House will be prepared to give this additional elasticity to the vote for the purposes of annual drill. I may say that I believe that this can be done with little or no increase in the amount of money which we have been expending upon annual drill.

I propose in the future to take advantage of the discovery which has recently been made in connection with the cartridge factory of a cheap form of cartridge which can be manufactured at a very low price and which is safe to be used almost anywhere—it does not require the expensive rifle ranges which it is necessary to have when using ammunition of full strength. I would propose in the future that no man shall be taken on the force as a recruit until he had been tried with the rifle to see whether he showed any reasonable possibility of becoming a useful soldier. In this way we will give new interest to the force; we will bring into it a class of men who mean business, and we will exclude from it a most undesirable class of which a considerable number now attend the annual camps.

My hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) discussed the question of the construction of another arsenal in Canada, and he has referred to some statements which were made during former sessions. I am quite prepared to stand by what I said in the past: That no doubt the day is near at hand, if it has not already come, when we should at least have one other arsenal situated in a more central position in this country. I may say to the House, however, that we are now engaged in increasing enormously the capacity of the arsenal at Quebec, so that the output after a year hence will be four times what it is now. Instead of an annual output of perhaps 2,000,000 a year, we shall then have an annual output of 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 rounds a year, and that, mark you, working at only an eight hour basis. It would practically mean that we will have an arsenal at Quebec at which 18,000,000 or 20,000,000 cartridges can be manufactured working full time. What we really need more just now than an additional arsenal is two or three additional magazines in which to store our cartridges. As they are manufactured at Quebec they can be moved westward to convenient points for storage in these magazines. My hon. friend has asked me to state what amount of ammunition we have on hand——

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. And where it is?

Hon. Mr. BORDEN (King's).

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That question was asked last year by the late member for York (Mr. Wallace), and I then stated that I thought there were reasons why it was undesirable to make a public statement as to that, but I will give the information privately——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I still think so, but I shall tell any hon. gentleman in the House who comes to me and wants the information. Of course we have a considerable quantity at Toronto; we have a sufficient quantity at Kingston, and we have a considerable quantity at London. My hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale) said that he thought that some time very soon there should be even a third arsenal in our great North-west. I would hardly go that far. I think something of the kind might be considered as to British Columbia, but in case of a war the question of holding the intermediate country between the west and the east might be so doubtful as to render it undesirable to place a cartridge factory there which might be captured by the enemy and turned against us. However, that is a matter more particularly for the consideration of military men.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Give them a magazine there in the meantime.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, I think so. In this connection I might refer to the question of arms, a most pertinent one. My hon. friend has said that we have the men, but unfortunately we have not the arms, which is quite true. We have a very small number relatively to the number of men who could be enlisted; but the House I am sure will be glad to learn that we are taking means to supply that want, and that we hope within a short time to have in operation within Canada a factory which will turn out from 12,000 to 15,000 stand of rifles each year if required, and which, working full time day and night, could turn out more than double that number.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. Where is it to be situated?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is not settled yet, but it will be probably near the present arsenal.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the Ross Company which is being incorporated that you refer to?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, the Sir Charles Ross rifle. I may say that that rifle was some months ago placed in the hands of a committee composed of Colonel Otter, Colonel Hughes, Colonel Anderson, Colonel Gibson, and one or two others, who spent a great deal of time, with the assistance of the staff at headquarters, and of an expert, Major Gaudet, who is in charge of the cartridge

factory at Quebec, in testing the rifle. They sent in a report to the government which was favourable to the rifle, and on the strength of that report it has been adopted.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does it use the ordinary ammunition ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The same exactly, and in the contract which will be entered into with Sir Charles Ross provision will be made that in case we desire to change the rifle, or in case any discovery is made, he will, on receiving notice, manufacture such a rifle as the department may require.

Another matter which has been referred to by my hon. friend and by the General, and in which I agree with both, is the question of distributing the rifles we now have to the rural militia. When I came into office, I found, as I have explained here before, that the General who was here at the time my hon. friend was in office, had recommended very strongly that these rifles should not be distributed until central armouries were constructed, on the ground that the rifle was a very sensitive weapon, and must have the care of an armourer. It has been sufficiently proved, I think, by what has taken place in South Africa, that it is not such a delicate weapon, for it has stood the test very well. I doubt if any rifle could have stood the test better than the Lee-Enfield or the Lee-Metford has done. Therefore the Major General has recommended that the rifles be at once distributed, and that the old system of company armouries under proper inspection, more frequent than in the past, be continued ; and on the strength of that recommendation, instructions have been given that these rifles be at once issued and the old rifles called in. I think this will be very satisfactory news to the militia all over the country. I think it is a step in the right direction, and I am very sorry we did not take it before.

I do not know that there are many other points of importance to which my hon. friend referred, and I will bring my remarks to a close by saying that from my experience during the five years I have been in office, I think it is possible for us to have in this country a very effective defensive force at an expenditure very little in excess of that which we are making at the present time. Without repeating what I have said as to the methods we propose to take in the future in recruiting men for the active militia, I may say that, along the lines of interesting the citizens of the country in rifle shooting, and bringing them into sympathy with the militia by giving them something practical to do, I believe that, without any increase of expenditure at all we can enormously increase the interest and bring in thousands of young men who will be ready and properly equipped, if the unfortunate time ever occurs, to defend our country. What we want to have, always ready, always at hand, is an effective staff. We want an effective headquarters staff. We want the machinery ready to be set in motion. We want, as my hon. friend has said, decentralization to the extent at any rate of having not only an effective headquarters staff, but effective district staffs, ready to act immediately when called upon. We want officers—educated, well-trained officers ; and I approve entirely of the suggestions which the General makes, that we should insist in the future upon a higher grade of education ; that we should apply higher tests to the officers, making them pass more severe examinations. In that way we are now adding every year to our reserve of officers, our list of unattached officers, men who have gone out by the system we adopted a few years ago of limiting the term of service for officers. The colonel of a regiment goes out after five years ; the next below him steps up and takes his place, and so on. There is a step up for every man in the regiment. That very fact has given additional zest and interest to the militia of the country. A man joining to-day, even at the bottom of the list, knows that some day in the not very distant future he will have a chance of getting to the top if he is a young man. Then, the old men who go out are not lost to the militia. They go on the reserve or unattached list and there remain ; and I think we should take some means, as we are doing, to keep these men in touch with the militia by giving them something to do. In this way we are increasing every year the number of trained and educated officers whom we have at our disposal. We have a fairly equipped staff with all the branches that are required for an army in the field, at headquarters. We have organized here a medical army corps, to which the general refers in the highest terms, and to which my hon. friend did not refer, although it is worthy of passing notice. I believe that we have here a medical army service corps second to none in the world. That was shown the other day in South Africa. Our field hospital corps had scarcely landed when it was put to the most severe test which could be applied to any such organization, and I had the satisfaction of receiving a cablegram from Col. Evans stating that it had acquitted itself with the greatest possible credit. We are organizing now an army service corps. We have an officer in England to-day, Col. Biggar, who is taking a course of study there, who has had experience in South Africa, and who will return in a few months fully able to organize, from one end of the country to the other, that most important branch of the service. I repeat that with all these important branches fairly organized at headquarters and in the districts, with a very large number of officers ready to be called upon at any moment, and with the precautions we are now taking to edu-

cate our men in the use of the rifle, I believe that we shall have in the very near future, a force which will be amply sufficient to protect this country against any ordinary trouble from within and, with the aid of the mother country, do its part in defending Canada from any attack from without.

I do not know that I have anything to add, but as the items go through I shall be most happy to give any information regarding any details.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MACLAREN (Huntingdon). In the remarks I have to make, Mr. Chairman, I wish to discuss the militia, more particularly as it concerns my own particular district. We have a frontier in the county of Huntingdon, adjoining the state of New York of some seventy miles. In 1862-3, as stated by my hon. friend from South Norfolk (Hon. Mr. Tisdale), quite an impetus was given the volunteer movement throughout the Dominion. The fever then ran high in Huntingdon as well as in many other parts of the Dominion, and we had a very good force of volunteer militia raised on the frontier at that time. In the county of Huntingdon we had thirteen companies of fifty-five men each which, in a population of 14,000 or 15,000, would give about a company to each 1,000 of the population. That, it will be admitted, was a very fair representation of the military spirit of that day. I was much pleased with the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand and Monck (Mr. Thompson) in connection with the militia estimates last year. He proved to the House that he has given this question considerable study, and from his experience and study was in a position to speak with a good deal of authority on it. I have also had some experience in the matter. I joined the volunteers as a private in 1863, and served in the militia from that date until 1899—a period of twenty-six years. During the first four years I served as private and sergeant and was sergeant-major of a provisional regiment during the Fenian troubles of 1866. In the fall of 1866 the fiftieth battalion was formed, of which I was adjutant and drill instructor, and in 1889 I retired with the brevet rank of major. I have always taken a great deal of interest in the militia, and am therefore in a position to speak with some knowledge of the subject. As I look around the House this afternoon, I could not help thinking that if the number of members present was any indication of the military ardour of this Dominion, that spirit must be at a pretty low ebb. I counted some forty members present out of 200, and it seemed to me that if a similar spirit prevails in the country, there is not much hope of a very strong militia force being kept up. There is always a good deal of enthusiasm about these matters when they are new. I remember that in my own county, no matter what work had to be done on the farm, we use to turn out in the evenings to attend drill, and that spirit was kept up pretty well in that part of the country until 1866, in which year we were out on active service for some months in connection with the Fenian troubles. In 1870 there were again rumours of a renewed attack from across the line, when we were again called out and had the good fortune as I suppose I may call it—to have a little brush with the Fenians at Trout river, so that we are privileged to have 'Trout river' on our colours. After that there were still talk of our friends opposite coming across the border, and our military spirit was kept up pretty well until 1877-8, when our military ardour seemed to cool off very much, and during the last few years I was connected with the battalion we had considerable difficulty in keeping the force up to such a position as we would have liked. I think we had the proper kind of men in that county and have them still. Out of fifty-five men in the company to which I belonged thirty-two were six foot and over, and while tall men may not be any better soldiers than short men, still they look better in the ranks. We have the same kind of men there now but they do not join our volunteer force.

Now, there are several reasons for that. I do not intend to deal with this question in the abstract, but simply to speak of matters as I find them in our own part of the country. We had in our county, as I say, the 50th and 51st—eight companies in each battalion. They do not all come from our county, but some from the adjoining county of Chateauguay. We had thirteen companies and one troop of cavalry in the county of Huntingdon. Since the time I spoke of, 1877 or 1878, it has seemed almost impossible to get the proper kind of men to join the volunteers or to remain in the ranks. The consequence is that the companies have fallen away until, at the last camp, I think out of sixteen original companies it was found impossible to get four full companies to go to camp at Laprairie. As I said, one of the reasons which has militated against securing proper recruits and which you may think is not a very commendable one—is that many of our people do not see the great necessity for keeping up the militia force. I think they are as loyal as the people in any other part of the Dominion. I think they would be as ready to turn out in the defence of their country as the people in any other part of the Dominion. But we are a practical people in the county of Huntingdon, and a people who like to attend to our work; and a good many do not see the necessity of keeping up the force and spending time and money in going to camp year after year. I may say that we never had as good a force in the county of Huntingdon as when we had drill at our company

headquarters. That may not be practicable now, but if it were practicable, I believe that we could get the same class of men into the force as we had from 1863 to 1875. And here again I might say that the class of men we have had turning out to camp during the last ten or fifteen years is not the class of men upon whom we would have to rely in case they were needed for the defence of the country. As I have just said, we are an agricultural county, and our people somewhat object to letting their sons go—and the sons also object to going—to camp probably during the latter part of June or the beginning of July, just at the busy season of the year. Another feeling that a good many people have is that they do not think it is possible to make soldiers out of boys in twelve days. You know how business is done at the camp. It takes a day to go and a day to come home. Then there is Sunday, and, generally, one or two rainy days. My experience is that, out of the twelve days in camp, you never get more than seven or eight days of actual work. I think the present Minister of Militia is improving the matter very much in this direction. At the same time, I never could see the sense of trying in ten or twelve days in a year to make Tommies out of our boys.

The one great objection to the way the militia was conducted in the past was the irrational dress the boys were expected to wear. I believe that that has been improved; but, not having kept up an intimate knowledge of the force, I cannot speak definitely on this subject. I suppose all will agree with me when I say that there is no more independent class of people than our farmers' sons. The artisans in cities, operatives in factories, or clerks in stores, are under some sort of discipline and restraint, but that is unknown to the boys on the farm. You know how a young man rigs himself up when he is going to work on a hot day in the latter part of June. He puts on as little clothes as he can decently wear. A pair of trousers, a shirt, a broad straw hat, and a pair of shoes, that is about all. If he is warm, he will roll up his shirt sleeves and open the collar. Suppose one of these lads goes into camp. He is taken to headquarters—I am speaking of the olden times—and given a pair of woollen trousers and a red tunic with cloth as thick as a board. For fear it would not be warm enough, the tunic is lined with nice soft flannel. This tunic is buttoned up to the neck. The lad wears a two-inch belt around his waist and a three-inch strap over his shoulders with a great pouch hanging over his hip. When it comes to inspection day and he is in full dress, he has a hideous knapsack on his back, on top of which is placed a tin canteen with an oil cloth cover. Then he has a small round woollen cap stuck on the top of his head, and now he is complete. In that guise he is taken to camp. Now, fortunately for me, when in camp I always had the privilege of riding on horseback. But I have pitied these young men when on inspection on a very hot day, when they must be in full dress or heavy marching order with knapsack and all the other accessories. These boys were taken out at ten o'clock in the morning. They marched, perhaps for a mile or two, to some large field, where the inspection was to be held. They would be lined up, and about twelve the general would come, a feu de joie would be fired, and then these boys were marched back into camp at half past one or two o'clock, having been with this hideous rig on for three or four hours. And I have heard these boys in their tents cursing the rules that made these things necessary and swearing that they would never come to camp again. And very often they did not go—and I for one do not blame them for it. I believe there has been an improvement in these respects, but that was one great objection to our militia system. And here let me say that I do not know whether it is the best thing to have an officer of the British army at the head of our militia force. I may be radical in that, but I think that any officer in the British army who takes our boys for twelve days and thinks he is going to put them on the footing of British soldiers, is making a mistake. They are learning a lesson in South Africa. A man may not be able to put his heels together, face, salute and do all that sort of thing, but if he can ride, and shoot straight. I would not care whether he had a red coat on or what he wore. Too much time has been spent in connection with our militia, in trying to mould the boys on the model of soldiers of the British army. I am glad to see that the department is getting rid of this paraphernalia and dressing the men in khaki suits with bandoliers. I never could see the necessity of subjecting the volunteers of our Dominion to the hardship of wearing such an outfit when performing their annual drill. I have seen the foreheads and ears of the men blistered so badly that you could see traces of it for some time after they returned to their homes, on account of the change from the straw hat they generally wore to the woollen cap. If more common sense were used in connection with our militia we should have a better service. What I say is, generally speaking, true of the whole frontier of the province of Quebec. There is not an effective battalion on the frontier, except the one with its headquarters at Sherbrooke. I am not speaking to find fault but simply to set forth matters as they are in my own locality. But after what I have said it will be thought that I ought to suggest some remedy for this difficulty. Well, of course, one of the changes that would suit us—whether the department would regard it as practicable or not, would be to have more drill at home and less in camp. Any one who is acquainted with military matters

knows that if a man is competent in squad and company drill he will soon be able to pick up battalion and brigade drill, because battalion and brigade drill is only an enlarging of what he has already learned. I think that the most effective thing in our locality would be a few mounted corps. We have as good men as we had in 1866 and 1870, and we have the horses. If a volunteer force is necessary at all—and I am not going to discuss that phase of the question—it should be necessary on the frontier. As I have already stated, we have sixty miles of a frontier in the county of Huntingdon with only an imaginary line between our county and the United States; and, if it is this country we fear, surely it is important that we should have a force near the frontier. If we had four squadrons of mounted troops, they could probably be made an effective force. Whether they would object to going into camp or not, I do not know, but I know that that was one of the great difficulties in connection with our volunteer system—the difficulty of getting men to go to camp. Latterly, captains forming companies were obliged to take in men who were not suitable for the service, and those of the most desirable class who might have gone were not willing to go into camp with the majority of those whom the captains had to accept. The consequence is that the volunteer militia force of the frontier not only in the county of Huntingdon, but throughout the eastern townships, is practically only upon paper.

So much so that our 16 companies, as I said before, have now been reduced to 4 companies, and they are only the bones of companies. I understand if we want to keep up a militia system we must at least have arms and the nucleus of a force in the country. But I do not see any way of adapting ourselves to the circumstances, so far as we are concerned, except by getting up mounted troops, squadrons of mounted infantry, or something of that kind. I think myself, there might be some system adopted by which we could go into camp not more than once in three years, with part of the drill done at home and part in camp. But one great objection is the going to camp, and there is the feeling that they do not get the instruction in camp which they think they ought to get for the time that the camp continues. Whether our people would be willing to remain longer in camp, I am not prepared to say; but my experience has been that in 12 days in camp you do not get more, at the outside, than 7 days of actual work; and to try to make British soldiers, or soldiers at all, out of boys in about 7 days drill out of 365, is a difficult thing to do, and of course you can understand that they cannot be very effective.

Another thing that I am pleased to see is that they are taking up the practice of rifle shooting more generally. Rifle shooting at our camps has been a very perfunctory performance, there was not much attention paid to it, and I do not think that there was the good result from it that there should be. One of the difficulties of course in new places is that of getting proper butts, so that we could use with safety the new rifles now in use.

Our county is the most western in the province of Quebec, and there are not many corps in our vicinity, and we do not feel able to erect suitable butts to use the modern rifles now in use, as they carry to such a great distance. With the old Snider-Enfield rifles not nearly such expensive butts were necessary.

I was pleased to hear the minister state this afternoon that they were making a new kind of ammunition which would not be so dangerous as the other and which was costing less. But as I stated before, if an effective force is to be kept up on the frontier, on our frontier at least, something else is necessary to be done. I do not know what it should be. Of course one of the objections is the pay, although that is not the main objection. Of course we would like to receive larger pay than we have been receiving, although that is a paltry matter. But, if it is felt there is a necessity, and that seems to be the feeling of the House, that a large volunteer force should be kept up in this Dominion, so far as our frontier is concerned, there will have to be some new means devised, because we are, practically speaking, without any militia force on our frontier at the present time.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to say a few words with reference to some remarks of the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren). He says that if the number of members in the House during this discussion is to be taken as a measure of the military enthusiasm of the country, it must be very low. Well, in my judgment it cannot in any sense be taken as an evidence of the military ardour of our people.

I think there is another explanation for the lack of interest among the members. I have been in this House for some years, and I have noticed that whenever members of this House, who are not connected with any of the military organizations, venture to express an opinion or take part in the discussion on votes in the estimates for military purposes, the few colonels that are in the House, or other military men, rather sneer at them as if they were doing something they had no right to do. I have seen that very frequently in this House, until many members who would like to say something refrain from doing so because they might be regarded as impertinent. Now, I never believed, nor do I believe to-day, that it is the part of wisdom for non-military men to take no part in these discussions. Whether a member of this House might be regarded as an expert in the line which he

attempts to discuss or not, it is equally his duty to take part in that discussion, and to bring to bear upon it such knowledge and information as he has of the subject. For after all, it is only in the consensus of opinions that are given in this House that the opinion of the country can be ascertained by those who, for the time being, are charged with the responsibilities of government. For that reason I have not always refrained from taking part in the discussion of military or any other questions because of a timid feeling that others might think it was improper for me to do so.

People do not see the necessity of keeping up the force, the hon. gentleman said. Well, I believe there is a good deal in that. But I have always thought that if there is one thing more than another that stimulates ambition and attracts people's attention to military matters, it is a taste of actual war. If the hon. gentleman thinks back for a time he will remember the circumstances of 1866. I remember them very distinctly, for we had a little excitement in the part of the country where I lived, and a great many men joined the force at that time. He will remember that the military spirit was very low at that time ; but so soon as the announcement was made through the press, or by telegram, that the country was actually invaded, there was suddenly aroused a military spirit that was unknown before, and the result was that, although there was no preparation for war, every person seemed to be desirous to take up arms and take part in the defence of the country. Although the military operations were very short, still that invasion gave a stimulus to the military activity of the country that continued for a good many years ; and because after a while there was nothing to keep up the attention, public interest in military affairs began to die out again, but how soon did it reappear when we began to enlist men for the South African contingent. Why is it that to-day we see the military spirit and the military enthusiasm so awakened in the Dominion of Canada. It is on account of the taste of war that our people have had, and the evidence that has been brought to our senses of the necessity of the defence of the British Empire even in the Dominion of Canada. That has aroused the military spirit in every part of the country. Active military operations and a taste of war are the greatest incentives to generate and keep up the military life in the country. Now, I believe it has done us a great deal of good, because at this stage in our national life we are not only taking on the responsibilities of nationhood, but we are developing a national spirit very rapidly. But heretofore we have been somewhat behind the age in the matter of national defence. In the matter of providing, as we ought to do, for our military defence, we ought to be moving, pari passu, with our development in every other line of national life. When I speak of national life, I do not mean to confine it to the limited sphere of the Dominion, but as part and parcel of the British empire of which we are a very important part.

I believe I express the sentiment of the people of Canada when I say that they regretted to read in some of the morning papers that the present premier had practically refused to discuss with the Imperial government the question of Imperial defence. It was thought that it was something entirely out of keeping with the spirit of the age or the sentiments of the Canadian people, but I am quite sure that he gave offence to very many of his warm friends by that intimation. No doubt it was done with good intentions, but still it seemed to leave the impression upon the Canadian people that there was less of a desire than should have been displayed by the head of the government in Canada to seriously consider the important problem of national defence. Now, there are two lines in which national defence may be undertaken; first of all by the military force of the country, and, secondly, by a naval force. I think we have reached a time in the life of our country when we should begin to create something of a naval nucleus, but there is no possibility of accomplishing much, in my judgment, except after an earnest conference with the Imperial authorities, so that we might act in concert with them along that line, and to my mind, there could be no more opportune time than when the Coronation ceremonies are being carried on, and when all the representatives of the various colonial empires, as they may be called, are there, and are consulting with each other. The people regard this as an opportune time, above all others, in which a discussion may reasonably take place in regard to what lines may be profitably pursued for the purposes of military defence either in the military or naval lines. But, it left the impression on the minds of the Canadian people that the right hon. gentleman was not as much interested as he ought to be, holding the high position that he does in the Dominion of Canada, in defence of the empire when he refused even to discuss that question at the time when he goes to attend the Coronation ceremonies. A great many people believe that we are spending too much money for military purposes. A few years ago I thought so and I felt that there was no need of it, that we were creating a military spirit, that we were attracting attention to that line, that we were taking the people away from the peaceful and industrial pursuits of life and rather inducing them to engage in the lazy pursuits of life, and that as ours was an industrial country, the more men you take away from the industrial pursuits the more you take away from the wealth of the country, but, we have all had such a lesson as has opened our eyes since then, and every one will admit that there is a great neces-

sity of keeping pace with the onward march of progress in the military life of Canada. At the time we entered confederation, we agreed with the Imperial government that we would spend a certain amount of money annually for military purposes, in providing proper defences for the Dominion, and in providing a military force that would be available in time of need for the defence of the empire. We were expected to spend annually something like $2,000,000. It is only within the last two or three years that we have made any attempt to do it, but we are now doing something in the way of carrying out the spirit of that agreement. We are doing it on much more intelligent lines than heretofore, but I think there is a great deal of room for improvement yet in many lines in which this expenditure is going on, and that we might even go much farther with credit to ourselves and profit to the empire if we undertook to organize the nucleus of a naval defence as well as a military defence.

I am not going to say much about the expenditure of this money in these various lines, because I do not know enough about the subject to intelligently criticise it, or to say whether it is wise or unwise, but I have always thought that one of the urgent needs of the situation is to have a sufficient supply of arms of a modern type available at any time need might arise. You might mobilize your forces very rapidly, but you could not supply them with arms as rapidly as you could mobilize them. But if you had an available stock of arms and ammunition, it would be an easy matter to put men in the field and in a short time they would become trained and drilled soldiers. I was glad to hear the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden) say this afternoon that we have a fairly good supply of arms. He did not give us an approximation as to the kind or number of the rifles we have, but I take it for granted that the rifle is of the best pattern available. He gave one reason why the government were rather chary about purchasing arms, which was the improvements going on from time to time and the urgent necessity of buying the very best. It seems to me that at some time in our lives we must reach something like perfection in the rifle that we use. I believe it is generally conceded that the rifle we have to-day is a very good weapon, and I think it should be supplied to the forces of the country in sufficient numbers to be available at any time for the needs of the country. I would also suggest to the hon. minister that the old and useless rifles might be supplied to cadet corps or cadet schools, and they might be used in other ways to stimulate military enthusiasm among the young and rising generation, because it is with these young men that we must supplement the forces we have in the field, and if you create a military spirit early in life, it will be easy to get men when you require them to go to the front. I think there is something in what the hon. gentleman said in regard to the restraint which these young men are under when they are sent to the front. Our young men might be dressed in some way that would be much more comfortable for them and that they might be equipped so as to enable them the more easily to carry the accoutrements with which they are supplied during the warmest t e of the summer, because that is a tir when they usually attend drill. Ther ight be a style of clothing adopted beter suited to the climatic conditions and the work they have to do when they are taken out for their annual drill, than the clothing that is usually supplied to them. In my opinion, that would be a great improvement, because one of the complaints they usually make when they come back from drill is that their clothing is uncomfortable. I do not think there will be any great difficulty found in getting our young men to go out and attend drill. They regard it as very much in the nature of a pleasant holiday, but I have always thought the time of drill was much too short in order to give them any adequate instruction in the movements and duties that we desire to give them knowledge of. I think the suggestion made by the hon. minister is perhaps a good one, that if we cannot afford to give them two or three weeks in camp every year we ought to give them that amount of drill every two or three years. I think military knowledge might also be promoted by company drill. I do not think we have enough company drill in the country. We have these companies all over the country, but they rarely meet at any time in the year except just before they are going to camp. A few days before they are going to camp they muster up their forces, and from that time until they are required to go out next year, there is little or nothing heard about them. They might perhaps meet a few days in the fall to do a little rifle shooting. We built some years ago expensive drill sheds and armouries and they have been allowed to rot away and little if any use has been made of them. I think we ought to have company drill from time to time. It is very important that these young men should be allowed to meet together within a radius of a few miles and have some rifle shooting. I have always thought that rifle shooting was one of the strongest attractions that a boy or a young man could have, and if you have more of that you will have more young men ambitious to go into the militia force, and as these young men are doing the duties of military men and experiencing the stern realities of war, their usefulness will be in proportion to their ability to shoot straight. It therefore becomes necessary to give them as much practice as possible in that line, so that in time of war they may be useful soldiers when you put them in the field.

But, the practice now of giving them a few rounds of ammunition and only one or two days of practice reduces their value. It neither creates an incentive for the work nor does it make them experts. They should meet from month to month, and have their regular rifle practices, and ammunition should be served out to them in sufficient quantities to enable them to indulge in constant rifle practice. That is what they like, and that is what makes them the best militia experts.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the present strength of the permanent force?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The number is limited to 1,000. The establishment is over 800 now.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood it was about 600.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The last figures I have are 805 men; 152 non-commissioned officers and 64 officers, making 1,021, including the officers. The strength may vary about 50 during the year.

Mr. FOWLER. The militia list gives the number of officers as more than the minister stated. It seems to me that this permanent force is slightly top heavy. I notice by the militia list that there are four colonels; fifteen lieut.-colonels, twenty majors, thirty-two captains and seven lieutenants. I understand of course that the permanent force is a sort of skeleton force intended to make a number of regiments out of in case of necessity, but the department appears to have been more kind to this branch of our military service than to the general militia. Take for example the district officer commanding. He has under his command any where from 3,000 to 5,000 men, but he is a lieut.-colonel almost in every case, whereas the permanent force of 800 men has no less than four full colonels and fifteen lieut.-colonels. It seems to be rather unfair to the district officers commanding, who are in many cases quite as competent and quite as deserving of high rank as are the men who happen to belong to the permanent force. I know of district officers who have been in the North-west rebellion, and who have been outranked by officers far their junior in point of service, and not their superior in point of military ability. This is a matter which is deserving the attention of the minister. It seems to me that it is rather unfair to our general militia officers. I have understood that there was some objection to promoting the district officers on the part of the General Officer commanding, because it was felt that in case difficulty should occur the officers who would come from the Imperial service to command in Canada would not care to have our militia officers holding high rank. I hope that rumour is entirely unfounded, because the experience in South Africa has shown that we have officers in Canada who are quite as well fitted for the positions which they occupy as are the Imperial officers. If that objection has been urged it should be removed at once.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not aware that the General Officer commanding has made any statement of the kind; he certainly has not to me. I have no objection however to state that there was an inquiry from the War Office to know to what extent it was proposed to utilize the power which parliament gave the executive two years ago, to appoint colonels. The answer that the government made upon my recommendation was that we proposed to follow the rule of the Imperial army with reference to the rank of colonel. However, the main point of the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler), was: that we had in the permanent force, officers out of all proportion to the number of men. On the face of it that might appear to be a fair criticism, but I will remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) of what he must know, being a military man himself. We have in the permanent force the nucleus of what would be the Canadian army if we were called upon to mobilize. We have in the permanent force every branch of the militia except the engineers. We have the two branches of artillery, field and garrison; the two branches of mounted troops, dragoons and mounted rifles, and we have the infantry. When the hon. gentleman takes into consideration that we have these five branches in the permanent force, he will not object to the number of officers. In fact I think we require more officers rather than less. As to the appointment of full colonels in the permanent force, I explained recently to the hon. gentleman from Victoria (Mr. Hughes) that most of these appointments were made as a result of the distinguished service these officers rendered in South Africa. Had it not been for the war in South Africa I fancy these promotions would not have been made. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) said with reference to certain of the district officers not having been promoted has some force in it. It is quite true that at least one or two of the district officers served with distinction in the North-west rebellion. I have been at some pains to look at the records of that time, and I must say that the officers who served for the maintenance of the government of this country against rebellion, were not treated as they should have been. On considering the matter, I felt that it was very difficult to deal with it, it being so long ago, and that perhaps I had better leave it alone. I may say that I hope at an early date we shall be able to recommend that promotion to the position of colonel shall be given in the case of several district officers, and I hope also to some officers of the active militia.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that they place no limit on the number of officers they ask you to appoint ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, they simply asked the question, what we proposed to do.

Mr. FOWLER. The argument with reference to the permanent officer applies to the district officer commanding, because he has under his command infantry, cavalry and artillery. When the troops are in camp he is in charge of the field manoeuvres of a large mixed force, and therefore he should be a man who can command a brigade, and with sufficient military knowledge to entitle him to the highest position the department can confer. I think it would be a very good rule that no man should be placed in the position of district officer commanding who is not fitted to be a colonel, and that upon his promotion to that position he should be given that rank. To the lay mind these nice little distinctions do not amount to much; but to the military man, there is a wide gulf between lieutenant-colonel and full colonel; and it is rather annoying to an officer in command of a district to find men occupying very much inferior positions to his and yet his superiors in rank. I throw out the suggestion therefore, that these district officers, many of whom are superior men, should have this rank.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say that all the promotions which have taken place have been made on the recommendation of the General Officer commanding. I have been very particular about that. In fact, that matter must be left in his hands, he being a professional soldier and having large experience in such matters. I have discussed with the General the very point my hon. friend has raised, and I believe that within a short time the line he has indicated will be largely followed. I think there is a great deal of force in what he says, though I do not think the General will feel disposed to recommend, and I do not know that I would feel disposed to agree to it if he did, that all the district officers indiscriminately should receive the rank of full colonel, although several undoubtedly are entitled to it.

Mr. FOWLER. My point was not that all the men in that position at present should receive the rank, but that no man should get the position unless he was fitted to receive that rank. It is difficult for an officer coming from England to ascertain in two or three years the fitness of the different officers ; and that raises the question whether it would not be well for us to have a Canadian officer in command rather than one from England. I do not propose to discuss that now, but that is my view of the question.

Hon. Mr. BORDEN (King's).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the minister whether anything has been done with respect to a matter that was discussed two years ago very considerably, and also to some extent last year, that is, the organization of corps of mounted troops as a substitute for or in addition to the forces we have in Canada at the present time.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The organization of mounted corps to take the place of infantry has not been done to any great extent as yet, although in the district near or about Brandon and elsewhere in the North-west, I think there are four independent corps of mounted troops; in the city of Toronto a corps of mounted rifles has been organized; and in the province of Quebec the number of mounted troops is being increased. Outside of these districts, so far as I can remember, nothing has been done; but I am still of opinion that it ought to be done as rapidly as possible, and the General himself recommends in his report that in the case of rural corps we should substitute mounted rifles for infantry.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this pay and allowances for the whole force, or only for the permanent force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The pay of the permanent force is really only $225,000. The other items are : Pay of the headquarters and district staff, $43,100; pay of the active militia attending schools of instruction, $45,000; allowances for drill instruction, care of arms, postage, stationery to the active militia, $75,000; guards of honour, etc., $4,000. These items are not chargeable to the permanent force, but to the militia.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice an increase of $1,490. How is that figured out ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The increase is in the headquarters and district staff, and is made up as follows : Lodging allowance for the district officer commanding in districts 1 (London), 2 (Toronto), and 11—$400 to the first and $500 to each of the last two. Then, there is an increase of pay to the district officer commanding number two district of $455, and a decrease of $365 in district number eight.

Mr. FOWLER. This lodging is where there is no barrack accommodation for the officers ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Annual drill and musketry, including clothing and stores, $520,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I notice an increase in this item of $80,000, is it the intention to carry out the recommendation of the general commanding regarding extending the period of drill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Although there appears to be an increase of $80,000, there will really be a decrease, because in the $440,000 for the vote for 1901-2 the supplementary estimates for this year are not included, and I shall ask for a further vote for the annual drill of $150,000, so that really there is a reduction instead of an increase ; I have lumped these votes together for the reason I mentioned this afternoon.

Mr. SPROULE. One objection appears to me to be that the pay is too small. Throughout our country the officers are obliged to apply to the municipal councils to supplement the vote by twenty-five cents a day or as much as they can get. Some of the councils are imbued with the spirit of liberality and give it while others do not. If we are to keep up the military force at all, all the pay should come from the consolidated revenue, and it should be large enough to compensate the men for their lost time. It ought not to be necessary for the officers commanding battalions to go around the townships asking the township or county councils to supplement the small allowance of pay by a donation. If we gave a fair compensation there would be very much less trouble getting young men to join the ranks.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I quite agree that it is very undesirable at the last moment to have to solicit men to go to camp, but I think that that is due, to some extent, to the carelessness of the officers themselves in waiting until within two or three days, and sometimes until the very day before the camp and then rushing about to get men. I have no objection to an increase in the pay, but I think it might be given in this way as an inducement to give three years service. I would prefer having the pay increased during the second year and still further increased in the third year. Further than that, I believe that we shall succeed in awaking renewed interest in the militia by encouraging rifle shooting, and I hope that, with a large quantity of free ammunition each year, we shall be able to do that much more effectively than by an increase of pay from fifty cents to seventy-five cents.

Mr. FOWLER. I am strongly in favour of the hon. minister's suggestion to increase the pay to those who continue in the service. We have no difficulty in the section I come from in getting men to go into camp, and, as the minister says, the difficulty is generally due to laxity on the part of officers in not attending to recruiting in time. You will get a much better class of men, if they do not join through the inducement of pay. The less of the mercenary class we get the better, and the greater will be the enthusiasm, and the more efficiently will the work be done. There is one improvement which I would like to insist on, and that is to change the drill along the lines suggested by my hon. friend from Huntingdon (Mr. Maclaren). We have now a little too much parade, pipe clay and high collar business. We want more of the kind of drill that the Boers get in South Africa, and which has proved very effective, as some of our starched and pipe played British soldiers have found out to their cost. If we have more of that kind of drill—and I notice that this year in the camps at Sussex there was more of it—we would have greater efficiency in active service. We must get out of the old ruts, and in order to get good officers we require to make the service less expensive. We should have cheaper uniforms for the officers and get rid of the high collar and 'ha, ha' business altogether, and come down to business. We will then have an effective force. If we were attacked from the outside we would have to resort to the same sort of tactics which have proved so effective in the case of the Boers. Let us have more drill along that line and make the men good rifle shots. Let us do away with the parade movement and all that sort of thing and make the drill more effective.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot speak from experience as a military man, but I have followed carefully the discussions on military matters during many years, and have come to the conclusion that it is very important. In looking over the reports of the superintendent of military stores I find that he draws the attention of the militia throughout the country to the fact that the Lee-Enfield rifles are liable to get out of repairs. Has the government taken any steps to correct that defect ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe that the parts of the Lee-Enfield rifle are not interchangeable, but it is equally true that each rifle being numbered, any part that is lost can be replaced. We have in our service very good armourers, educated specially for the work, and we propose, when the rifles are issued to all the rural battalions, to instruct those who are in charge of them that special and frequent inspections will be made to see that the rifles are properly cared for. Of course bonds have to be given by the officers for the safe keeping of these rifles, for the care of which they are paid out of the public fund.

Mr. INGRAM. Take the contingent we sent from Canada to South Africa, did those armourers, engaged by the department, pay strict attention to the arms supplied to the different troops that went to that country ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think so.

Mr. INGRAM. I have a document here, which has not been furnished to me by any officer of the department or any man in-

connection with it, and in justice to the minister I shall read it so that he may say whether it is correct or not. It is a report from South Africa in connection with those soldiers that went on the 'Pomeranian,' and was written on March 22nd, 1900.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Who wrote the report ?

Mr. INGRAM. I do not know whether the report is true or false, but it is supposed to be signed by L. W. Herchmer, lieut.-colonel.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Lieut.-Colonel Herchmer ?

Mr. INGRAM. It is supposed to be signed by him. This is what he says :

I must, however, report that it is fortunate that there is no fighting, as our rifles are improperly sighted. I suspected this on board ship, as we had to fire almost off the target with Morris tubes. I got an armourer at Cape Town to inspect, and he reported that our back sights did not belong to the rifles and that at 800 yards they shot eight feet to the right. I reported this officially to the officer commanding the battalion and we had to march without new sights. To-day I am in receipt of a letter informing me that new sights are being furnished; but when we shall get them, or, on receipt, find an armourer to alter them, I cannot say.

I presume that this report has been sent to the department here, that is if it is a correct report. If that is the case, and if these rifles shoot eight feet to the right of the mark, the armourers could not have done their duty in inspecting them. It is a very important statement and should not go abroad uncontradicted if it is incorrect, as it would do a great injustice to the department that furnished these rifles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) taken the precaution to notify me that he was going to read this statement, I would have been ready to answer him. It is the first time I ever heard of it, however, and, of course, I cannot give a complete answer at the moment. But I would say that the rifles were purchased, I think, in 1895, under the late administration, and were inspected by the war office inspector. I believe they were properly inspected, and that they are just what they ought to be. I am not advised of any rifles in store here of the character mentioned in the report read by the hon. gentleman. No complaint of that kind has ever been made. But now that the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, I will make inquiry, and when an opportunity arises, I will give my hon. friend and the House an answer. It is, as he says, of course, a very important matter. It is rather singular, however, that this should be the only occasion when a complaint of this kind has ever been made. I cannot possibly understand it. The difficulty about the sights of the rifles might possibly have resulted from the sights being interchanged among rifles, but that is hardly likely. Colonel Otter and the different commanders have made elaborate reports as to what took place in South Africa, but, so far as I know there has been no mention of this matter.

Mr. INGRAM. I would have been glad to consult the hon. minister, but this report came into my hands only a short time ago. There is another point. As I understand it, this government supplied the horses with the forage, etc., while in transport to South Africa. I do not know whether this government or the home government is responsible for supplying the forage in South Africa. But if the horses are treated as this report states, it is high time there should be a reform, not only in the treatment of the men but in the treatment of the horses as well. In his statement, which is evidently furnished by Lieut.-Colonel Herchemer, this is what is stated with regard to horses at Cape Town :

The forage was insufficient, particularly for horses just off ship and we had great difficulty in feeding our horses ; they did not gain at Cape Town

Other extracts from this report are as follows :

During the three days en route, the horses got oats and water, but no hay.

We make from 10 to 18 miles per day, according to water which is very scarce, the whole country being at this season of the year a sandy waste without a blade of grass, relieved here and there with a few small bushes which the native animals consume. The country is entirely destitute of trees, except a few willows, &c., near the dams and wells. All along this march our horses were under-fed.

The forage for the horses being again very short indeed, it appears impossible to get them filled up on the government rations ; if this could be done for several days running and the horses could get into condition, they would do, but under the present conditions, I have little hope of their doing much hard work.

We had to leave 23 horses here, some with sore backs caused by poverty and lame, and about eight too poor to face the difficulties ahead. It is hardly likely these horses will ever be in fit condition again, as they do not get sufficient forage to build them up.

If the Imperial authorities are responsible for insufficient forage for the horses in South Africa, particularly on landing, it is high time that something should be done. The English authorities have recognized that the Canadian method of fighting the Boers—that is as mounted rifles—is the most successful method. And the success of that class of troops must depend entirely upon the good condition of the horses they ride. If it is true that forage was short even at the port of landing, it is nothing less than a disgrace to those who are responsible for it. I can understand that, at times, forage would be insufficient at a distance from a base of supplies, but not at the very port of landing. I do not say that this report is true, but if it is true it must have caused

a great deal of suffering to our soldiers. I am glad to see that a Canadian has been given the credit of showing General Kitchener the importance of having pack horses for carrying on operations in South Africa. That is a step in the right direction, one that will do credit to Canada and will assist in the success of British arms there. There are one or two other points in this report but they are of less importance, and I shall not deal with them. But those that I have mentioned, it seems to me, are very important.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. My hon. friend will remember, and the House will remember, that under the arrangement made with the Imperial authorities, the Canadian government has nothing whatever to do with the forage or rations after the arrival of the troops and horses in South Africa. That is the fact, and consequently we are not responsible. Of course, the case to which the hon. gentleman refers is a serious one, and I agree with him that if true, it is quite inexplicable at a point so near the base of supplies. On the other hand, I would point out to the House that Lieut.-Col. Herchmer may possibly be looking at what happened out there through glasses perhaps scarcely fair. I think that any wrong that occurred he would be inclined to see through a glass magnifying a good deal, and any good he would see from an infinitesimal point of view. I should not have referred to this, but it is only fair, I think, when a statement of this kind is sent into the House, no doubt at the request of Lieut.-Col. Herchmer——

Mr. INGRAM. No, Mr. Chairman, excuse me. Col. Herchmer is in no way responsible for that document, nor any other living man, so far as I know. I came across that document accidentally, I do not know who placed it in the position where I found it; and having perused it, I could not help referring the matter to the hon. gentleman. If it was laid in such a position that I could put my hands on it, there may be other documents lying around in such a position that other gentlemen can put their hands on them.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman reading it, but I think it was the duty of Lieut.-Col. Herchmer, who was appointed by this government as one of the officers of the Canadian contingent in South Africa, to make a report of that kind to his own government. As a matter of fact, Lieut.-Col. Herchmer was displaced from his command in South Africa on the report of General Hutton, supported by a medical officer, I forget which one it was; and Col. Herchmer has been applying to me and to the government ever since for redress with reference to his treatment. I was not able to see that he had been badly treated, nor do I think he was badly treated. But I have no doubt that he feels uncomfortable, and feels disposed to make things as unpleasant as he can, both for this government and the Imperial government.

Mr. INGRAM. I may say this is dated at Canarvon, 22nd March, 1900, and is addressed to the C. S. O., Ottawa, that is the chief staff officer, Ottawa. It goes on from day to day, giving reports to the department here, as I take it, and is signed T. D. B. Evans, Lt.-Col. Comndg. 2nd Bn., C.M.R.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then, I think it would be in order to ask my hon. friend how he came into possession of it. If it is an official document, I think we have a right to know.

Mr. INGRAM. I can say I found it in a drawer. I do not know who put it there, I will admit that much, and that is all I can admit. That drawer I am in the habit of using myself.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is no doubt about its being an official document.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister tell us about the number of rifles we have, and also give us some information regarding the quality of the ammunition?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The only ammunition which we have had here which was not up to the proper standard, was ammunition which we purchased from the War Office. That was admitted to be bad, or not quite what it ought to be; and after having a report by the superintendent of the cartridge factory we asked parliament to vote, I think, a sum of $15,000 to make these cartridges all right. That money was voted, and the cartridges have been made good. The Imperial government, recognizing that we were not to blame in the matter, that they were responsible, have repaid the amount. As to the quantity of arms, we have 40,000 stand of Lee-Enfield and Lee-Metford rifles. As to the quantity of ammunition, I am not able to state the exact amount. Perhaps it is not desirable that I should. But I may say that it is not up to the reserve quantity that we ought to have, that we are increasing the capacity of the cartridge factory now to about four times what it was, in the hope that in a very few years we shall have a very large reserve indeed, a satisfactory reserve of ammunition, in fact the reserve which the intelligence branch of the War Office required or advised.

Mr. INGRAM. There is another matter I desire to mention, and one to which I drew the attention of the hon. gentleman last year, and that is the cadet corps. Would the hon. gentleman explain what he has done to supply the cadet corps with ammunition, &c.?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may tell my hon. friend we have not supplied any ammunition to the cadet corps.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman, I think, suggested this afternoon that he proposed to bring down a Bill at the next session to provide that before any soldier is allowed to join the active service he has to be thoroughly tested in the matter of shooting.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. And I notice, according to the report, he is supplying associations or clubs with free ammunition and rifles, I presume, they have got to give a bond for a proper care of the rifle ?

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Now we have, speaking of my own city alone, a cadet corps, I think about 60 strong. They have taken a great interest in drill, and I think the department has supplied them with ammunition to some extent, and some tubes, I believe.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, the Morris tube.

Mr. INGRAM. I think great encouragement ought to be given to the cadet corps, the citizens take a great deal of interest in them, and have subscribed for uniforms for these boys in order to encourage them. So far as our own cadet corps is concerned, Col. Peters inspected them, and no officer could make a better report than he has made of the cadet corps in St. Thomas. They have competed with the cadet corps of London and of Chatham, and with others. It strikes me as a singular thing that clubs or associations throughout the country can be supplied with free ammunition and free rifles, subject of course to a bond for proper care when so little attention is paid to the cadet corps of our country. I think cadet corps ought to be encouraged in every possible way, and if there is any free ammunition to be given, and plenty of it, they should be supplied. They are generally young men leaving collegiate institutes, 18 or 19 or 20 years of age, and very often they join the different battalions wherever they are located. These young boys will be eventually the defenders of our country, and the drilling and training they are receiving as cadets is of very great importance to them and to the country as well. So I say again, on behalf of the cadet corps, that more attention ought to given to them, and that the department ought not to be too particular in regard to supplying them, but that it should supply them as liberally as can be done.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think there is a great deal of force in what the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) said, but we cannot do everything at once. I have my doubts as to whether, under the present law, we have the power without asking a special vote of parliament to do what he requests. If the law is revised, or if a new law is passed, there will be an opportunity then to make some provision for this. The age of the militiaman is now from eighteen years up, whereas, many of the cadets are under that age, and they are not, strictly speaking, members of the militia. They are, however, most important features of the militia, and I quite agree that to the utmost of our ability we should encourage them and give them the means of learning how to shoot. That can be done at a much younger age than eighteen, the lowest age for joining the militia. I have not forgotten the matter and the hon. gentleman can rest assured that I will do whatever I can to encourage these cadet corps.

Mr. INGRAM. Not being a military man I cannot discuss the question in military terms, because I have not been taught them. There is another thing that I omitted to mention and that was the question of tents. I notice in the report that there is something like 500 damaged tents at the departmental stores. I know that the cadet corps have applied frequently to the department for the use of these tents in order that they might camp out for a certain time in the summer. They have been refused on the ground that if the department were to give them to one cadet corps they would be obliged to give a great many of them to the different cadet corps throughout the Dominion. If there are 500 of these tents that are of no use for the regular militia, surely it would not be out of place to supply the cadet corps with these, because I understand they have a thorough system upon going into camp. They try as far as possible to conduct themselves on the same lines as those laid down for militiamen when they go into regular camp. This is a movement that should be encouraged and instead of obliging them to buy tents for themselves, or to borrow them, I think the department should supply them. So far as the vote of this House is concerned, I have been here long enough to know that when a number of years ago the militia estimates were before this House, the members of the House certainly did not act in a very friendly manner towards the Department of Militia. They were, if I may use the word, too stingy with the public moneys in their grants to the Militia Department, but I think, perhaps, since the difficulty in South Africa has occurred, a more generous spirit has prevailed amongst the members of the House in regard to granting more money to the Militia Department. So far as I am personally concerned, while the Militia Department to-day is asking for a considerable sum of money, I am willing to vote a greater sum than we are

providing the department with now. I have always believed, and I believe now, as a civilian having no military knowledge, that when we have good men in this country, men of ability willing to devote a large part of their time and to incur personal expense to assist in drilling our young men in order to make them soldiers, available in time of need for the defence of this country, the country has received too much at the hands of these men and that the members of this House have not come to this House with a view of assisting them as much as they should have done. I think the officers in our militia should receive greater encouragement and that they should not be called upon to pay out large sums of money for the purpose of helping their particular corps. I know men in the province of Ontario who, being too proud to allow their battalions to go down, have put their hands into their own pockets for the purpose of making their battalions a success, and I have known these very same men to leave their battalions a great deal poorer than when they joined them. Why this should be is beyond all comprehension. I think we should give them all the encouragement we can reasonably, consistent with the other expenditures which we make throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would like to say one word in respect to the question of tents for the cadets. It is quite true that the Militia Department was in the habit of loaning a certain number of tents to the cadets, and as far as I know, they were well taken care of. But since we have taken to drilling the whole militia every year in camp, we have had to use all available tents and at the same time we found the demands on the part of the cadets increasing so that there was no alternative for us but to stop issuing them. We also had to consider, when the question became a large one, as to whether we had the right or not to issue these tents. The very same point that I suggested a moment ago in regard to rifles and ammunition, arises in reference to the supply of tents. I do not know that parliament authorizes us to supply tents. As to the damaged tents, I did hope that we might perhaps give these to the cadets, but my officers advised me that there was only one way in which that could be done, and that was by offering them at auction and have some one bid them in. I suggested that, but I do not think that suggestion was accepted. We must offer everything at public auction. There is no alternative, but I should be very glad indeed to facilitate in every way in my power the securing of these tents by the cadets or by some one in their behalf.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that all of these cadet corps will be supplied with rifles? Is it only cadet corps in connection with collegiate institutes and high schools that will receive them, or cadet corps raised in any portion of the country?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Cadet corps in any portion of the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any limit as to age in the cadet corps?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, there is an age limit of fourteen.

Mr. SPROULE. The cadets must be between fourteen and eighteen years of age?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the issue of rifles will apply to any cadet corps in any portion of the country?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I see that a large share of this vote is for clothing and stores. How do you buy clothing and stores? Is it by tender or do you just give an order to a large house?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The clothing during the last two or three years has been purchased from the same contractors with whom we made a contract three years ago. The Sanford Co., who were the contractors when I came in and who have been most satisfactory, and a firm in Montreal by the name of Workman, which has done a great deal for us and which has also been very satisfactory, are the contractors. The contract was made for three years under the late government, and although when I came into office I did not think it was a good arrangement I was glad to be able to state in the House last year that the system was a wise one. As a matter of fact we terminated several three years contracts because the then Minister of Justice reported that they were illegal. We advertized for tenders in all the papers in all the cities of the Dominion, and I am bound to say that I never had so much trouble about anything in my life. A firm took a contract for about $70,000 which knew nothing about the work and absolutely failed to deliver any goods whatever. We had to go back to the Sanfords and ask them to do the work for us. After that experience, and on the advice of my officers I have felt that it was wiser for us and better in the public interest to stick to the bridge that has carried us safely over. I am satisfied that the prices we are paying are not extravagant. That matter is carefully looked into and a report made on it. Although the price of cloth increased last year we were able to get our clothing made at practically the same rates as before and very satisfactorily.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Will the minister say if it is proposed to make any change in the kind of clothing ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Well I think it is, although the matter is under consideration. I think myself that we might have more comfortable clothing at less expenditure than at present, and I asked the General to look into that matter. I hope that some result will come of the inquiries which he is making.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you keep any quantity of clothing in stock ? How will you equip the new contingent for instance ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We will have to give an order for the clothing. Unfortunately we have no reserve of clothing. I found very little when I came in and we have been using a great deal in the camps and in the reviews during the visit of Their Royal Highnesses when we had 20,000 men out. We have not been able to accumulate a reserve. I hope under the terms of this vote that possibly we may be able this year to do with less in camp, and add something to our reserve. It is very important we should do so, but I did not feel at liberty to ask a special vote for it.

Mr. CLARE. I was very much surprised to hear from the member for East Elgin that the cadet company in St. Thomas had been supplied with Morris tubes for rifle practice. I know that a great many cadet companies from the different high schools have petitioned the Minister of Militia for Morris tubes but without success. The Minister of Education was presented with a petition from all the high schools in the province of Ontario, and was asked to make representations to the Minister of Militia about it. I cannot understand why one school should get this tube and all the others not. I think they should all be treated on the same principle. It is very important that these young men should have a chance of getting rifle practice which is perhaps the most important of the manoeuvres of war. I hope the minister will see that all schools are treated alike, and that all the cadet companies shall be supplied with these Morris tubes. I understand that there is a grant made to those companies of $50 each or altogether about $1,750 for drilling. It will cost very little more to provide these tubes so as to enable the cadets to study this important part of military service.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Clare) that there is no intention on my part to discriminate. I was not aware that any Morris tubes had been supplied to cadets. I know that an application has been made, but the fact is that we had not a sufficient number to comply with that application. I will inquire and we shall certainly treat all alike.

Mr. CLARE. Then, is it the intention of the minister to supply the different cadet companies with Morris tubes ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am informed by the Deputy Minister that we have not supplied any. It is quite possible that in the case referred to the tubes may have been secured from the local militia, and possibly that arrangement might be made in other instances.

Mr. FOWLER. It would appear then that the department has done nothing to encourage the cadet corps. They have not allowed them to have tents.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have supplied rifles.

Mr. CLARE. You gave them no ammunition.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. FOWLER. They would be like wooden guns then.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is plenty of ammunition to be purchased.

Mr. FOWLER. No better use could be made of the money that is devoted to militia purposes, then in supplying these cadet corps with tents so that they may camp out. They go into the business not for the 75 cents a day but for mere love and enthusiasm, and when they are young and enthusiastic is the time to make soldiers of them. The militia department should supply the cadets with tents and Morris tubes. I think the minister should take that suggestion into his serious consideration and try to do something during the coming summer.

Mr. INGRAM. The militia department has sent officers to inspect these different cadet corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. And we have supplied drill instructors from the permanent force.

Mr. INGRAM. I see that there is but one slight reference to the cadets in the whole of the militia report. Would it not be well to publish the report of these inspecting officers so that we may know what progress they are making.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That suggestion is a very good one. The cadets of course are not part of the militia, and there is no vote taken for them.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that no Morris tubes were issued to the cadet corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The Deputy Minister informs me that there were not any issued.

Mr. CLARKE. What did the minister say as to supplying tents for the cadets ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We really have not the tents available. If I could I would gladly facilitate the cadets in securing tents that are reported as unfit for military use, but we must go through the form of selling them by public auction.

Mr. CLARKE. I desire to take the opportunity of saying that on two or three occasions when I asked the minister to facilitate the camping out of the companies of the boys brigade, he very kindly placed at their disposal tents that were not quite up to the mark for military purposes. Possibly he might be able to do something of that kind for the cadets.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will look into that suggestion.

Mr. CLARKE. I should think too, that the senior members of the cadet corps might possibly be supplied with a certain quantity of ammunition.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the supplies, after they become used up, can only be sold legally by public auction.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, or by public tender.

Mr. SPROULE. That was not done with rifles that were sold at twenty-five cents each.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, by public tender advertised in every paper in all the large cities in Canada. That matter was threshed out here. I laid the papers on the Table. The hon. gentleman has forgotten it.

Mr. INGRAM. When you submit the Bill next session you might provide that the damaged tents should be given to the cadet corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think provision might be made to include the cadets in the militia of the country, and I may say that is under consideration. Then there would be no difficulty.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice also that the report calls attention to the fact that many of the aiming tubes were out of order. It says :—

> In one instance 33 out of a total of 48 were returned serviceable, as many as seven bullets having to be removed from one tube.

Is that owing to the carelessness of the men using them or to the tubes not being perfect ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I cannot tell my hon. friend. I think that it must be due to carelessness.

Mr. CLARE. In the petition to the minister to which I have referred they asked that some of the discarded staff sergeants' swords should be given to the officers of the cadet corps. I understand that each company would like to have three swords, and if they are discarded and of no use to the department, I do not see why they should not be given to the cadet corps.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No reason at all. I think that ought to be done. I will look into it.

Mr. FOWLER. I think some of these young cadets could hardly lift a cavalry sword. It would be rather heavy for them.

Mr. INGRAM. I observe that the Major General in his report expresses disapproval of the abolition of canteens on the ground that soldiers are liable to go to hotels and indulge in spirits whereas they would be content with a glass of beer if they could get it in the canteen in camp. Has the hon. minister any particular view himself on this question ? I know he was attacked very severely a few years ago for allowing the canteens to exist, and he assured those who were attacking him that it was his intention to abolish them. If the commanding officer in his report recommends them, and if only ales are allowed to be sold in them, on the ground that they would prevent the soldiers going outside and indulging too freely, I think it would be a step in the right direction to re-establish them, notwithstanding all that has been said against them. There is no doubt that while there may be a good many temperance men in camp, there are others who believe in taking a glass of ale—perhaps more than that.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Two of them.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, two of them. I think we ought not to be guided too much by sentiment in this matter. I think common sense ought to prevail, and that the Major General's recommendation should be carried out. I am not advocating the drinking of liquor by soldiers, but they may think at times that they should have a glass of ale, and I see no good reason why they should be deprived of it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If my hon. friend were clothed with responsibility of office possibly he would not be quite so free to express his opinion. The fact is that when I came into office I found the regulation to which the Major General takes exception in existence, although some people have supposed that it was adopted quite recently. That regulation has been in existence for ten years or more. While the Major General is quite within his right in expressing his own opinion, I am not myself inclined to recommend the wiping out of that regulation. If a man requires a glass of beer, if it is essential

to his health, there is a way of getting it, the surgeon can prescribe it. If he really needs anything of that kind it can be got in that way. If he is perfectly well he can get along very well with tea or coffee or ginger ale. I am inclined to think that our lady friends, who take a great interest in the militia, would view the abolition of this regulation as a retrograde step, and I do not propose at this moment to take the risk of making them the enemies of the militia organization. I think, therefore, the regulation will have to continue.

Mr. INGRAM. Lest I should be thought to have misrepresented the position of the Major General, I think it would be well to place on 'Hansard' his recommendation on this subject, and if hon. gentlemen have no objection, I will read it for that purpose. He says this :

> I would not on any account permit the sale of spirits in the canteens during annual drill, but I must here most strongly protest against a system that forces a soldier, if he needs a glass of beer, to resort to the saloons and drinking shops of the nearest town where there is no control over either the quality, nature, or quantity of the liquor supplied to him. The effect of this regulation is to largely increase the amount of drunkenness in camp, and it is easy to show why this is so. In a military canteen all liquor has to be consumed on the premises and, if proper supervision is exercised, no man shall be served with more than is good for him. But what happens under the existing system of prohibition ? The man who would have been contented with his glass of ale or lager beer had he been able to procure it in camp, has to walk some distance to get his drink, probably takes whiskey instead of malt liquor, and very often returns to camp with a bottle of bad whiskey under his coat which he takes to his tent and proceeds to make his comrades intoxicated.
>
> I contend that it is a serious evil to drive our men into the temptation of the city liquor bars, rather than let them buy a glass of wholesome beer in their own camp, and I trust that this incentive to intemperance may be removed from the militia regulations.

There is no doubt that the Major General has had a great deal of experience of soldiers, both in the old country and in Canada, and if his observation of their habits and customs has led him to make this recommendation, and it will be the means of preventing the too free use of spirits, and is really a step in the direction of temperance, I think his recommendation should be carried out. If it be in the interest of temperance, as he says it is—and I am sure he ought to be the better judge than some of those who object—in my judgment we should adopt the recommendation of the Major General.

Mr. SPROULE. Have the various corps the right to store their arms at their own headquarters ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The General commanding recommends that we should go back to the old system of issuing the rifles to the captains of companies at company headquarters, and that is being done now.

Mr. CLARKE. Have we disposed of canteen business ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I intend to leave the regulation as it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand the explanation of the minister with regard to the increase of $440,000 to $520,000. Are $150,000 more to be voted in the supplementaries ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The fact is that the annual drill of the whole militia costs $425,000, and the custom has been to vote $275,000 for the first part of the year and $150,000 for the balance. But there is not much to be said in defence of that system. I ask the one sum, and it is not my intention to ask any supplementary estimates for the years 1902-3. But there will be a supplementary asked for this year 1901-2, as a portion of the militia go into camp in June, and it will require $135,000 to $150,000 to drill them. This vote will be sufficient for the year from 1st July, 1902 to the 30th June, 1903.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is really no increase ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it is a reduction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Comparing it with the estimate of 1900, which was $275,000, and adding the $150,000, would make $425,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And this includes something further ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Clothing and stores.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think this is a very much better way than to have two votes. I objected to that system of supplementary votes last year. I could see no reason why all the departments should not do as the hon. gentleman has done in this case, namely, bring down the whole estimate in the first place, so that the House may judge what amount the minister thinks will be requisite for the expenditure of the year. I made a formal protest against the other system last year, and suggested to the Minister of Finance that this change should be adopted and I am glad it has been in this case. It is a more business like way of dealing with the matter.

Salaries and wages, $90,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The increase here of $10,000 is due to the fact that we have had to employ more men and give them higher wages.

Higher wages are being paid in every other department of the government, and we found it absolutely necessary to increase them here. We increased last year the pay something like 25 cents per day for each man, and I hope we will be able to get along this year without further increase.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister considered the propriety of giving the first contingent the same pay as was received by the second ? That was brought to the attention of parliament last session, and he said he would consider the matter.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Before the supplementaries come down I may be able to give an answer. The matter was discussed last session and I thought it seemed to be the sense of the House that the law, as it stood, should not be disturbed. However, I will bring the matter up again in council, and have it discussed and give an answer later.

Mr. CLARKE. I think the feeling is very general, in view of the splendid services rendered by the men of the first contingent, that it was an invidious distinction to pay them a much smaller per diem allowance than the men who succeeded them. I am satisfied that if the minister should ask parliament to vote the amount necessary to increase the pay of the men, it would be cheerfully done. The pay did not influence the men of the first contingent, or those of the second contingent either, and I think that the men of the first contingent are entitled to as much per diem as the men who followed them.

Militia—chargeable to income—military properties, $190,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Some time ago, discussing the Sussex armoury, I made a statement which I wish to correct. I found some fault with the architect who designed the armoury and who had apportioned the different parts of it to the several corps. I think that I stated at that time that the compartments that were to be given to each company of the infantry were made the same size as those set apart for each squadron of cavalry. I was speaking from recollection of what had been said to me. I find that, technically, I was wrong. But, practically I was right. The armoury is divided into two equal portions, one half being devoted to the 8th regiment of cavalry, and the other to the 74th battalion. Now, the 74th battalion consists of six companies, with the total strength of 278. The cavalry has a total strength of 359, or nearly a hundred more than the infantry. In the case of the cavalry, there is the horse equipment, and the equipment of a horse will occupy fully as much space as the equipment of a man. The compartments were not as I stated they were, of equal size, for there are six compartments in one half, one for the use of the quartermaster and the others for the use of the companies; in the other case there are five compartments, one for the use of the quartermaster, and four for the accoutrements of men and horses. Generally speaking, the point I made was that the same amount of room was devoted to the 74th battalion as was devoted to the 8th cavalry, though the cavalry consisted of something like eighty more men than the infantry and also had the equipment of the horses to consider. Therefore, my contention was a proper one, and there is actually not room enough for this regiment of cavalry and its equipment. I think that at that time the minister said that the Oliver equipment when issued to the men, would take up a good deal more room. But, even so, I must persist in my claim that the division is not properly made, if it is made along the lines suggested.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. When my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) made the statement, I felt that it was an important one, because it seemed to reflect upon the work of the architect. The question is not so much as to how the space is divided, for it is possible the 74th regiment might be increased in strength, or, if there was extra room another infantry corps might be accommodated, for this room is not necessarily limited to the 74th. But the real question is the one to which the hon. gentleman referred at the end of his remarks—is there sufficient accommodation for the cavalry ? The hon gentleman says there is not. But my officers say that there is.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say that my authority is the quartermaster of the 8th Hussars, who ought to know.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) speak to the colonel about it ?

Mr. FOWLER. I did not happen to see the colonel, but the quartermaster would know more about it than the colonel.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I understand that the plan was submitted to the colonel before the work was gone on with, and he approved of it. The chief engineer of the department says that the plan was prepared by him, giving the accommodation asked for by the General Officer commanding.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that the chief engineer of the Militia Department has made a recommendation, as follows :

The present system by which the Public Works Department construct all military buildings is very unsatisfactory, and considerable trouble and delay is occasioned thereby. I would strongly urge the necessity of having the construction, as well as the maintenance and repairs of these buildings under the charge of the engineer branch of the Department of Militia and Defence.

Has any step been taken on that direction, or is that recommendation to be acted upon ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No steps have been taken in that direction, and I do not feel at liberty to discuss the matter until the policy of the government with reference to it has been settled. It is no harm, however, for me to say that there is a good deal of inconvenience resulting from the fact that the work for the Militia Department is being done by the Department of Public Works. The same condition of things existed for many years in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and, I think while Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was minister, or perhaps earlier, a change was made by which the Department of Marine and Fisheries did their own work of constructing lighthouses and so on. There would certainly be many advantages in having the work done by the Militia Department itself.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand, these armouries are for the purpose of keeping the arms and accoutrements in a proper state. I notice that at page 41, the Major General commanding reports :

> So soon as district staff adjutants are appointed to all the military districts, more frequent inspections of the arms and equipment of rural companies should be made, and this would minimize the risk of deterioration ; but I strongly recommend that, to make inspections more effective, a thoroughly qualified armourer should form part of the staff of each military district, who should accompany the staff officer at all inspections.

Have these district staff adjutants been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the armourers been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I believe there are qualified armourers in nearly all, if not all, the military districts.

Mr. INGRAM. May I ask if the district staff adjutant for military district No. 1 has been appointed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is the London district ? No.

Mr. OLIVER. What arrangement has been made for the taking care of the arms and accoutrements of the mounted rifles in the west ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. So far as I know, they are under the control of the commanding officer.

Mr. OLIVER. Have any arrangements been made for the renting of a building to keep them in ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, there is a money allowance that is supposed to be sufficient to cover everything. As a matter of fact the captains have usually buildings of their own, and they are given lump sums of money for taking care of the buildings.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to call attention to the state of things that exists at Hamilton. We have there a battery of artillery and a regiment of infantry ; and without boasting, I may say we are very proud of that battery and of that regiment. We think they are not exceeded in soldierly qualities by any other regiment or battery in the Dominion. A medical corps has lately been formed there, and during the short time it has been in existence we have had reason to feel equally proud of the commander and men of that corps. Not long since I was asked by the officer commanding to visit the quarters of the medical corps, and I am glad to be able to say, to the credit of the Militia Department, that the medical and surgical equipment provided there by the government was a credit to this country. I do not profess to be able to judge myself of such matters, but I express the opinion of gentlemen who are competent to judge. Nothing could be better, nothing could be more complete than the equipment provided by the minister. But, Sir, I was surprised, when asked to visit the quarters of that corps, to find that, instead of going to the drill shed and armoury, I had to go into the middle of the city, half a mile away from the armoury, and into the second story of a business block. Now I have a reason for bringing this matter before the minister. There are volunteers drilling night after night at this season, and practicing with heavy guns, and at any moment there may be a serious accident, and if an accident should occur it would be easier to get a dozen ordinary medical practitioners than to reach the medical corps at its quarters. I do not think that is right. I may say that I was even more astonished to learn that the quarters in which these valuable stores were kept were not provided by the Dominion of Canada, but by the officer commanding the corps and at his own expense. I think that is not credible to this Dominion. I make these remarks with reference to what the minister has said as to the providing of accommodation not being entirely within his control. The Minister of Public Works, I believe, as things go at present, has to be consulted in all such matters. I do not know whether the Minister of Militia and Defence has any control over the 40,000 rifles that he has spoken of, but if he has not, I think he ought to apply to the Major General for a permit to take one of those rifles with a bayonet, and poke up the Minister of Public Works to compel him to provide us with proper accommodation at Hamilton for the medical corps. Accidents might very possibly

happen to the men in gun drill. Some years ago the officer commanding the battery at Hamilton was injured in camp, and that gentleman will go to his grave limping because there were not then at hand the necessary surgical appliances. Such accidents may happen at any time to the men of the corps in the spring of the year, and I think it is not to the credit of the government—I do not like to say it is to the discredit of the Militia Department, because it does not entirely rest with the Minister of Militia; but it is not to the credit of the government that after forming and equipping a medical corps, that corps should not be, in case of accident, immediately available.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is a great deal of force and truth in what my hon. friend has said. He must not forget, however, that when the Hamilton drill hall was constructed, in fact all the drill halls, there were no bearer companies then, and there was no army medical corps or staff in existence, you may say, in this country. It was not then contemplated to give accommodation to a corps of any kind to which the hon. gentleman refers, though we can all see now that such a corps is absolutely necessary, and one of the most important parts of the system. Therefore a place had to be found outside. I was not aware that the commanding officer of the bearer company was paying rent for the building, I was under the impression we were paying it. I know we are paying rent in other places, and we should pay rent in Hamilton. My hon. friend, however, will be glad to know that I hope to be able, out of this vote, to make some provision adjacent to that drill hall for the corps of which he speaks. That is one of the things which we contemplate doing with the money now being voted.

Mr. BARKER. I do not assert positively that the commanding officer is paying the rent, but I understand he is. I shall be glad to know that the government is paying the rent.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We are paying it everywhere else.

Mr. BARKER. The most serious objection is that the medical corps are quartered nearly half a mile away from the drill shed. I think that state of things should not exist one minute longer than it can be remedied.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I agree in that view.

Mr. CLARE. I notice in the report of the Major General that during the year 1901, he mentions drill halls as having been built at Windsor, Dundas, Kingston and Vancouver, and central armouries at Aurora, Barrie, Charlottetown, Chatham, Fredericton, Galt, &c. I would like to know whether this means that an armoury has been erected in the town of Galt. It says so on page 41 ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not prepared to give an answer with regard to this particular place. The report means, I think, that armouries have been established within the buildings. The Militia Department does not construct new buildings; but under the Act we may add to buildings already in existence, or repair or alter them. So I assume that must mean that in Galt some change has been made in the building for providing a central armoury for the battalion of infantry.

Mr. CLARE. The report here says that it had been completed. Now in the town of Galt the agricultural society of the south riding of Waterloo, erected a new building, and in this building they rented a room, I understand, for an armoury, for which the government pays them $40 per annum. This report is misleading if it means that the government has erected a building there for armoury purposes. I would like to say that in the county of Waterloo, where we have a regiment, there is just one armoury for one of the companies in the town of Hespeler, and that itself is a make shift.

I think it would be proper for the government to enlarge the regiment which we have in Waterloo, and which is composed of six companies. I understand that there should be eight companies in a regiment. We can easily have two companies more. The town of Waterloo is very anxious to organize a company, Berlin would form another company, and Preston could form a company. The county of Waterloo is so situated that one-half of the regiment, located in Hespeler, Preston and Galt, would have the advantage of electric railway communication. They would have four companies at these places, and then four other companies would be located, two at Berlin, one at Waterloo and one at Hamburg. We could then have a full regiment, and we should have armoury and drill shed accommodation for half of the battalion in Galt, and for the other half in Berlin. Is it the intention of the government to erect these buildings ? I understand, a few years ago—I do not know whether it was just before an election—there was some land purchased in the town of Berlin for the purpose of erecting a drill shed and armoury. Unfortunately in North Waterloo the election went by acclamation and we have heard nothing since in regard to it. I think when we have in that county men who are willing to fight the battles of the country, we should provide them with armouries so as to give them a chance.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Clare), in all sincerity, that the election had nothing to do, nor will it have anything to do with the policy of the Militia

Department as to where armouries are located. They are located at the headquarters of the battalion, and that will be done regardless of the results of elections. In regard to this particular battalion to which my hon. friend has referred, I have no doubt that what is meant is that the room in Galt has been fitted up at the expense of the Militia Department. Some expenditure has been made, and no doubt the name is included there, because there has been an expenditure. Perhaps the engineer should have been more particular as to the nature of it. That is the reason it is in the list. There has been some expenditure in connection with arm racks, or the means of taking care of the equipment and furniture.

Mr. CLARKE. Was there a site purchased for the erection of a drill hall at Berlin a couple of years ago?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think not.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the statement was made that there had been.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No.

Mr. CLARKE. In the list of drill halls and central armouries that have been completed during 1901, I notice that the Toronto central armoury is conspicuous by its absence. That hall has not been completed yet, but I am very glad to hear from the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence that it is within the province of the Department of Militia to add to or alter the buildings that have been erected for militia purposes by the Public Works Department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. We have brought the question of the completion of the Toronto drill hall before the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence and the hon. Minister of Public Works again and again, but there seemed always to be a divided authority. When we appealed to the hon. Minister of Public Works we were referred to the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence, and when we appealed to that hon. gentleman, we were referred by him to his colleague. Now, however, he has made the statement, and I am very glad to hear it from him, that it is quite within the province of the Militia Department to complete a building, to add to a building, or to alter it.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Not to complete.

Mr. CLARKE. We only want him to add the accommodation that is so urgently required, and we shall certainly after this hold the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence himself, and not the hon. Minister of Public Works, responsible if the work is not done with reasonable expedition.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think my hon. friend (Mr Clarke) is a little bit astray yet. I understand him to say that the building in Toronto is not completed.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Therefore, the Public Works Department have not yet got through with their job, and I must refer the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) to the department which undertook the construction of this building to see that they complete it.

Mr. BLAIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if any provision is made in this grant for the better accommodation of arms in the town of Brampton. This is the matter that was up for consideration last year.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) that under the regulations by which the arms are distributed to the headquarters of companies, a good many armouries that were under consideration will be unnecessary, and I cannot say whether this is one of them or not. What is the number of the hon. gentleman's battalion?

Mr. BLAIN. The 36th Peel Battalion.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have the list here and I will look at it in the meantime and see whether it is included.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps it may be well to see what the Major General says on this question of armouries. He says :

> I have also observed that where rural regiments have been provided with central armouries, there is a decided leaning on the part of commanding officers to gradually convert their commands into city corps, to the very great detriment of the service, for, however good the city regiments may be, the bulk of our defence force must be the hardy men of our rural units, and anything which has a possibility of weakening that portion of the active militia is, in my opinion, greatly to be deprecated
>
> I, therefore, recommend that 'central armouries' should cease to be provided for rural regiments, and that, in their stead, plain substantial buildings should be hired, as at present, for company armouries at the company headquarters.

Perhaps that would do away with a lot of the promises that are made by the Public Works Department for political purposes to put up buildings throughout the country. I will be very glad indeed if some of the patronage of that department is wiped out by taking away telegraph lines and armouries from it. If the Public Works Department were shorn of a lot of that patronage, we would have less politics in that department.

Mr. McGOWAN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence what the policy of the department is in connection with this matter that the hon. member

for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has spoken about. Some military people in my constituency belonging to the 30th regiment, feel very strongly about this matter. They think it will be most unwise to establish central armouries at the headquarters of the regiment, and I understand that they have communicated that view to the minister. They think it would be a mistake to build a large armoury in the city of Guelph, and this notwithstanding the fact that some of the people holding that view live in the city of Guelph themselves. They spoke to me about it. They expressed the belief that it would be better to provide accommodation at the company headquarters and not at the headquarters of the regiment. When I was home during the recess I was spoken to about it, and I know there is quite a strong feeling in the regiment that instead of erecting a large building at the headquarters of the regiment the minister should provide accommodation at the company headquarters. Will the minister tell us what his policy is in regard to that matter?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I agree with the recommendation of the Major General that we should provide armouries, or suitable rooms, at the company headquarters, and on the strength of that recommendation, rifles will be immediately issued to the rural battalions and disposed of in that way. I do not think it will be necessary to construct a building in all cases, perhaps not in many cases, because suitable rooms can be found. That is the policy which has been adopted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that about a month ago a delegation from Montreal composed of the officers of the Montreal regiments came up to Ottawa and urged the establishement of a military school. Has any progress been made in that connection?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I will have to refer my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux), I think, to the hon. Minister of Public Works, as well as my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Clarke). As a matter of fact, what my hon. friend says is quite correct, and I may say to him that I consider it a matter of importance that there should be a depot established at the most important centre of trade and population in Canada, Montreal. The matter has not been fully discussed yet, and I think it would be premature to say what would be done this year.

Mr. CLARKE. I wish to direct the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence to the report of the chief engineer of his department respecting military buildings. This report is very pregnant now, and if the recommendation which the chief engineer made were carried out we would know whom to hold responsible for the unreasonable delays which have occurred. The report says:

> The present system by which the Public Works Department construct all military buildings is very unsatisfactory, and considerable trouble and delay is occasioned thereby. I would strongly urge the necessity of having the construction, as well as the maintenance and repairs of these buildings under the charge of the engineer branch of the Department of Militia and Defence.

Might I ask the minister: What is the policy of the department respecting this recommendation? Has the government decided to carry it out or not?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have already stated that I have no hesitation in saying that I believe that it would be in the public interest to have the construction of military buildings under the control of the Militia Department. So far no action has been taken with reference to that.

Mr. CLARKE. This would be a very good time to carry out the recommendation made by the officer of the department.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It would require an Act of parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. We could rush that through in very short order if absolutely necessary. There is a good opportunity for doing so just now. I find that the chief superintendent of stores also makes a report in reference to the condition of military store buildings which emphasizes the necessity for a change in the present method of constructing and maintaining militia buildings. This officer says on page three of his report:

> Store Buildings.
>
> Reference is requested to recommendations on this subject, in previous reports. New store buildings are urgently required in Toronto and Kingston. Those now in use are constructed of wood, very old, and in constant need of repair. No proper care can be taken of the valuable material stored in them.

I would remind the Minister of Militia and Defence that so deficient is the military store accommodation in the city of Toronto, that some of the municipal buildings have been given to the department in which to store valuable military supplies. In view of the reports made by the superintendent of military stores, and by the chief engineer of the department, this matter should be immediately given attention to. We should be able to hold some minister responsible for the unreasonable delay in completing the drill shed in Toronto. Now that the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence has been called to the matter, and now that he has assumed a reasonable measure of responsibility, I trust that we shall have no more cause for complaint.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the Minister of Militia and Defence now answer my question with regard to a drill shed in Brampton.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I do not find any mention of that particular matter but as this is a general vote it is possible to use it for urgent purposes as they arise. I shall be very glad to look into the matter to see if what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) refers to has been recommended, or whether it will still be required under the changed conditions to which I have referred as to the distribution of arms to the country companies.

Militia—Provisions, supplies and remounts, $130,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word on a subject somewhat cognate to this vote. The system which has been carried out by Major Dent heretofore in purchasing remounts has not given satisfaction, although I believe that he is now making a change which will be more likely to meet with approval than the original system. At first remounts were purchased generally through one party, and if rumour can be relied upon that party made a great deal of money and did very little work. Those who purchased horses and brought them to Toronto complain that they were obliged to sell them through Grand's old firm, which had a substantial rake off on every animal purchased. The result was that the buyer was obliged to purchase them at a very low figure, and he could not get as good a class of horses on account of the low prices. He was obliged to sell them to this firm and the firm for doing nothing at all, except perhaps supplying a suitable place for the inspection of the horses, made a substantial rake off. While the Militia Department here may have no control over the matter, yet we have always believed that if they made representations to the War Office that it would be more in their interest and in the interest of the people of Canada if a different system were adopted, that representation would be attended to. It would be a much better plan to have the horses sent to the exhibition grounds in Toronto where they could be inspected at certain dates and purchased if found suitable. In this way a better class of animals would be supplied at a lower cost to the War Department, and our farmers would get better prices. I notice of late that there is greater latitude allowed to the buyers of horses, and so far that this is an improvement. I hold that there should be the greatest freedom in this matter, and even the individual farmer should be able to send his animals to Toronto and have them examined and purchased direct from him. That system would be better for the Imperial authorities, and the farmers of Ontario would get a better price for their animals.

Mr. McGOWAN. All the horses were not bought in Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. No, but a large number were.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) says : This is not our concern nor do I think it would be advisable for us to offer advice unless it were asked. When my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture was in England last year he had an opportunity of discussing this very question with the War Office, and he and I have been trying to induce the Imperial authorities to establish regular and permanent remount stations in this country for the purchase of horses. Up to this date nothing has been done, but I hope that something may be done, in which case officers of either the Department of Agriculture or of my own department would deal directly with the people. It has been suggested that fairs might be held, not necessarily at Toronto, but at country centres once a month, to which horses might be brought, and that men should be sent out to select the horses on the spot. I hope something of that kind will grow out of the negotiations now going on.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be preferable, for this reason, that a large percentage of the horses sent to Toronto are culled out, and they have either to be put up at auction and sold at whatever they will bring, or else are left on the buyer's hands. If he sells them, he is obliged to take a lower price than the animal is worth if bought at home, besides paying the cost of sending them there.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is quite true, and I think the amount of money which these dealers have been credited with having made is altogether incorrect. As my hon. friend says, they have had left on their hands a large number of horses which they could not dispose of or had to sell at auction at very low figures, which has eaten up a very large part of the profit.

Mr. SPROULE. My understanding is that if a buyer consigned a number of horses to Silver and Grand of Toronto, he would only be responsible for the number selected out of that consignment and he would get something like $5 or $10 for each horse taken by the purchaser, but the culls would be left on his hands.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I happen to know of one case in which fully 12½ per cent of the horses consigned to the Grand firm were thrown on their hands, and they actually lost that number of horses, or had to dispose of them at very low figures.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that the officer who is here purchasing on behalf of the War Office has considerably modified the original system, and for more than a year back has been purchasing in a large number of centres. When he first began purchasing he only went to two

or three centres—perhaps Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal ; but lately he has been going to a large number of centres, and has been having the horses brought there. What my hon. friend the Minister of Militia says is quite true in many instances. I do not think the officer himself knows altogether what the arrangements are between the man who brings in the horses and the original owners of them ; but I know of my own personal knowledge that in many cases the contractors found on their hands a large number of rejected horses which they had to dispose of as best they could. In addition to that, they were under considerable expense. They had to keep the horses from one to two weeks before the officers came round, trim them, and in some cases bridle and bit them and manage them. So that the business is not quite as profitable as at first sight it appears. I have no doubt these contractors have been making some money ; it is not likely they would engage in the business if they did not ; but I think I may say that the prices of horses in Canada has been materially raised in consequence of the purchases of the War Office within the last two years, and it has helped to relieve our own market of a large number of horses which otherwise would not have been easily sold.

Mr. SPROULE. I know that prices have been materially raised, because many of these horses were bought from the farmers at as low as $65 or $70 and sold to the War Office at $140.

An hon. MEMBER. No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. I know what I am talking about, because I saw some of the animals purchased. I moved for a return on the subject in this House, and I found that these horses had been sold to the War Office at an average price of $140. But that has been changed, and the farmers are at present getting comparatively good prices for their horses. If, as the minister suggests, fairs are held at different localities, where the farmers can bring in their horses or the contractors could have them selected direct by the party sent around to make the selection, that would be in my judgment the very best plan that could be adopted.

Grants to associations, $38,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the usual vote. Ontario gets $1,800, Quebec $1,700, Nova Scotia $1,500, New Brunswick $1,300, Manitoba $750, British Columbia $620, and Prince Edward Island $630, making $8,300. The grant to battalion rifle associations and to bands range from $25 to $200 each, according to strength and efficiency, about 90 of each. The artillery grant is all paid to the Artillery Association. There is the grant to the Dominion Rifle Association and the grant to local rifle associations $6,500. The bands of the active militia receive $7,500, and military institutes $300.

Contingencies, $22,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This includes printing and stationery, $12,000; military survey, $4,000. This is a topographical survey, done by cadets at the Royal Military College, under the direction of their professors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was done with it afterwards ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is in the Intelligence branch of the Quartermaster General's office. It is a most careful survey of the country along the frontier, giving every road, the height of hills and the buildings. It is a magnificent piece of work, well worth examining.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much of the country has been done ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We have been doing the work for the last five years. I could not say the number of miles. Then there is advertising $1,500; injuries at annual drill, $3,000; telegraph and legal expenses, &c., $3,500. When we came to office we had a smaller vote, but two years ago we adopted the plan of making the vote large enough to cover expenses, so that we will not have to ask any supplementary vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are those injuries ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Injuries to men, but more particularly to horses. Every year there is a certain number of horses killed or rendered useless, and we pay for them at a rate not exceeding $100 per horse.

Royal Military College, $75,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I would call the attention of the minister to some comments by the commandant on this institution :

It is a matter for great regret that this admirable institution, established for the express purpose of securing for the Canadian militia a supply of well trained and capable officers, entirely fails to attain this object. What brought about this state of things it is impossible to say, but one thing seems clear, that in the period spent at the college, the students do not imbibe any soldierly ambition or acquire a taste for military employment, and it is sad to see, year after year, young gentlemen who have received such an excellent military education at great cost to the state, holding aloof from the service of their country.

Has the minister given any consideration to those comments ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I have read very carefully the General's report, and while I agree with him to some extent, I do not think that he should have made so strong a case. He

is quite mistaken when he says that no military spirit is imparted to the cadets. As a matter of fact, there are now in the British army nearly a hundred cadets of the Royal Military College Had he said that the young men were not entering our militia or permanent corps, he would have spoken more correctly. But I do not see how we can remedy this. We might require each young man, on entering the school, to undertake to join a corps of Canadian militia after he came out, but I think that would be rather difficult. What I hope is that in the future more graduates of the college will come into our permanent corps. We have scarcely any there now, because they do not consider it good enough for them. They prefer going to the British army, where they have a career, which our permanent force does not offer. Besides we have no pensions, so that there is very little but hard work to offer them, and nothing at the end. But now we have a pension and hope to greatly raise the character of the permanent corps. So far as the active militia is concerned, every cadet who graduates is a member of the Canadian active militia and available for service when required. Many of these young men are now in the active militia throughout the country, and when the South African trouble came, we found dozens of them who were working throughout Canada as engineers, offering their services. There was a large number on the second contingent and in the Strathcona Horse, and a considerable number are now in the squadrons in the last contingent, so that I do not think the condition is as hopeless as the Major General thinks.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage of the graduates is in the Canadian militia and also in Canada ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I had these figures a year or two ago and gave them to the House. I asked for the statement this morning, but have not yet received it, but will give the information on the supplementaries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was it in the 'Hansard' last year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Either that or the year before.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This school seems to be regarded more as a school for educating an engineer than to fit young men for the military career. I do not know exactly how the difficulty is to be got over, but it seems rather discouraging. Are there any graduates of that school in the permanent force ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, two or three.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many does the school turn out annually ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Now over thirty. For a good many years there were only from seven to ten.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A certain number go into the Imperial service ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, a very large number went last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that is something that might be placed to our credit—that we do afford a military education to officers which go into the service every year. Is the education provided by this institution regarded as at all equivalent to the training given by similar institutions in England ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Quite as good.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is placed on the same plane ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman any idea how many men there are in the Imperial service who are graduates of this college ? I suppose the statement he refers to would give that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it is over a hundred.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by the Auditor General's report, page Q-91 that William Allan and Son of Kingston received $2,430.15 for boots, &c., and at page Q-93 C. Livingston and Bros., received $7,649.99 for clothing. Were these goods purchased by tender ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think not.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should think not by the prices that I see charged here, and by the fact that these gentlemen are very strong partisans of hon. gentlemen opposite. Messrs. Allan supplied 49 pairs of long boots at $10, and 10 pairs of riding boots at $10 a pair, also 194 pairs of short boots at $6 a pair. Then, Messrs. Livingston supplied, for instance blouses at $2.50 each, 4 great coats and 2 capes, $73 ; 36 coats at $10.50 ; 8 pairs of gloves at 25 cents and 170 pairs at $1 a pair. I suppose these are kid gloves for the young gentlemen we have there. It seems to me the furnishing of supplies for that Military College ought to be by tender and not by going to a friend of the party at Kingston and paying these large prices, when the amount is over $7,600.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That has never been done, and it would be very difficult to do. These young gentlemen have to be measured for the boots or clothing they get. It is not like asking for a large quantity of clothing for general use to be distributed among men according

as it happens to fit. In this case they are the prices of the tailor and shoemaker—retail prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. Retail prices ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Certainly.

Militia—chargeable to income—Dominion Arsenal, $150,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase here of $32,000. What is the explanation of that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is for the manufacture of cartridges. This increase of $32,000 is taken from what would have been the vote for annual drill and stores. As I pointed out, we are increasing the output of cartridges enormously, and this is to pay for wages, as we must employ more labour.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there anything in this vote for additional machinery, or anything of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, all labour.

Militia—chargeable to income—defences at Esquimalt, $114,703.

Mr. SPROULE. What is being done there ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There is an increase over last year of $2,433.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). According to the estimates before us there is a decrease of over $10,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I may explain that this is the result of an agreement between the Imperial and the Canadian governments. There has been, ever since confederation, an understanding between the two governments as to the proportion of expense that each should bear as to the defences at Esquimalt. Two years ago a new arrangement was agreed to which was fully explained to the House at the time, and which will be found in 'Hansard.' This is fixed and will not increase. It involves a considerable expenditure on our own militia which really forms the principle part of the garrison at Esquimalt. The cost of the Imperial garrison, 320 officers and men is £21,000 equal to $102,270—that is, we agree to pay that proportion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it all expended by this government, or is any part expended by the Imperial government ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. It is expended by the Imperial government, except the portion that is for the maintenance for the local militia which is supposed to be maintained at the establishment fixed by the agreement, and cost $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage of the whole cost are we to bear ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. We are to bear one-half the total expenses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Outside of the militia what is the expense ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The total expense is £42,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand, but for what purpose, is it labour, is it buildings, or what ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The maintenance of the Imperial garrison of 320 officers and men including engineers and artillery.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And besides that, we have our own ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Militia—chargeable to capital—rifle range, $75,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would like to change the words there, so as to make them read 'for the purchase of land and the equipment of rifle ranges.' The work we have done for this vote since it was begun two years ago included the construction of the rifle range here, the expenditure on which I gave last session ; the rifle range at Montreal, the expenditure on which I gave a day or two ago in answer to a question by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) ; rifle ranges at Hamilton, Halifax—or near Halifax—St. John, Fredericton, London, Victoria, Sherbrooke and other places, besides one undertaken at Winnipeg. These are first-class rifle ranges, 1,000 yard ranges, up to date in every respect. I am told that the rifle range at Ottawa is one of the best in the world. The one in Montreal, though not quite so large, is equally good.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the minister said yesterday that the rifle range in Montreal would cost $35,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That was the cost of the buildings and the work alone. I think the land cost $30,000 or $40,000, and the total cost will be about $75,000. The range here cost more than that, because we had heavy expenses in the Exchequer Court by reason of the fact that we could not settle with some of the holders of the land. The rifle range at Winnipeg will be something of the same character, but I hope not as expensive. These rifle ranges cost anywhere from $15,000 to $60,000, or $70,000. That at Sherbrooke is much smaller, and will cost $5,000 or $6,000. I may add that we have another vote of $20,000 for cheap ranges in small districts. It will be divided up in sums of from $200 to $500, to assist rural companies.

Many ranges are being constructed in an inexpensive way where one or two targets are sufficient. In these large ranges we have 40 or 50 targets; in the Ottawa range I think there are 55 targets.

Mr. INGRAM. I noticed a short time ago there was a landslide at Quebec. Can that landslide in any way affect the walls of the fortifications ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. No, it is on the front, next to the river. Those slides occur every year.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business is it intended to take up to-morrow ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If there are any government Bills they will be proceeded with, and after that branch of the business is disposed of, we will proceed with the estimates, taking up Agriculture and that part referring to quarantine, and Professor Robertson's branches.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

OTTAWA, Friday, April 11, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CRIMINAL CODE, 1902.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: The Bill makes some amendments in the law in regard to cases stated by magistrates, by way of appeal from summary convictions and orders. It seems that at present the statute is not effective. Amongst other things it provides that rules of court be made by judges to regulate procedure, but it says nothing as to what is to be done in the event of there being no rules of court, which has occurred in our province, and may occur in other provinces. This Bill adopts the English procedure in that matter. There are other matters of procedure which it is proposed to simplify in relation to cases stated by way of appeal from summary convictions.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Hon. Mr. BORDEN (King's).

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved:

That the name of Mr. George Loy be added to the following standing committees: Private Bills, Printing, Public Accounts and Agriculture.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Commissioner's branch for agriculture and dairying, including cold storage on steamships, on railways, at warehouses and creameries, and for expenses in connection with trial shipments of products, and for securing improvement and recognition of the quality of Canadian farm products, employees paid from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $210,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I suppose it will be proper for me to give an explanation in brief form of the considerable items of increase which are here. The item as you will see is considerably increased over the corresponding item last year, which was $188,600. I may say that while there is some increase in a number of the branches of this department, the chief increase here is due to an undertaking which we have decided upon on behalf of the cheese industry in Canada. Last season's cheese trade was not quite so satisfactory as the cheese trade of Canada has been for many years past and the causes of this have become quite apparent not only to the Department of Agriculture but to those who are engaged in the trade. It appears evident that the demand in England has been for a slightly different character of cheese from that which Canada has been supplying in the past and that to meet that demand our people have been endeavouring to make a softer and moister cheese, sending it forward under the old conditions. These old conditions were quite satisfactory for the harder and dryer cheese which Canada has been supplying in such large quantities for many years, but are not suitable for the character of the cheese now demanded by the English market and which our people have been trying to send forward. That quality of cheese requires that it should be cured and handled in a cooler temperature. A great deal of the injury that has been done during the last season or two has been done in the curing rooms of the factories. It is well known that these curing rooms are not very thoroughly constructed as a general rule and that the heat is not under control, especially in the hot weather of summer. A series of experiments has been carried on for some years back by my department. Another series has been carried on by the Guelph Agricultural College and still another series with most important results in the state of New York. The results of these experi-

ments have all tended in one direction, wonderfully coinciding one with the other, and proving conclusively that this moister and softer cheese which is to-day in demand in the English market must be kept at a temperature below 65 degrees if it is to be successfully made and handled. The question came up : How will you bring about a change of methods to accomplish this object ? My department has been for two years inculcating the necessity for this change, pointing out the results of the experiments that have been made and urging people in every way possible, by addresses at public meetings and by bulletins and reports, to improve their curing rooms so that they might be able to cure their cheese under the new conditions properly. I think, largely due to the fact that the year before last the general price of the article was pretty good notwithstanding the difficulties, the people have disregarded these warnings. During the last season, however, they got a rather severe castigation, if I may call it that, in the English market. We had report after report showing that Canadian cheese was not doing as well as it had been doing in the past, that it was arriving very deficient in the proper quality and that the price of our cheese was not as good in proportion to the price of other cheese in the English market as it had been in the past. The result was the farmers and cheese makers of Canada lost in the last season somewhere about $2,000,000 on the quality of their cheese alone. I venture to think that if the advice of the Department of Agriculture, which was given to them two years ago, had been followed that money would have been saved. No doubt a portion of it would have had to have been spent in the improvements which were required, but still, a very large amount would have been left in the pockets of the people more than they received. In investigating this question the proposition has been made that as it was pretty difficult for the people to improve their curing rooms all over the country in every individual factory, central curing rooms should be established to which the cheese of a group of factories would be brought, thus carrying out the principle of co-operative dairying a little step farther than it has been carried in the past. Just as in days gone by the milk which used to be made into cheese in the home dairy has been carried to the central factory for the purpose of making it into cheese, so, the cheese, after being made, will be carried to a central curing room to be cured. It is felt that some other improvements in connection with the business might be also tried and shown and that the result would be, not only on the point I have just elaborated, beneficial, but on several other points, also, improvements in the trade would be brought about. These propositions were laid before the great dairy conventions of the country during last fall and winter and were approved by these dairy conventions. The question was : How could this change be brought about ? It means generally through the country a very considerable investment in what up to the present time is an experiment—an experiment which has borne the test of careful analysis and investigation on the part of experts, and having been laid before those engaged in the business, has met with their approval, but still, is a thing which has never been tried anywhere else or in Canada either. We have been in the habit, in my department, of doing work of an experimental character for the benefit of the people concerned, but which no individual would be willing to undertake, and which no individual, or group of individuals, could fairly be called upon to undertake. The risk, in other words, of the results of an experiment of this kind should be undertaken by the government and paid for out of public funds rather than by individuals. I, therefore, propose to establish four such curing rooms, one in the western part of Ontario, one in the eastern part of Ontario, one in the French-speaking part of the province of Quebec and one in the English-speaking part of the province of Quebec. Some exception has been taken to the fact that only four of these curing rooms are going to be carried on. Being of an experimental character I think it is desirable that enough should be done to show that if this experiment is successful it can be fairly held to be true under different conditions and under different circumstances, while at the same time, I think it is wise in an experiment of this kind not to build any more than is absolutely necessary to prove the results. The conditions in the particular localities that are indicated are sufficiently diverse to be fairly representative of the conditions in Canada, and the scale on which it is proposed to carry on these experiments will be sufficiently great, I think, that if it is successful in these places it will be held to be successful almost anywhere in Canada. At the same time I feel that the investment of public money in this way is warranted by the magnitude of the interests involved. I need not dwell on the importance of our cheese industry. We know that in some years as much as $20,000,000 worth of cheese has been exported from Canada, and that has been of great value not only to the farmers but to the industrial development of the industries of Canada generally. It is the one industry in which Canada has maintained a pre-eminence, and anything that tends to make this industry a continued success is worthy of attention. In doing this work we will require a capital investment of about $8,000 or $10,000 for each of these curing rooms, and we will require money for maintenance during the current year, which for the four curing rooms will amount in all to $35,000 or $36,000. I trust that the maintenance will not

be a serious drain upon the department. Our experiments show that the cheese cured in the cool temperature which we propose to provide will not only be of better quality and consequently bring a higher price, but there will also be very materially less shrinkage in the curing process. While we have not absolutely decided upon all the details, our proposition is that the owners of the cheese will reap all the advantage of the increased price per pound, but that the gain made by the less shrinkage shall go to the maintenance of the curing room. I think that will pay for all the expenses of the curing room in a commercial sense. But we expect to make some other experiments and to do some other work for the benefit of the cheese trade, and I do not think that the expense of this will be covered by the sum I have mentioned. In this estimate we are providing for not only the capital expenditure in building the curing rooms, but also for a sum to help in the management of them for the current year. This involves altogether nearly $40,000, or a very considerable amount more than the increase which is to be noticed in this item.

In other ways the expenditure will be largely on the same lines as in the past. There will be some increases and some slight decreases. The general lines of the work are briefly these. We have the headquarters staff and expenses at Ottawa; we have the extension of markets division; the cold storage division; the live stock commissioners' division; the dairy division and the fruit division; all under the general direction of Professor Robertson, the commissioner of dairying and agriculture.

Mr. CLANCY. The committee will be anxious to know from the minister, as he has no doubt thought it out well, how the cheese is to be brought to the curing stations?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I wish first to give a general sketch of the work included under this vote, and then I will be pleased to answer any questions afterwards. As I have said, we have the extension of markets division, which covers generally the work for the improvement of our products and of the handling of our products between here and the foreign markets. It includes the watching of the loading and of the unloading of vessels on this side of the Atlantic, and on arrival in the old country. It includes the work we have been doing to improve the poultry trade in Canada, and also our efforts to improve the quality of the grain and seed which is used by our farmers. In a general way, that is what is embraced in that particular division. We have for this purpose several men in Montreal watching the loading of ships with our Canadian products, and giving us information which we are constantly laying before the different transportation companies, urging upon them improvement in their methods. We have men also engaged in St. John and Halifax during the winter season. We have also men in the old country watching the landing of our products there, and when time permits, watching the markets and giving information as to the condition of our products when they arrive in these markets. The advice which is given by the handlers in Great Britain is of great importance in the improvement of the packing and management of our products, and it is reported by these gentlemen.

We have also been introducing into this country within the last few years, entirely new methods of dealing with poultry meat. Until comparatively recently in Canada, hardly any one thought of fattening the chickens which they sent to the market. The result was, that Canadian poultry while good in quality, was generally not up to the mark in condition when put on the home market, or the British market. Some years ago, Professor Robertson and myself when in Great Britain came in contact with what was being done there. We found that a most extensive business was being done in the fattening of poultry and we found that these fattened poultry brought a very much higher price than the ordinary birds. We knew that our Canadian poultry was being sent to England in the ordinary condition, and we did not see why the advantages of this improved fattening process should not be obtained for the Canadian manufacturers. We set to work to experiment with regard to this system in Canada. We established some stations where birds were fattened and sent to England. The results were extremely satisfactory; so satisfactory that we were able to induce people to go into the business. The progress has not been very rapid, but it has been very considerable. As will be seen by the trade returns, the poultry meat exported to Great Britain has increased from something under $20,000 four years ago, to something over $200,000 last year. In addition to that increase in the trade, I may say that there has been an immense stimulus given to the feeding of poultry for the home market, and to-day the men who handle poultry in centres like Toronto, Montreal and Ottawa are prepared to take all the fattened poultry they can get at remunerative prices, and the only complaint they have made to us is that they cannot get enough to fill their orders. This stimulus has been given by the department during the last three or four years; and while it was originally intended for the export trade which was rendered possible by the introduction of mechanical cold storage in the steamers crossing the Atlantic, it has extended to the home market in a way which we hardly anticipated when we began it. We have been trying experiments in this line, the details of which I have in my hand and could give. They have all been published in the evidence given before the

Committee on Agriculture and in the annual report of my department.

The next branch is what I call the cold storage division, which now involves two distinct branches. When we first discussed cold storage in this country and introduced it in its improved form of mechanical cold storage, we wanted to provide comparatively small cold chambers on the vessels for the purpose of carrying across the Atlantic certain perishable products which otherwise could not be carried at all and be kept in proper condition. This was chiefly necessary for butter, which up to that time had never been landed in the British market in the condition in which it had left the creamery or the producer in Canada. For some time past, practically all the butter that has gone from Canada—and the export of butter has increased from about $1,000,000 in 1896 to $5,000,000 in 1901—has gone in these cold storage chambers in a frozen condition, and is laid down in the English market in practically the same condition that it leaves the creamery in Canada. That is possible by reason, first of all, of the introduction of cold storage refrigerators at the creameries, which we have stimulated by giving a bonus.

Mr. CLANCY. The bonus, I understand, applies also to the cooling rooms for cheese making.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is only given to factories which make butter in the summer. We have not given any bonus for cooling chambers in cheese factories. There are a large number of factories in Canada which sometimes make butter in summer, as well as cheese, and if they do that we have allowed the bonus to them, the condition being that they must retain the refrigerator room at a certain temperature to become entitled to the bonus. At the present time I think over three-fourths of the factories in Canada fulfil these conditions. Then, cold storage is provided in iced refrigerator cars, numbers of which leave all parts of the country and converge at the ports. At the ports private enterprise has almost entirely fulfilled the necessity of providing cold storage accommodation, for the holding of those perishable products which the owners wish to be held. If they are to be transferred direct to the steamer from the cars, our officers watch that transference to see that no damage is done and that the goods are properly handled. If they are not properly handled, reports are immediately made, and complaints are sent to the transportation companies, and the owners are notified. On the steamers there has been for some years back full accommodation for all the product going forward which requires mechanical cold storage on the steamers. Occasionally instances may have arisen where a particular shipment was destined for some port to which there was no regular line of steamers. I believe that in one or two instances a particular steamer at a particular time was full, and the goods had to wait for a few days or a week for another steamer; but in a general way in the last year or two there has been sufficient of this mechanical refrigeration on the vessels going from Canada to meet the demands of trade.

Now, I want to allude to another kind of what I may call cold storage, although it is different in its essence from this; that is, the principle of cooling the ordinary holds of vessels where certain goods are stored for transport. As a general rule during the shipping season of apples and the big shipping season of cheese, the owners and shippers do not care to pay the extra charges for the cold storage chambers proper, and moreover there are such large quantities of apples going forward for a few months in the fall of the year that it would be practically impossible for the steamers to provide mechanical cold storage for all that freight. Many of the shippers also believe—and I am not prepared to deny it—that it is not at all necessary for cheese or apples to be carried in these cold storage insulated chambers which are cooled by mechanical refrigeration. Under these circumstances they send their cheese and apples forward in the ordinary holds of the vessels; and when the holds are battened down and shut up tight, without any complete system of ventilation, there is no doubt that there has been serious injury to our apples and our cheese going forward in days gone by. We have urged the steamship companies to obviate that difficulty. We have represented to them that it was necessary to put in not only the ordinary ventilating shafts, but fans, so that a mechanical generation of a current of air through the holds would be obtained; and furthermore we have in the last year believed and inculcated that for this purpose there ought to be a mechanical refrigerating plant on the vessels, with a chamber where the air could be artificially cooled down to a low temperature, and that air forced through the holds of the vessels where the cheese and apples are stored. The plan of putting in fans and simply ventilating with the air at the ordinary temperature has been pretty successfully initiated and carried out. The other plan of a refrigerating chamber where the air would be cooled to a very low temperature and forced through has only been begun in the past season. We were able to induce companies to put four ships under that arrangement last season, and we have received the most convincing evidence from the shippers, the receivers in the old land and the owners of those ships, that, for the carriage of our cheese and apples, that system is most eminently satisfactory. I may say that, with the single exception of the

newly subsidized line from Bristol to the West Indies, the ships we have been dealing with are the only ones I know of in the world fitted up in that way. This system, I am glad to say, will be very largely extended this season now opening. We have been negotiating with other vessel owners, and I am in a position to state that this coming season there will be at least ten more vessels fitted up in this way for trading in the St. Lawrence.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between freight rates on goods shipped on those vessels and those shipped on other vessels.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall tell the hon. gentleman in a few minutes. From the experience we had last year, I am satisfied that this system will be the ultimate one adopted by all the ships coming to Canada which expect to carry large quantites of cheese or fruit. We have had to do the same kind of thing that we did in the case of the original cold storage scheme, namely, bear a share of the cost of fitting the vessels up, and make a similar contract. The experiment I am happy to say, has justified our expectations. By the contracts we then made with the shipowners to fit up their ships with this apparatus, we agreed to pay half the cost of fitting up, on the understanding that the cost should extend over, in the first case, three years, and in the second, two years; and the results have justified our expectations that the ships would continue with that apparatus after the contract had expired. To-day a large number of the vessels now leaving Canadian ports and not subsidized at all by the government, are fitted up in that way, and when any new ship is being built for the St. Lawrence trade, it is well understood that it is necessary it should be fitted up with this cold storage system. Gratifying as has been the success of the work we have undertaken I am satisfied that when we have got the other system I have been describing, thoroughly into working order, similar results will follow, and that in the near future every steamer which expects to carry our apples and cheese across the Atlantic will be fitted up with this arrangement.

I shall not go into details just now on the particular expenditure in that line, although it is somewhat larger than last year.

With regard to the railways, the system has been constantly extended. We have to-day a larger number of lines fitted up with this system than we had any year before, and are occasionally receiving requests to have more put on, which we immediately act upon.

I hope this year to have an additional officer, whose duty it will be to watch more closely the carriage by these railways of our cold storage products. That work is now being done by an officer stationed in Montreal, to which these lines nearly all converge. He there watches carefully the arrivals, makes note of the shipments received, the condition in which they arrive, and the temperature maintained. His observations show that the work, on the whole, has been satisfactorily done, but we have complaints occasionally, especially at points where the cars stop on their way to Montreal, and where there are converging lines coming together, and I think it would conduce to greater efficiency and the removal of any such complaints, if we had an inspector, whose business it would be to take special charge of this particular work. I hope to be able to provide for such an officer during the coming year.

I have a statement here with regard to the creameries. I find that there are, roughly speaking, in the neighbourhood of 700 creameries in Canada, and that up to the present about 500 have been fitted, leaving in the neighbourhood of 200 which have not yet complied with the conditions and got the bonus.

Mr. CLANCY. What is the exact number in each province?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the number in each province, but in the whole Dominion. The great bulk of those which have taken advantage of the arrangement are in Ontario and Quebec, and but few elsewhere. There are some in the maritime provinces and possibly one or two in British Columbia. I do not think that there are any in Manitoba. From the 31st March, 1902 to the 31st March, 1903, we anticipate that 100 creameries will get the first year's bonus and the second year's bonus and about 80 will get the third year's. During this current year from 31st March, 1901 to 31st March, 1902—this statement was made out in February a few weeks ago—there were 80 creameries that got the first year's bonus of $50 each and 80 that got the second year's bonus, and about 100 that got the third year's bonus. The bonus is $50 the first year and $25 each second and third year.

Mr. CLANCY. Can the hon. gentleman tell the committee how much butter, made in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, was exported in this way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures here, and I do not know even that we have the figures available in the department, showing how much of the export comes from these two provinces. In the Trade and Navigation Returns, we have the export from the several ports, but then it must be remembered that the great bulk of the products from Montreal and westward and even from Quebec and westward, are exported from the port of Montreal, and the Trade and Navigation

Returns do not indicate the province or origin of the goods. But I may say, in general terms, that, of the butter exported from Montreal nearly all goes from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Last year there was a little of North-west and Manitoba butter exported from Montreal. For a year or two there was scarcely any export of this kind, the great bulk of the western butter going to British Columbia and the Yukon and some little to Japan. But, during the season just passed, the trade there did not absorb the whole of the territorial and Manitoba production, and some was sent to Montreal and exported to Great Britain. Of the maritime provinces butter and cheese a certain proportion sometimes comes to Montreal. That depends on so many things that it is difficult to exactly gauge it. The Montreal merchants engaged in this business handle the great bulk of this trade for the country, and they buy in the maritime provinces as well as in Quebec and Ontario. Sometimes they ship direct from Halifax and other ports, but sometimes they bring the butter and cheese to Montreal and keep them in cold storage until they are ready to ship. We do not know to what extent each province contributes, so, I fear it will be impossible to give the hon. gentleman the information in greater detail.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not expect the hon. gentleman to be able to give it in minute details, but if he could state approximately the quantities made by the two provinces, it would be an interesting point.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps I can get from Professor Robertson his estimates of it.

Mr. CLANCY. Just one more question. Can the hon. gentleman say in what proportion each province is making application for the assistance covered by this vote ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not state that off-hand. Of course, we have in the department the details of every application that comes in, but I have not obtained the figures by provinces. I think there again the great bulk of the applications would come from the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Speaking from memory and subject to correction which, perhaps Professor Robertson can give me, the greater number of applications lately have come from Quebec. There are more creameries in the province of Quebec, in proportion to the population, than in the province of Ontario. Ontario has taken a great lead in cheese production, but in butter production, I think Quebec has rather taken the lead, at least in the number of factories and the proportional amount of butter produced. I have just received a memorandum from Professor Robertson, saying that, so far as the exports are concerned, about three-quarters come from Quebec and about one-quarter comes from Ontario. And the bonuses to creameries are in about the same proportion.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the hon. minister state the amount given to Quebec and Ontario respectively ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not give that in more than round figures. I think about three-quarters of the amount paid in bonuses goes to Quebec. The statement I gave a moment ago indicated how much had been given in bonuses last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. minister will turn to pages D—65 and 66 of the Auditor General's Report, he will find that almost $6,000 was paid to Quebec and only $500 to Ontario. That is not in the proportion stated by the hon. minister.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are two circumstances that may help to explain that. It may be that Ontario has not applied for so many bonuses, or it may be that Ontario applied earlier in the carrying out of this arrangement. The first year's bonus is $50 for each creamery, and the second and third years' bonuses $25 each. If a hundred factories applied from Quebec this year, they would get $50 each, a total of $5,000; if, last year, a hundred had applied from Ontario, this year they would receive only the second year's bonus, $25 each, a total of $2,000. I have not analysed the applications or payments, and so am stating simply a suppositious case. The arrangement is that every creamery that applies and fulfils the conditions gets the bonus.

Mr. CLANCY. I think it will be found that certain individuals have been multiplying their application so that practically all this money has gone to a few persons.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been no second bonus given to any building in the country.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister does not understand me. The persons controlling a number of buildings here and there have been getting first and second bonuses and will receive third bonuses this year. A few persons receive the bonuses rather than the country generally, as I understand it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) does not understand the object of the bonus system. The object is to secure that at every creamery there shall be a refrigerator. I do not think that it matters in the least degree to Canada whether ten creameries that receive bonuses belong to one man or to ten men. We know that in some sections of the country, some men with busi-

ness capacity and enterprise have established a large number of cheese factories or a large number of creameries. These men would get bonuses on a number of creameries, yet every individual who asks for a bonus and complies with the conditions receives it; and it is as easy for the owner of one creamery to comply with the conditions for one building as for the owner of ten to comply with the conditions for ten buildings. The bonus is given to the factory, not to the individual.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the reason the export of butter fell off so much in 1901 from what it was in 1900 ? There seems to be a discrepancy there at which I am rather surprised, because the hon. minister seems to be doing a good deal to promote the butter industry.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The figures the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) refers to are for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1901. The butter production for that fiscal year was smaller in consequence of the price of cheese. We have a certain amount of milk in Canada to be made up into butter or cheese. Some seasons a larger proportion is made into butter and some seasons a larger proportion is made into cheese. It happened that the season for the calendar year 1900 opened very well for cheese, and, during that calendar year there was a very much larger quantity of milk made into cheese than there was made into butter. The year before, the butter export had been very large. The result was that, in the fiscal year commencing 1st July, 1900, and ending 30th June, 1901, there was less butter produced for export than there had been for the year before. The conditions, however, apparently, have changed a little, and last calendar year, the year just closed, we had a much larger export of butter. In this last calendar year—we sometimes reckon butter and cheese production and exports by the season, and then in the Trade and Navigation Returns they are entered by the fiscal year—in the season of 1901 again there was a much greater production of butter, as a matter of fact, about $5,000,000 worth in round figures, was exported. During the season of 1900 there was much less exported; during the season of 1899 there was about $5,000,000 worth of butter exported. I think the explanation is that the factorymen and the patrons thought that season that cheese was going to sell rather better than butter. As my hon. friend will notice, this last calendar year in which, as I have pointed out, there was a great increase in the butter exports, there was a very decided decrease of cheese exports.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not got the figures for the calendar year.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that, and it was a complicated work to prepare the figures, because the season's make is in the calender year, and the export of it comes very nearly in the fiscal year. There is not a great deal of butter, as a rule, exported during the early months of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. The export of butter made in a given calender year does not begin to any great extent until after the first of July, it therefore goes into the fiscal year following.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice, however, that in the last fiscal year the article of butter, so much aided by the government, shows a very much reduced amount of export, and the article of cheese, that was not assisted by the government, showed an increased export, showing that the government's assistance made no difference.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have pointed out that in that season the price of cheese in England was up, and the price of butter was not up particularly, and therefore our people turned their milk into cheese.

Mr. HENDERSON. So as a matter of fact the government cannot take credit for the increased export.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The government cannot make people do one thing or the other, but the government can provide facilities, and the people take advantage of them or not, as they think it is to their interest. As a matter of fact, butter has come up again during the last calendar year of 1901, and $5,000,000 worth was exported. The hon. gentleman has not got those figures in the Trade and Navigation Returns, but they have been published in the press, and given to different dairy conventions over the country, and are well understood. During the last calendar year the cheese export has not only been reduced in price in consequence of what I explained a few minutes ago, but it has also been decreased in volume. As a matter of fact, in the calendar year of 1901 the value of cheese exported from Canada was about $4,000,000 less than it was in 1900, speaking in round figures ; and of that $4,000,000 decrease, those who are acquainted with the trade have placed at $2,000,000 the shrinkage of quantity, and at about $2,000,000 the shrinkage in value. Now, I will speak a little about the live stock division. Here I have taken a new departure in appointing a live stock commissioner.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister may remember that he said the other day that he had appointed a live stock commissioner on the advice of eminent agriculturists whom he had consulted by letter, and he was pleased to see that their reports were almost uni-

versally favourable to the appointment of the gentleman whom he had selected. Would he have any objections to putting those letters on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember the exact words my hon. friend has reference to. I looked in my office, and my secretary has not been able to find the letters in regard to it. I think what I said was that I had consulted people engaged in the live stock business. If I said letters, I have not yet been able to lay my hands on any particular letters of that nature. But I have under my hand, and will read to the House, or give them to the hon. gentleman, letters in large numbers endorsing the appointment. I did consult the live stock men, and I know of my own knowledge what Mr. Hodson had been doing before in Ontario, and I felt I was right in choosing him for that position. I think the event has justified the choice most amply, and I will read later on, if the hon. gentleman wishes it, some statements that have appeared over the signatures of leading live stock men, and I have resolutions of live stock associations endorsing the appointment of that gentleman, and pointing out how eminently qualified he is for that position. But aside from the appointment of a live stock commissioner, I have endeavoured to stimulate the trade and to organize what I may call the live stock interests of the country. With that object in view, along with the live stock commissioners who has been working now a little over 2 years, this work has been largely that of organization up to the present time. Mr. Hodson had shown his ability as an organizer in the province of Ontario. He had been for some time, I am speaking under correction of the official name, secretary of the Live Stock Association of the great province of Ontario, which is the centre of all the live stock interests of Canada, and I may even go further and say of all the live stock interests of this North American continent. Mr. Hodson had had that experience, and knowing him as I did, I believed his services would be of great value all over the Dominion. He has been travelling about a good deal, meeting with live stock men in other provinces as well as in Ontario, and trying to introduce into other provinces the same kind of work that had been so successful in Ontario. I am glad to see that the people have responded very willingly, and to-day we have live stock associations, not altogether inaugurated since he came in, but certainly stimulated and vivified, and rendered more effective in consequence of his work. The live stock associations of British Columbia, the Territories, Manitoba, and Ontario, and the breeders associations in the maritime provinces, not only have been individually and locally stimulated, but they have been brought into relations with one another, and a large inter-provincial trade has sprung up, which live stock men say is of great value to them. Ontario is the breeding place of the live stock interests of Canada. Ontario men a few years ago, were comparatively glutted with their own production, and they had not such a good market as they desired. That market to-day has been found for them to a large extent in the west and in the east by reason of the institution of the live stock associations, as well as through the arrangements that have been made to facilitate the carriage of live stock eastwards and westwards. The people of Ontario have been able to make enormous sales of their live stock to Manitoba, the Territories, and British Columbia on the one hand, and to Quebec, the maritime provinces, and Newfoundland on the other hand. This is largely work which Mr. Hodson has been doing, that is the line he has been taking, and which has resulted in the advantages I have just mentioned.

In connection with that I may say that we have very much increased what I may call our participation as a Dominion department in the institute work of the various provinces. Besides doing this work and making experiments in various lines it is absolutely necessary that this work and these experiments should be given to the people and brought right home to them so that they may reap the benefit of them and understand them. We have done this in the past by issuing reports and bulletins which have been spread broadcast throughout the country, but, as is well known by those who are familiar with agricultural problems and work, by personal contact, the holding of meetings, and the impressing upon the people through personal addresses the results of our investigations and experiments, the work is more interesting to the people, more likely to attract their attention and more likely to induce them to carry on the work themselves until these same results have been obtained. Consequently, we have to a considerable extent aided in the local institute work. In Ontario that work is so admirably organized and so complete that we have not had to do a great deal there although we have done some. It was just beginning in New Brunswick, but in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island it was hardly organized at all. I am glad to say that to-day, and I venture to claim some credit for having, by advice, incitement and work, helped to bring about that result, they have pretty well completed the organization of that institute work in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the same is true of Prince Edward Island. In the west a great deal has been done of this kind of work. They had a stock-breeders' association and a horse-breeders' association in the territories. They were, however, working at a great disadvantage without any touch between them and other organizations of the kind, and they were rather disheartened, but to-day,

they are encouraged, stimulated and confident and this has been very largely due to work which Mr. Hodson has been able to do in helping them, advising them, and encouraging them in their work. Until we went out to British Columbia between one and two years ago, the farmers of British Columbia were hardly in touch with the farmers of the eastern part of Canada at all, but since that visit there has sprung up an enormous trade between Ontario and the far west. I will get, before I finish this item, a short statement of the amount of stock that has been sold there. Since the 1st of January last, I think I am correct when I make the statement that the sale of $60,000 worth of stock has been arranged by the efforts of Mr. Hodson alone independently altogether of any other purchases or sales with which he had nothing to do of stock from Ontario to British Columbia and the North-west Territories.

Mr. CLANCY. Where was that want supplied from before ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They did not get this stock at all. Their live stock interests seemed to be almost dead and they were not pushing ahead at all, but lately they have been trying to get live stock as they have seen an opening in the markets for it. Anything that they did get in the past they got from the south of the line. There were a few odd shipments of stockers from Ontario to the North-west Territories and British Columbia until the last year and a half, but during the last year and a half there has been a constant stream, not only of pure-bred animals for breeding purposes, but of stockers which have been bought in Ontario and shipped to the west for the purpose of feeding them and then re-selling them as finished animals. That trade has sprung up, and has been the direct result of bringing into contact the people in the east with the people of the west, and which but for this would probably have gone on in the old limited way in which the trade was going on. Then Mr. Hodson has started one or two good movements which are of value to the country. He has worked in conjunction with the farmers of Ontario in the improvement and the large increase of what is known as the Fat Stock Show at Guelph. This takes place every December, and I will venture to call it the great gathering of the agricultural interests of Canada every year, especially those connected with the live stock interests. Men go there from all over the country. They have there large audiences gathered together. They have not only the exhibition and the competition of live stock in cattle, sheep, swine and poultry, but they have also addresses delivered on practical subjects, taking the animals which have been competing in the ring and pointing out their excellencies and the reasons why such an animal is good and such another animal is bad. This work has had a tremendous educative influence and it has been giving very great results from the fact that the institute workers from the province of Ontario and from the other provinces as well have been brought there and heard these addresses, have seen these animals, have mixed with one another and exchanged experiences and ideas. These men to-day are going all over the Dominion of Canada and carrying the results of what they heard at that great gathering to the people. This part of the show was organized by Mr. Hodson. For the last two years he has, with my approval and concurrence, managed practically the addresses and the gathering together of the people at this fair. In addition this winter we have organized and stimulated and worked up a similar fair at Amherst, N.S., for the benefit of the maritime provinces. We had a most successful gathering there exactly similar to the great show at Guelph, and it is an augury for the future of the live stock interests of the maritime provinces that the town of Amherst passed a by-law devoting $12,000 to the erection of buildings for the continuance of this fair, so that it is an assured thing that such a fair will be in existence in the maritime provinces in the future as that which is in existence at Guelph. Mr. Hodson has inaugurated another work which will be of the greatest benefit to the country. That is in connection with the ordinary agricultural society exhibitions throughout the country. There has been great difficulty in regard to these exhibitions in getting competent judges, judges who were known and whose judgments would be accepted. Mr. Hodson has undertaken to help the agricultural societies to get these gentlemen. We have spent some little money in my department for this purpose. We have been able to send men who are recognized as authorities on different lines of stock. Mr. Hodson has been able to inaugurate another thing which I believe is going to be of the greatest benefit and importance, and it is the system of the judges giving to the people who are assembled to see their judgment the reasons for their judgment and explaining why it is that one animal deserves the prize and the other does not. That has been done to a certain extent last fall, and it was a remarkable success; so successful indeed that the officers of these societies have been urging on us that it should be continued. In this way, and in other ways that are contemplated, Mr. Hodson's work will render these agricultural exhibitions much more beneficial to the people.

The next division is what I might call the dairy division. It comprises the work at headquarters ; the work of running the creameries in the North-west Territories ; the work of the assistant dairy commissioner in the province of Quebec ; the grant

to the dairy school at St. Hyacinthe and to the Dairymen's Association ; the running of three creameries in Nova Scotia ; help to the dairy school at Sussex, New Brunswick ; and the employment of an officer to help dairying interests in the maritime provinces. It includes also the cheese curing rooms which I have already described. That takes $62,000 out of our whole grant.

The last division is the fruit division. It includes the general work at Ottawa in connection with fruit ; and the work in connection with the Fruit Marks Act which necessitated the appointment of some inspectors. It includes the experimental work, and the advice and assistance which is given in the packing of fruit, as well as to methods to secure that the fruit shall be free from spots and as fine as possible. Last season, the first season of the operation of the Fruit Marks Act, after careful consideration and consultation with those interested in the trade, we thought it best not to proceed too rigidly with the enforcement of the Act. It was an entirely new departure, and a good many people thought that the provisions of the law were extremely strict. For my own part I believe that any one who does not live up to the provisions of that Act deserves very little sympathy. At the same time the trade of the country being already well established on certain lines, a rigid enforcement might have involved consequences which it would be as well to avoid. I gave instructions to my officers to bring to the attention of those interested, the provisions of the Act and the methods in which we proposed to enforce it, so as to give them fair warning. There were doubts expressed as to the meaning of certain clauses and I consulted lawyers and got their opinions, and then tried to impress on the packers and shippers what these opinions were. I may say that the passage of that Act has contributed materially to an improvement in the packing of our fruit. I regret that I cannot say that last year there was not a great deal of fruit packed which was contrary to the provisions of the Act. But, at the same time there was an effort on the part of packers and shippers to try and live up to its provisions. At first we did not undertake to impose penalties, but we found that some people were continuing in their old ways and we afterwards did impose a few penalties chiefly as a warning, and to show that the Act could be effectively enforced. We have been all the time giving information as to the nature of the Act and endeavouring to get people to comply with its provisions. Last year our inspectors have been extremely busy throughout the season doing this work. The services of these inspectors have been required for a longer period than I had expected, but I think we are in a position now to lay off one or two. An important feature of this work is our endeavour to explain to fruit growers how they can avoid the growing of spotted and wormeaten fruit, so that next year it is hoped that our fruit will be better in quality than in the past. That will make the enforcement of the Act easier in the coming year. What is more important still, it will bring our apples up to the high reputation which Canadian apples should enjoy in the foreign market, and it will contribute much to the benefit of the trade generally. Our inspectors did not attempt to inspect all the shipments of fruit, but they examined 33,000 barrels in Montreal up to the 1st of December last. It would be a physical impossibility for any reasonable number of inspectors to inspect all the fruit sent to Montreal, and it was not intended under the Act that this should be done. We have also had inspectors travelling around the country inspecting fruit which was not sent to the port of Montreal. We have had demands for more extensive inspection, and especially for inspection in different localities. To what extent it is possible to meet these demands I am not now prepared to say. We hope to do a good deal more of that work this season than last season, and I believe it will contribute to the improvement of the fruit sent to the home market, just as much as what we have done this year has contributed to the improvement of our fruit for the export trade.

Mr. WADE. Is it the intention of the minister to introduce any amendments to the Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think any amendment is imperatively demanded at the present time. There have been one or two little hitches in the working of the Act, but we have worked these out, so that on the whole the Act is working fairly well. I thought a little of introducing a very short Bill to amend the Act in some slight particulars, but it is questionable in my mind whether up to the present time sufficient defects have been shown in it to justify amending it this session.

Mr. COCHRANE. How many inspectors has the hon. gentleman got under this Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have had 12 inspectors for the whole Dominion during the past season.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why is it necessary for 5 or 6 of your inspectors to appear on the scene at one place at once ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Unless it was to discuss a question with the trade or to take hold of some particularly complicated case, I do not think it would be necessary. I am not aware of any case where that has occurred except where there was a necessity of consultation.

Mr. COCHRANE. What complicated case could arise ? If the inspector understood his business properly, he would surely know

whether a barrel of apples was up to the mark or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On some occasions we have thought it well to have more than one inspector discuss a particular case with the trade. We have one chief inspector whose business it has been rather to guide and control the work of the others, and he might at any time be called upon by one of the ordinary inspectors to decide a point which had arisen unexpectedly or which was not covered by the instructions which had been given. If 4 or 5 met at any one particular place, I can only believe that it was in order to discuss a number of points which had been raised by the trade.

Mr. SPROULE. How much do you pay these inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The chief inspector gets $100 a month.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where does he reside ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has been making his headquarters at Ottawa.

Mr. HENDERSON. What are his duties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His duties have been, first of all, to direct generally the whole of this work under Professor Robertson as the head of this branch. He is a lawyer by profession, and has been largely occupied in working out what I might call the legal side of the enforcement of the Act. He has also been a fruit-grower, having been raised on a fruit farm, and consequently knows a good deal about the fruit business. His name is W. A. McKinnon, and he comes from the county of Wentworth. He is a graduate in law of Toronto University. The other inspectors work under him. One or two are more experienced than the others. Some have been appointed permanently, while others have been appointed temporarily for the months during which the fruit trade is largest.

Mr. COCHRANE. How much do the gentlemen get who are under him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One of them, Mr. Alexander McNeil, gets $1,000 a year. Mr. Lick gets at the rate of $1,000 a year, but is not engaged for the whole year. Mr. Vroom and Mr. Burke are also engaged at the rate of $1,000 a year.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where do they reside ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. McNeil comes from the western part of Ontario. He has had great experience in institute work, in fruit growing on his own farm, and in lecturing on that subject. Mr. Lick is also from the province of Ontario. Mr. Vroom is from Nova Scotia and Mr. Burke from Prince Edward Island. Then, I have 7 other inspectors who are temporarily engaged at $100 a month.

Mr. GILMOUR. Where are they stationed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is rather difficult to say that they are stationed anywhere. Two or three are stationed at Montreal most of the time, but are liable to be called elsewhere. Others travel from place to place. Mr. Burke and Mr. Vroom have been in the maritime provinces all the time. Mr. McNeil and Mr. Lick have been mostly in Ontario, but one was sent to the Fruit Growers' convention of Nova Scotia to give them an address on the Act and on fruit growing generally. The chief inspection has been in the port of Montreal for the export trade, but we have not confined ourselves entirely to that. There has been inspection anywhere else. The Act says that apples may be inspected anywhere that they are found, and consequently we have been obliged to have inspectors travelling a good deal of the time ; we think it is wise that they should, so that the shippers may not know just where an inspector is going to light on their shipment.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any account of the number of inspections made and the number of prosecutions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have the number at Montreal, but I do not think anywhere else. We have only had, I think, 9 prosecutions.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Has the chief inspector made a report to the minister of what has been done during the last season ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have had constant reports from the chief inspector and from all the inspectors from time to time. Those reports will all be made into a general report which will appear in the departmental report of next year. The season was hardly advanced enough to get it into the report that was laid on the Table at the beginning of this session, although there is in that report something about the enforcement of the Act. But that report only comes up to the 1st of November, by which date there was hardly time to have had a real experience of the working of the Act. But we have all the reports of this work in the department, and Professor Robertson will collate them into a comprehensive report on the working of the Act, which will appear in the annual report of the department next year.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Will the names of the delinquents be published ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that it would be well to

publish those at present. Of course, when a prosecution takes place, it is usually reported in the newspapers, and the names of the parties appear there. I have not yet thought out whether it would be best to put the names into the annual report of the department or not.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I think it would.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It might be best to do so. I may say that this Act is chiefly deterrent in its character. Its object is not so much to punish as to prevent this kind of thing going on—to try to secure honest and proper packing, and the supply to our people of just what they buy. If it should be necessary to hold the whip of publicity over the people who are thus packing, we may have to do it, but I am in hopes that the means adopted already will be sufficient, and rapidly improve the trade.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Has the hon. minister made arrangements with the shippers to see that the perishable products are protected or properly shipped ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am working that with the ship-owners as much as possible.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Is the minister aware that there is an incongruity between the Ontario and the Dominion statutes with regard to the punishment of delinquents in the dairy business ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not any knowledge of it at the moment. Will the hon. gentleman state to what particular discrepancy he refers ?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Under the Ontario Act respecting butter and cheese no one can be found guilty of an offence unless it can be shown that he committed it knowingly or wilfully, but under the Dominion Act such knowledge is not made an element of the crime, but on the contrary the lack of such knowledge is no defence. That appears to me very unjust. Perhaps I had better read the statutes for the information of the hon. gentleman. Here is the Ontario statute—chapter 251 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario page 3,091 :—

6. No person shall sell, supply, bring or send to a cheese or butter manufactory, or the owner or manager thereof, to be manufactured, milk diluted with water, or in any way adulterated, or milk from which any cream has been taken, or milk commonly known as 'skimmed milk,' without distinctly notifying, in writing, the owner or manager of such cheese or butter manufactory, that the milk so sold, supplied or brought to be manufactured has been so diluted with water, or adulterated, or had the cream so taken from it, or become milk commonly known as 'skimmed milk,' as the case may be. 51 v.c. 32 s.1; 55 v.c. 53 s. 1 (1).

7. No person who in the course of his business agrees to sell, supply, bring or send to any cheese or butter manufactory, or the owner or manager thereof, to be manufactured, the milk of any cow or cows, shall, in the course of such dealing and business, keep back any part of the milk of such cow or cows, without distinctly notifying, in writing, the owner or manager of such cheese or butter manufactory what portion of the milk he has so kept back.

8. No person shall sell, supply, bring or send to a cheese or butter manufactory, or the owner or manager thereof, to be manufactured, any milk that is tainted or partly sour without distinctly notifying, in writing, the owner or manager of such cheese or butter manufactory of or such milk being tainted or partly sour.

The said sections 6, 7 and 8, shall not apply where the person charged with the offence proves to the satisfaction of justice or justices of the peace that the commission of the alleged offence was without his knowledge or privity, and contrary to his wish and intention, and that he was not aware thereof.

Chapter 43 of the Dominion statutes 52 Victoria provides as follows :—

1. No person shall sell, supply or send to any cheese or butter or condensed milk manufactory, or to the owner or manager thereof, or to any maker of butter, cheese or condensed milk, to be manufactured, milk diluted with water, or in any way adulterated or milk from which any cream has been taken, or milk commonly known as skimmed milk.

2. No person who supplies, sends, sells or brings to any cheese or butter or condensed milk manufactory, or to the owner or manager thereof, or to the maker of cheese or butter or condensed milk, any milk to be manufactured into butter or cheese or condensed milk, shall keep back any portion of that part of the milk known as strippings.

7. For the purpose of establishing the guilt of any person charged with the violation of any of the provisions of sections one or two of this Act, it shall be sufficient prima facie evidence on which to found a conviction to show that such milk so sent, sold, supplied or brought to a manufactory as aforesaid, to be manufactured into butter or cheese or condensed milk, is substantially inferior in quality to pure milk, provided the test is made by means of a lactometer or cream gauge or some other proper and adequate test and is made by a competent person; provided always, that a conviction may be made or had on any other sufficient legal evidence.

In the one case a man who does not know that the milk was adulterated cannot be convicted, but in the other case it matters not whether he has any knowledge or not, he may be convicted. I think it is the duty of the minister to see that this mattter is made straight so that we will have but one law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The only thing we can do is to change our law. The Ontario law requires knowledge on the part of the person who is charged with the offence. Does he wish to make our law the same ?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I am not introducing a law but asking the minister if he is aware of the fact.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not looked into the details of the two laws. I prefer the Dominion law, under which the delinquent may be punished without the prosecution being obliged to prove positive knowledge on his part. If the hon. gentleman disapproves of that he ought to introduce a motion to change the law, and I will be very glad to discuss it with him. I think that our law is the better, it being more direct and easier to enforce. Of course this parliament has no control over the Ontario law.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I do not rise for the purpose of changing the law but to call the attention of the minister to the fact.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose that a prosecution might be taken out under either law. If a prosecution be taken out under the Dominion Act, that Act will guide the judge, but if under the Ontario Act, I suppose that he will be governed by it. I would not like to give a legal opinion, but perhaps the leader of the opposition may enlighten us.

Mr. HEYD. Have they not found beneficial effects from the fact that we have these inspectors appointed, independent of the convictions secured ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I think I can say most positively that the shippers generally and the packers generally have appreciated this law and have, in many cases, exerted themselves loyally to carry out its provisions. But, of course, they have found difficulties in the way. Long continued practices in the trade are not done away with in a day; and, even with a perfectly loyal intention to live up to the provisions of the law, no doubt many cases have occurred where the law may have been violated. That is one reason why we have not undertaken to strictly or severely enforce the law. Where we have thought that people deliberately disregarded the law, or where—as in a very few cases—they deliberately told us that we could not enforce it, we have undertaken to show that the law was enforcible and effective.

Mr. COCHRANE. Does the hon. minister know that any of his inspectors have taken power into their own hands, and, where they found apples that were not up to the mark, have said : If you will pay so much, we will let the thing go ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I know of no such case, and if such a case were brought to my notice, the inspector would have a short shrift before dismissal. But I know the character of the inspectors, and I feel confident that not one of them is capable of such an action. I would say in general terms, before closing this general exposé——

Mr. COCHRANE. How do I understand the minister in connection with that matter ? Do I understand him to say that if he knew of an inspector who acted like that he would dismiss him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I knew of an inspector who had made a bargain with an individual whose fruit he found to be unsatisfactory, to let him off in consideration of a payment, I would dismiss him at once.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to be quite clear as to what the minister has said concerning Mr. McKinnon, the chief inspector. I am sure that the House and the country will regard the position of Mr. McKinnon as one of great importance. Do I understand that the minister told the committee that Mr. McKinnon was a gentleman of large and ripe experience ? Did he say whether Mr. McKinnon had served a time as a fruit-grower sufficient to entitle him to the confidence of the people of the country, and that, after giving up fruit culture he practiced his profession as a lawyer—in other words, that Mr. McKinnon had an equipment that would entitle him to the implicit confidence that men should have in one whose duties are so important and involve so much affecting the great trade that we hope to make so much greater than it is now ? The hon. minister shakes his head. If I misunderstood him, perhaps he will explain.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) has said a great deal more than I said. Mr. McKinnon is a comparatively young man. He was brought up on a fruit farm in the Niagara district, and engaged in that work until I do not know what age. He was employed by me in my department to do certain work in preparing the fruit exhibit for the Paris Exposition. He went to Paris in connection with the fruit exhibit, and showed himself eminently qualified to attend to fruit matters. He is an educated man, with a university training, and he has also a legal education. I do not think he has ever practiced the law. He obtained his degree not very long ago—if I remember well after he returned from Paris. As I say, he is a young man. I have frequently found that young men are the most efficient officers I can get, if they have had the necessary training and education to fit them for their work. The experience I have had with Mr. McKinnon in connection with his former work and in connection with this Act, convince me that he is a most efficient officer, thoroughly well equipped for his work. It is because I believed he had the necessary qualifications that I placed him in this responsible position.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit me to tell the rest of the story. I am far from desiring to make it appear that it is a crime to be a young man, and the hon. minister will not urge that against

me. I am told that Mr. McKinnon is a young man whose father occupied a very responsible position as school inspector, but had nothing to do with fruit farming until six or seven years ago. The last six years or so, I am told, is the only time during which even Mr. McKinnon's father had any experience in fruit-growing, and I understand that it is not possible that Mr. McKinnon, jr., could have had the slightest experience, because during this whole period he was at college. Since then he has passed his examination, and, before he had time to enter upon the practice of his profession the hon. minister discovered qualities in him that caused him to send him on a trip to Paris. Now, if Mr. McKinnon has given such service as the hon. minister says, he is a very extraordinary young man, because he has succeeded in spite of not having experience or any of the qualifications required for duties of this kind. It is as well for us to look at this matter in a plain light. No glozing over the matter by the minister will make it appear that a man, no matter how bright he may be, can have, without experience, the qualifications for the performance of such duties as devolve upon this officer. The minister says he employed Mr. McKinnon because he was a lawyer, and that the carrying out of the law required judgment and discrimination. To use the minister's own expression, from which I do not greatly dissent, in having the Act faithfully carried out, it was thought to be as well not to be too harsh. That is what I understood the hon. minister to say.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. I am sure the hon. minister will admit that, if experience in the practice of his profession as a lawyer is necessary, Mr. McKinnon is destitute of a single qualification to enter upon duties of this kind. The hon. minister must see that it is not enough to say that Mr. McKinnon served him in Paris. It is not very hard to understand that Mr. McKinnon was picked up because he was a political friend. I would like to ask the hon. minister if Mr. McKinnon is not the son of the Liberal candidate for the local legislature for the county of Lincoln. Perhaps the hon. minister is innocent of that—he is usually innocent of these things. I suppose he did not even know Mr. McKinnon's politics.

Now Mr. McKinnon has also drawn considerable sums in connection with the Paris Exposition. I see he has drawn $893.56 in some three months ; that of course includes his living allowances as well as his salary. When I turn to what is called the general expenses in connection with cold storage, I find Mr. McKinnon has drawn $510.10. I am not disposed to quarrel with the sums paid him if he has given efficient service ; but I do dissent from the position that the hon. gentleman can pick up any young man or any old man in this country who is without experience, as the hon. gentleman well knows Mr. McKinnon was—for he was not even born on a fruit farm, and has not been long out of college, because I am told he is under thirty years of age now—and the very moment almost that he has passed his law examination the hon. gentleman takes him into his service. Every one knows that it is a perfect farce to allege for a moment that Mr. McKinnon ought to be given charge of duties so important. I am persuaded that the thoughtful men of this country will have little confidence in such an appointment, not because Mr. McKinnon may not be a very bright young man, but because he is without the experience necessary to discharge those duties.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may say that I am aware that Mr. McKinnon was a Liberal, and I do not feel that I have committed a crime in appointing a Liberal to office. I do not know of any particular reason why that fact should be a disability in my mind or in the mind of any other Liberal minister. It would be a new theory entirely in this country. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. McKinnon was not appointed to this office because he was a Liberal ; he was appointed because I believed him to be fit for the position, and I had some little experience and knowledge of what he could do in regard to the work of preparing fruits for the Paris Exposition. I found him with some administrative capacity, and some knowledge of general affairs. I knew he had had a university training, and also a legal training ; but even if he had been without experience in practising before the courts, the legal training would be no disadvantage to him. I regret to say that in our agricultural work of this country it is not always easy to get the right man for any particular kind of work ; and I daresay my colleagues in the other departments find the same difficulty when they have some special work to be done. I have found Mr. McKinnon exceptionally bright and satisfactory, and in discussing this work with him, and knowing his antecedents, and knowing his training, I believed he would be suitable for the work. The event has well justified my choice, because I have found him very judicious and very effective in the performance of his duties, so much so in fact, that I propose to continue him in that work, or in other work that may arise in my department. I would be glad if I could attach him to the department as a permanent officer, and secure his services for the country in future. So far as his father is concerned, I am aware to-day that he is a candidate in the local elections in Ontario. I am not going to allow that to stand in the way of his son being an officer in my department. I do not think that is a valid objection, nor

do I think that, if the tables were turned, the hon. gentleman would consider that an objection.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understood the minister to tell us in his brief remarks in introducing this subject, that Mr. McKinnon's father was the owner of a fruit farm, and that this young man had been brought up on a fruit farm. But if the hon. gentleman is correct in his statement now, he was not on the farm at all and did not know anything about fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Does the hon. gentleman say his father does not own a fruit farm ?

Mr. COCHRANE. He was a school inspector up to the last five or six years, and never had a fruit farm at all ; and when his father bought the fruit farm this young man was in college. I would like to ask the minister how a man, however intellectually bright he may be, but knows nothing about fruit, can all at once develop into such an expert.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman when his father bought the farm.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then you should not have told us that he was brought up on a fruit farm, if you did not know it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was on a fruit farm when I first heard of him, and I knew his father owned a fruit farm, and I was informed by the late Speaker of this House, the Hon. Thos. Bain, that he had a fruit farm, and that the son had lived on a fruit farm, and was as thoroughly equipped with a knowledge of fruit-growing as his father was. His father is to-day a member of the Fruit Grower's Association, and has been frequently in communication with my department in regard to the fruit interests of the Niagara district.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose the hon. gentleman has had several conversations with this young man as to his qualifications. Doubtless he has discussed the peach question with him. I had been at a loss for some time back to understand where the hon. gentleman got his information with respect to peaches ; I never knew before that peaches had stems on them until I heard the hon. gentleman make that remark. Now if Mr. McKinnon gave him that information, I have grave doubts as to his qualifications. Did the hon. gentleman say that Mr. McKinnon is permanently appointed as an inspector ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has been permanently appointed for this purpose up to the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that mean for the year round ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. INGRAM. When a Bill was passing through this House last session the hon. gentleman said it was not his intention to appoint permanent inspectors. The hon. gentleman was asked : Would these inspectors be only temporarily employed during the fruit season, and he answered, Yes. How does it come that the hon. gentleman has changed his policy since then ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not looked up what explanation I gave last year when this Bill was up, but I know I had in contemplation the appointment of several inspectors by the year, as well as a temporary one.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have some slight knowledge of Mr. McKinnon's father, whom I have known for the past 25 or 30 years. I also know something of a cousin of his who tried to supplant me in the House of Commons a year or two ago, and this gentleman's father was very active in assisting him to get left at home. But it is rather a serious question, whether this appointment is proper or not. Mr. McKinnon, senior, I believe, is a member of a fruit association, and is an important fruit grower. I have no desire to minimize his position in that respect ; he has taken an active interest in that industry, and I presume as a shipper and all that. Still I think it is a question whether it is proper that Mr. McKinnon's son should be over the entire department that controls the inspection of the fruit. It would be a very difficult matter indeed, no matter how honourable the son was, to avoid giving a preference. I think there will be a feeling amongst other shippers that they will be handicapped to some extent by the fact that Mr. McKinnon's son is in a position to benefit him at the expense of others. Of course it is unfortunate that this gentleman's father is a candidate at the present time in the Niagara district, and I would not for a moment suggest that his influence would be used there ; but I do say there will be a strong supposition that his influence will be used to the detriment of a large number of people who are engaged in that industry. I think the minister might seriously consider whether the fact of the father's connection with the Fruit Grower's Association, and the other fact of the son's connection with the inspection, will be regarded as quite satisfactory by the fruit growers of the province. I fear that it will destroy confidence very much in a proper inspection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think practically that almost everybody whose name was suggested as an inspector in connection with this Bill had some personal or business relations with fruit shippers and would be, therefore, open to any such accusation, but I have not the slightest idea that there is any such feeling of alarm of Mr. McKinnon, jr, doing anything in connection with his official position which would

justify any such fear on the part of the people.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If the hon minister had accepted the clause which I wished to place in the Bill last year this difficulty would not have arisen.

Mr. HEYD. What difficulty ?

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin.) This difficulty in regard to the inspection. The inspection would not have been needed at all. I asked the hon. minister to insert a clause providing that if apples, not according to the regulations, or apples that were rotten, were discovered, either in Europe, or any other country, in a barrel with a brand, or the packer's name or the grower's name and if three persons who purchased these apples could give prima facie evidence before a justice of the peace and this evidence were sent to Canada and to the county from which the apples were shipped, the packer or shipper might be brought before a judge and punished. Every barrel of apples cannot be inspected as every barrel cannot be opened, and if the hon. minister had accepted my proposition last year all the difficulty that has arisen would have been avoided. But, he refused to do so, and of course, he has to take the consequences.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) This is a strange proceeding. One hon. gentleman complains that the inspector does not know anything of fruit growing, and that he had no training in that respect. Another tells us that his father is a fruit-grower and probably an exporter of apples and on that account he thinks his son is disqualified for the position which he now occupies. That might apply to other inspectors as well as to Mr. McKinnon, because I think if they are supposed to be qualified for their positions it would be well that their fathers and themselves should have been brought up on farms and have been engaged in growing apples, because that is the very thing that would qualify them for such positions. I do not think that it would at all disqualify any one for occupying this position that he had training for it by reason of his being on an apple farm.

Mr. BLAIN. I just wish to say that Mr. McKinnon was not brought up on a farm. His father was the public school inspector in the county which I have the honour to represent and the young gentleman was born in that county. He went to the common school there and then he went to college and his father was not engaged in any kind of farming whatever until he removed from our county to the county where he now resides about eight or ten years ago and went into the fruit-growing business. I think the general complaint is that the hon. minister led the House to believe last year that when this Act was put into force the gentlemen who would be appointed as inspectors would be men of experience, men who knew something about the exporting business and who understood the fruit-growing in this country. The complaint is that the most important office, that of chief inspector for the purpose of enforcing this law, has been given to a young man of no experience whatever, not having been brought up on the farm, not having been engaged in the fruit-growing business and not having a particle of knowledge in respect to the export of apples from this country. This is the chief charge and I think it would be looked upon as being rather serious. If the hon. gentleman had appointed his father who has had six or eight years experience in growing fruit there might have been some reason why that gentleman should have been appointed because of his experience.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I spoke from memory a few minutes ago but I find in 'Hansard' the clause that I wished to insert in the Bill. With your permission Mr. Chairman I will read it :

> Whenever any barrel or package of apples shall be found to be in violation of this Act or any of its clauses, on information being laid before a justice of the peace or a judge in the district in which the apples are found to be bad in any country, an affidavit shall be made by not less than three persons of the fact, when such affidavit shall be forwarded under seal to the judge of the county or district in which the apple packers reside ; and said judge or magistrate shall have power to proceed under this Act, and a conviction may follow.

If that clause had been inserted in this Bill we would not have had all this trouble.

Mr. CLANCY. It is evident that if the hon. Minister of Agriculture had paid some attention to the advice tendered him we would have escaped all of this difficulty. However, as the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson) has made his case so strong, I will have nothing to say about it. I think the objection taken by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is not without foundation. The hon. Minister of Agriculture knows very well that it is his duty, as it is the duty of the hon. members of this House, so far as possible for them to act, to avoid even the appearance of anything that will lead to wrong doing. I would be sorry to charge Mr. McKinnon, without personal knowledge, of having done wrong in the capacity in which he is now acting, but I want to say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that he is open to the severest criticism. Let us take the position of Mr. McKinnon. He is to be the judge of fruit. He may come in contact with hundreds of people that may be influenced somewhat by Mr. McKinnon's conduct. Then, Mr. McKinnon is in the position of a prosecutor also. In accordance with what Mr. McKinnon says the case will be conducted. For a gentleman to be in that position he ought to be as free as possi-

ble, not only as regards himself, but so far as his associations are concerned, from any entanglements. If he is not, then he is not in a position in which he can even hope to have the confidence of the people. I am going to venture a statement in advance of any personal knowledge and it is that Mr. McKinnon was never recommended by the Fruit-growers Association of Canada, or of the province of Ontario, which would have the best possible means of knowing the person best fitted to discharge duties of that kind. My hon. friend is not open to censure for having made an appointment from his own party. That is the custom and no hon. member of this House will waste a moment in discussing it, but when the hon. member makes a party appointment and for that and no other reason, as he seems to have done in this case, he is open to censure. The Minister of Agriculture cannot tell this committee that he had a personal knowledge of Mr. McKinnon's qualifications. In any service at all, whether in law or in the knowledge of fruit, a man cannot possibly have knowledge unless he has experience and training. You might as well say that a bright young man would make a good lawyer without passing a single examination, as to say that a young man was fitted to be an inspector of fruit because his father bought a fruit farm while he was at college. The hon. gentleman says that he found this young man to be very useful, but he should have taken precaution to discover that before appointing him. Mr. McKinnon may know more about fruit than before he went to Paris, but it is perfectly clear that the Minister of Agriculture placed an inexperienced lawyer in charge of an agricultural branch, and that his doing so might have very disastrous results to the trade. I am not attacking lawyers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CLANCY. I rather envy those gentlemen who have a training as lawyers, but I pity them if they try to be farmers or fruit-growers. Hon. members of this House who know the history of this young man know that he had absolutely no experience in the fruit business, but nevertheless the minister elevated him to a position of great importance in connection with the fruit-growing industry of this country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot now remember whether I asked anybody as to Mr. McKinnon's qualifications for this office, but he had undoubtedly been recommended to me as knowing a good deal about fruit-growing.

Mr. CLANCY. By whom ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By the Hon. Thomas Bain, late Speaker of this House, whose judgment I will take upon such matters as readily as that of any man in Canada. Mr. McKinnon had shown in his work in the department, industry and intelligence and exceptional ability as a business man, as well as practical worth. He was a well educated man; he had a legal training, and the work he has to do as the head of that particular branch is particularly connected with the organization and administration of the Act.

Mr. COCHRANE. It must require a great deal of capacity to superintend eight or nine men.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It does require very considerable capacity to organize entirely new work for eight or nine men in the country. I believed from what I had seen of Mr. McKinnon's work that he was equal to the position, and after eight months experience I can say that he has proven himself to be extremely capable. I can rest upon the justification which the course of events has given for my choice of that gentleman. Hon. gentlemen opposite, I am afraid, are a little led away by the fact that they have discovered that Mr. McKinnon is a Liberal and that his father is engaged in active Liberal politics. I do not wonder at that, but I do not think that should influence me in my judgment of an effective officer who is doing effective work. I believe I was perfectly right in putting Mr. McKinnon into that office, and I propose to continue him in it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the duties of this young gentleman ? Is he required to know about fruit or fruit-growing?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would consider it necessary that a man in charge of this work should know something about fruit-growing, and I know that Mr. McKinnon does know a good deal about fruit-growing and about fruit. In addition, he had to do a great deal of organizing and of direction in connection with the administration of this Act which was entirely a new thing. Prof. Robertson and myself gave a great deal of thought and attention to that, and we had to have some men under Prof. Robertson especially in charge of that work, whose duty it would be to carry out the details of the plan which we decided upon. I do not know that Mr. McKinnon has ever examined personally a barrel of apples, but if he had to, I believe he would be quite capable of doing so. His work has been that of administration and supervision, while the other inspectors have done the actual inspecting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is perfectly plain from the statement of the minister that this young man had not the slightest qualification for the discharge of his duties in connection with fruit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not acknowledge that at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister has appointed this young man inspector of fruit, because he had studied law.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. WADE. Because he did not practice law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Wade) corrects me; because this young man had studied law and not practiced it, and because his father had purchased a fruit farm while this young man was at college. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice would think it worth while to appoint some gentleman to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada because that gentleman had been an apple grower, but it would be just as sensible for him to do so as for the Minister of Agriculture to appoint a man as a fruit inspector because he was a lawyer. If the Minister of Justice was able to go a little further, he would be still more in line with the Minister of Agriculture who says that this young man is qualified because his father owned a fruit farm ; carrying out the same idea, the Minister of Justice might appoint some person to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada because that person's father had owned a law library. Whatever Mr. McKinnon may develop into in the future, it is plain from the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that he had no qualification for this position when the minister appointed him. No one objects to this young man being appointed because he is a Liberal, but the objection is that he should not be appointed for that reason alone.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not done so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The fact is that this young gentleman's father was inspector of schools until after this young man began to go to college and study law, when the father purchased a fruit farm. There is no suggestion that the young man ever had anything to do with the management of that farm, although perhaps he might come home during the summer vacation and see apples and peaches growing on the trees.

An hon. MEMBER. Peaches on stems.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He had the additional merit of observing stems on peach trees which I believe do not exist, but even that did not qualify him to be a fruit inspector.

As to his having any special qualification outside of that, he has none unless, the fact that he has studied law constitutes a qualification. I could understand, if a man had practiced law, that the knowledge of business which had come to him in that way might be of some service in a matter of this kind ; but I should think that the mere academic knowledge of law which a young man had derived at college would confer the least possible qualification for the position assigned to this gentleman. I certainly have never found in my experience that the mere academic study of law or anything else particularly fits a man to organize or transact business such as the hon. gentleman says enters into the duties of this position. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture has been led away by his doctrine of free trade in this matter—He desires to make the occupation of fruit-growing and a knowledge of the law reciprocate with each other. If that principle be carried out in the cabinet, it will be necessary for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to consider the agricultural qualifications of any candidate for a seat on the bench of the Supreme Court or any of the superior courts in the provinces ; because the experience of a lawyer is about as necessary or useful to the position which the Minister of Agriculture has assigned to this gentleman as the business of fruit-growing is to the appointment of any person to a place on the bench of a court.

Mr. HEYD. I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the arguments which our friends on the other side have brought against the appointment of Mr. McKinnon, but they are not such as to influence me at all in endorsing the action of the Minister of Agriculture. It appears to me that one of the best evidences that this young man is qualified is the very fact that his father is a candidate for the Local Legislature in a fruit-growing district. If the people there feared that his appointment would result in injury to the fruit-growers, that would be one of the main reasons why his father would not be a candidate for the Local House. One-half the people at any rate in that section have confidence not only in the father, but also in the son. One of the peculiar arguments brought forward to-day, I presume with the idea of having a little sport, is the injurious effect that will follow from the fact of this inspector's father being a candidate. Now, I would like to know where our friends are going to draw the line. Are they going to exclude a man from running for the Local Legislature because his son happens to be an official of the Federal government ? Or are they going to prevent a man being appointed to any office because his father or his cousin happens to be a candidate ? How far are the ties of consanguinity going to extend ? What do these hon. gentlemen want ? Do they want the father to stop running, or the son to resign ? It seems to me that the greatest crime the young man has committed is that of being the son of a father who is a candidate for the Local Legislature.

Mr. WADE. I think it is only fair that, representing the county where this gentleman has been performing a part of his duties, I should state to the House what opinion the people there have of him. I

dare say some hon. gentlemen opposite will not wish to hear it. I may say that very many of the fruit-growers of that county who have had business with him have expressed themselves to me as having the highest respect for this young man, and as thinking that he is well qualified, and is going to make a very superior officer. If they are satisfied with him I presume that the members of this House might very well be. The hon. leader of the opposition seems to think it is an obstacle to a man being appointed to anything if he possesses a library. I do not think so myself. It seems to me that the argument used on the other side as to the father's avocation and politics, is illustrated by the story of the gentleman who was asked what his religion was, and answered that he was a Presbyterian by his first wife. Here is a clever young man who is giving every satisfaction to the people who know him and his work; but gentlemen in this House who do not know him or the work he is doing, are entirely dissatisfied with him.

Mr. LANCASTER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what Mr. McKinnon did down there which has given so much satisfaction; because I happen to come from the county where this gentleman has been living for the last six years, since his father has had a fruit farm; and every one there wondered who this young man was—whether he was any relation to the man who bought the fruit farm a few years ago. It never dawned on them that it could be the young man in question, because he was at college at the time he was sent to Paris. I think the hon. member for Annapolis must have got his information from the very fact that the young man is not able to inspect fruit; because, if the fruit-growers of Annapolis are so thoroughly satisfied with the work he was doing, the only way that I can reconcile the statement made on this side of the House with the hon. member's statement is that he has not been inspecting apples in the county of Annapolis as they ought to be inspected, and that he is satisfactory to the fruit-growers because he lets everything go as they put it up.

Mr. WADE. Will the hon. gentleman explain how it would be pleasing to the fruit-growers of Annapolis not to have the fruit inspected properly? Does he mean that they are dishonest and do not want to have the fruit properly inspected?

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the fruit-growers were satisfied with the conditions that existed before, and if some person was sent there to inspect who did not know anything about fruit, they would be content to go on as they had been doing before. It seems to me that the question for the House is this: What are the qualifications necessary for an inspector? What does the Act provide? It provides that he shall know the names and varieties of apples. There are hundreds of varieties, and how could a young man without any acquaintance with the fruit business, or without being trained to it, be expected to designate the names and varieties of the different apples or the grade of the fruit? One apple might be small and another large, but both good of their kind.

Mr. HEYD. How much intelligence is required to tell a big apple from a little one?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman has given such evidence of his knowledge and of his desire to shield his friends that I think the House will be quite satisfied to hear but little more from him. This inspector has to see that such fruit shall consist of full-grown specimens of the one variety, but how would he know there was only one variety in the barrel. It would take the best of experts to distinguish the varieties in some cases, they look so much alike. Even fruit-growers have to send their apples down to experts at Toronto to determine the varieties and the disputes that arise at agricultural fairs are often so animated that the judges themselves cannot decide to what particular variety an apple may belong, although they are men who have been all their lives raising apples in the district. But this young man who was never engaged or in the fruit business, is expected to teach fruit-growers the difference between one variety and another. He is also to determine whether the fruit packed is falsely marked, and if he finds it is, he has to efface the mark and inscribe the words 'falsely marked.' But how can he do so if he has no experience or practical training? He could not tell whether there was a mixture of two or three varieties or whether the apples were full grown. That could only be done by some one who was in the apple-growing business or accustomed to handle and export apples. The information we have is that this young man cannot possibly have expert knowledge and therefore must be unfit for the position. The hon. member for Annapolis says he has satisfied the people in Annapolis and must therefore have satisfied the whole country. But that will not satisfy the fruit-growers and handlers who believe that the inspector ought to be expert in the line—one who can distinguish the different varieties, who knows what is a well matured apple and what is not, who knows what is an average sized apple, and who can tell when the Act has been complied with in the selection, packing and marking of the fruit.

Mr. FRASER. How is expertness acquired? How are we to know that a man is an expert? We cannot always tell by reputation. The hon. gentleman would be surprised to know that one of England's greatest historians, who has recently been appointed to the Oxford Chair of History,

Mr. Stubb, was so generally unknown that everybody was enquiring who he was.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, and Billy Stubbs, too.

Mr. FRASER. Billy Stubbs gave a good account of himself. The mere statement that a man is not qualified or has not been a certain length of time raising apples is not proof. There are farmers who raise apples in Nova Scotia and who could not go beyond twelve or fifteen varieties, because they have been raising only these varieties all their lives and have not expert knowledge of any others. What is required in an inspector is a knowledge of the different varieties, and he can get that without being an apple-grower. It is in this gentleman's favour that his father was a grower of apples, and then we have the admission that he has been a success. In this practical age we look at results and not at opinions. If he has proved his usefulness he is well qualified, and that is sufficient for us. I have not heard a single statement to the contrary. No hon. gentleman has said that there has been any complaint against him from the apple growers or shippers.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked the Minister of Agriculture if there were any complaints and he said there were quite a few.

The MINISTER OF AGRICUL... I did not say that there were any complaints about Mr. McKinnon.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked if there were any complaints regarding the enforcement of the Act, and the minister said there were.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is quite a different thing. I never said there was any complaint about Mr. McKinnon.

Mr. FRASER. We have no evidence of any complaint either from the apple-raisers or the packers or the shippers.

Mr. WADE. Or the apple-eaters.

Mr. FRASER. If there were any complaints made against this gentleman, that would be quite different. Surely we are wasting time discussing his qualifications when we have no complaint made against him. We have the evidence that he has been a good officer and has given satisfaction.

Mr. CLANCY. Where is that evidence ?

Mr. FRASER. We have it from the department, and I am bound to take that rather than the only complaint brought against him, which is that he is a Liberal and that his father was running an election. The minister says that in his own department there is no complaint.

Mr. CLANCY. Will he say that he is a good inspector ?

Mr. FRASER. He says that he has given satisfaction, and what more does the hon. gentleman want ?

Mr. CLANCY. The minister says he does not inspect at all.

Mr. FRASER. This seems to be simply an attack on this young man because he happens to be born of respectable parents and because his qualifications have been enhanced by an excellent education. Surely in this practical age we look at results.

Mr. HENDERSON. From one end of the Dominion to the other we have been told that this government has placed in the portfolio of Agriculture a practical farmer. If there is one thing which the Prime Minister takes credit for more than another throughout Ontario, it is that he has put a practical farmer over the Agriculture Department. But what is this practical farmer doing ? In the fruit trade, the export of which ranges from $2,000,000 to $3,000,000 per year, we have an inspector of inspectors, who, the minister tells us, never inspects the apples, but is paid a salary of $1,200 a year to see that the fruit is properly packed. The whole thing is a farce. This man cannot possibly have the requisite knowledge because he has never had any experience in the trade, and the sooner some change is made that will give confidence to the people, the better. What confidence will the people have in the inspection law, when its administration is in the hands of one who cannot possibly have the knowledge or experience required ? I say they will have no confidence whatever, and the people, in that way, will not respect the law.

Mr. WADE. I would like to ask the last hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) if it is true that this young man's father spoke against the hon. gentleman in a recent election ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not think that makes any difference. However, the fact is I heard him try to do so, but he was an absolute failure.

Mr. WADE. It does not seem that the hon. gentleman opposite wishes to answer my question. It appears now that there is a good case against this young man and, of course, the item should be now withdrawn. We have now reached the origin of the trouble. It is not because this man's father was a school inspector, or because he owned an orchard, or because he had a library, but because he spoke against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson). Surely the Minister of Agriculture would never ask this House to sanction the appointment of the son of a man who had done anything of that sort. As it is very near six o'clock, I trust the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) will enable me to go to my dinner in peace by answering the question I put to him.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) will tell me what his question is I shall be happy to answer him.

Mr. WADE. The hon. gentleman said that probably the reason why the Annapolis valley fruit-growers were so well pleased with this young man was that he did not insist on inspection. Does he mean to insinuate that the fruit-growers of the Annapolis valley are so anxious to pack dishonest fruit that they seek to evade the operation of the Act ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to put on his head a cap that does not fit him. I did not say what he imputes, at all events. I asked whether the fact that the people who were shipping this fruit that should be inspected were so willing to class this man as a good inspector —and I had in my mind that the minister himself had said that he was not inspecting, but was supervising inspectors, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Halton —had anything to do with the fact that he was satisfactory to my hon. friend (Mr. Wade). That is what I said. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman is satisfied ?

Mr. WADE. I am perfectly satisfied.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

KNAPP TUBULAR STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Knapp Tubular Steamship Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

On section 10,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). How does this clause as amended by the committee read ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I may say that, in the committee it was thought that, in case of private property, there was no reason why the company should be obliged to make reference to the Governor in Council ; and, if they attempt to make wharfs on a navigable river, the Public Works Act would apply.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

CROWN BANK OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Crown Bank of Canada.—Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the Bank Act provide for all the requirements of this corporation and for the organization of this bank ?

Mr. WADE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Yes, the Bank Act has attached to it a model Bill of which this is substantially a copy, so that all we have to do is to pass these clauses and then all the provisions of the Bank Act apply to all banks alike.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 53) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway.—Mr. Davis.

On section 1,

Mr. McCREARY. Before this Bill passes I want to put myself on record as objecting to this kind of a charter. It was stated a few days ago that this charter only covered about 2,500 miles of road. As a matter of fact, if the charter is looked into closely, it will be found that it covers fully double that amount of railway. This road runs all across the continent and twice across the continent from Winnipeg west with branch lines which will make the mileage upwards of 5,000 miles, a much greater mileage than was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1881. Now, there are no conditions attached to this Bill, as to the amount of road which shall be built each year, or as to the kind of rolling stock that shall be supplied. It is absolutely a blanket charter, or a roving charter, as was said by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) without any conditions whatever. If it is going to be the policy of this government to grant such charters and in future to continue granting them, then, let it be understood that such is their policy, but I submit, that at the present time there is no precedent for the granting of any such charter. There are some of those lines that might appear all right to eastern men who do not understand the situation, but to western men who do understand the situation, the local conditions and the geography of that country, they are simply lines running from any one point to any other point without any definition whatever. You might as well say that this company shall have power to construct a line from any one point in Canada to any other point in Canada. That is practically what the charter means. As the Bill originally appeared it authorized the company to construct a line from a point east of Edmonton to the Red Deer river. It now describes that line as running to a point between Beaver lake and Sullivan lake. When I tell hon. gentlemen that there are probably fifty Beaver lakes and fifty Sullivan lakes in the North-west Territories they will readily understand that the thing is quite indefinite. There are certain names attached to lakes such as Devil's lake which are very common in the Territories. There is nothing to show where that branch line

runs and I want this committee to understand that I object to any such charter. Then, again, in regard to the clause providing for the capitalization of this company, I trust this committee will bear in mind that last year there was ratified here an agreement by which the province of Manitoba has guaranteed the interest on $20,000 a mile on all of the line from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, and on all of the lines in Manitoba. They stated the other day they had 1,300 miles in all. I understand that this Bill—I have not been able to go into it, and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) is not here—increases that liability and that the province of Manitoba will be in rather a peculiar position, that that province will not only have to guarantee interest on $20,000 a mile but that the railway will have to earn much more than that before the province of Manitoba will be safe as guarantor. I would be glad if the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), or the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, would take this matter into consideration and explain the position that the province of Manitoba will be in if this charter passes in the condition in which it is brought before the committee. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) is here and as he is probably more conversant with the railway deal in Manitoba than I am, I would like to hear his views upon that point. I think, also, in all fairness, that subsection (e), which authorizes the company to build a branch line from some place east of Edmonton in Alberta or Saskatchewan to the Red Deer river, should be struck out. 'To some place east in Alberta or Saskatchewan.' Now, in my humble opinion that covers 300 or 400 miles. Some place east of Edmonton in Saskatchewan or Alberta would give a starting point 400 miles—to where? In the first place it was to the Red Deer river, and as I showed the other day in committee, that was within 600 miles of the terminus. They can do that, and it is so indefinite that they can start pretty nearly at any place and end pretty nearly at any place. There is nothing to that branch line, it should be cut out. Then, again, when do you suppose that branch line could be operated? In the first place they would have to build their line from a point near the Swan river, away north to Edmonton, and an immigrant would have to go about 300 miles out of his way to get to the point that he could get on this branch line; the same as if I was going to Winnipeg and went to Montreal first and then took some other route to get to Winnipeg. I submit that branch line is perfectly ridiculous. The gentleman who explained this the other day, Mr. Nash, said they were going down to the Red Deer river for coal. Well, anybody who knows anything about the Red Deer river knows there is little or no coal on that river. Coal is up on the Battle river, or on the Saskatchewan; on the Red Deer river there is no coal. Any one can see that it is a branch line put there purely for the purpose of obstructing some other line that may run up. Now if there is one line in the North-west Territories that is required, it is a line paralleling the Calgary and Edmonton line. From Calgary to Edmonton there is about 192 miles. There have been 40,000 to 50,000 settlers located within the last four years in that district, and the consequence is that the territory on each side is taken up, both the homestead and railway land, until parties now have to drive about 60 to 70 miles to get homesteads. They are getting discouraged, they wont go. Now the experience in the United States has been that whenever there has been a wave of immigration going into a certain territory, that territory has become popular, it has become well known. Then if you stop the immigration at a certain point, it practically stops immigration to the entire North-west. The reason why people go to Alberta instead of Assiniboia and Manitoba is this: The idea is prevalent in the United States among a great many people that the climate of Northern Alberta, being near the foot hills of the mountains, is much more mild than it is in Manitoba. If a man arrives at Winnipeg and you ask him where he is going to settle, he will tell you, I want to go out into Alberta, because the foot hills of the Rocky mountains will protect us and the Chinook winds moderate the climate. That is the popular opinion that prevails both among Britishers and the people of the United States; and if you stop immigrants going to that point you may stop immigration altogether.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman is enjoying himself, but I am trying to talk a little common sense here to-night, and trying to give members a little information. I submit that in a charter like that especially, that branch line should be cut out, and the capitalization of the company should be seriously looked into before it is allowed to pass this House.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is a good deal in some of the contentions of the hon. member. He made one statement that they had any time they liked to commence and finish this road, if I understood him correctly. In reality they have not, because it says:

> The respective lines hereby authorized shall be commenced and completed within the respective delays below mentioned, otherwise the powers should remain null and void.

Mr. McCREARY. What I said was that there was no time in which they should build any certain portion of the road, no certain number of miles they should build each year.

Mr. SPROULE. These lines mentioned in subsection A, that will be between Port

Arthur and Fort Francis and Quebec, shall be commenced within five years and built within ten years, the lines mentioned in subsections B, C and D shall be commenced within two years and completed within five years; the lines mentioned in subsections E and F shall be commenced within three years and completed within six years. That seems to me definite enough.

Mr. McCREARY. It does not limit them to build any portion in any one year.

Mr. SPROULE. The lines on each of these sections shall be commenced and finished within a limited time, which is moderately short. Now with reference to the objection which the hon. member has taken to that branch leading down to the Red Deer district, it seems to me, after looking at the map, as we did when we were discussing it, that it came so near to the Canadian Pacific Railway that in all probability that short length will be finished, and there will be the most direct route for immigrants into that country.

Mr. McCREARY. Why don't they go down to the line ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have no doubt, when they are building that line, if they find, as they will find, that it will be a matter of importance and convenience to the people to have it, they will get powers to go on and connect the two. If the one line is built so close to the other, as it seems to be, provided the map gives a correct idea, there will be a connection made in a short time, a much shorter time than it would take to incorporate a company to build another line.

Mr. McCREARY. It is only a very short branch line; why don't they apply for the whole thing ?

Mr. SPROULE. I rose at the time in committee to say that it would be the part of wisdom to extend that down to the other, but the hurry and bustle were so great that I could not be heard. Now with regard to the power which enables them to bond the road, including the incumbrances that are on it, of $20,000 a mile; at first sight it seems to be unreasonable. But we give power to nearly all these roads through that country, especially where they have to go through a country like that between Port Arthur and Quebec, to bond $20,000 and even $30,000 a mile.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman is an old parliamentarian, and I am not. Will he tell me if this $20,000 a mile will be an addition to the powers granted them last session under the Manitoba railway deal ?

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the powers which they will have under this Bill will only give them the right to bond, including the incumbrance already on it, to the extent of $20,000 a mile. I may be wrong, but that is my interpretation of it. As to the powers which they have between Port Arthur and Quebec to build roads to Ottawa and Montreal, there is no starting point given, but there is a finishing point, namely, Montreal in the one case and Ottawa in the other. I objected to that, because I thought it was scarcely definite enough, but as it related to the indefinite future when they might require to build those lines, it would not be a serious objection. Beyond that the Bill seems to be much the same, containing much the same powers, as many other Bills we have passed. I admit it is a very long line, and the charter was somewhat of a blanket character. But after all, it contains very much the same rights and powers as we have given to many other companies.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) made a reference to me. I think I ought to say that I have not had this Bill under consideration at all. It is true I am a member of the Railway Committee, but I was otherwise engaged, so I am not in a position to say anything. I regret that the Minister of Railways and Canals is not here, but on the point raised by my hon. friend I would not care to offer an opinion.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the strong statements made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) respecting the character of this charter, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Railways and Canals is absent, would it not be well to postpone the further consideration of this Bill until the next opportunity of taking up private Bills ? I am a member of the Railway Committee, but unfortunately I was not there when the Bill was being considered, and I have no idea as to the location or the distances which are covered by this charter. A strong point has been made by the hon. member for Selkirk as to the possible liability that may be imposed upon the province of Manitoba. In view of these statements, unless the government have made up their minds that the Bill is proper, I think it should not be proceeded with at this sitting. We should have an opportunity of ascertaining from the Minister of Railways and Canals whether he has examined all these allegations that have been made by the member for Selkirk.

Mr. McCREARY. The question of bonding the road was never touched upon in the Railway Committee.

Mr. CLARKE. That is an important point. Perhaps some other members of the cabinet who are present will give us further light. I was rather surprised at the statements made by the member for Selkirk.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the government had any objection to the Bill, of course it would have been stated by the Minister of Railways. There

was a large attendance at the committee and every clause was thoroughly discussed and the Bill was almost unanimously adopted without a vote. I do not think it is worth while wasting time discussing the matter that has been raised here. I agree with the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the clauses are usual. The people there want railway facilities and the limit in the Bill is two years to commence and five years to complete. If the road is completed within five years I am sure the country will be delighted. As to the clauses affecting the bonding powers and stock, they were well considered and the committee agreed with the views expressed by the Minister of Railways and left it to him to have the Bill amended along the line he indicated. The minister has gone further than any member of the committee thought of at the time, because he has—and I believe the committee has agreed to it—amended the clause so as not to increase the capital stock of the company beyond the powers they now possess. That has been restricted to a greater extent than any member of the committee present thought it would be.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it usual to give a charter covering such a large area—a charter that will enable them to start almost any place and go almost any place ?

Mr. COCHRANE. That question was raised, and as the Minister of Railways stated the line goes through a wild and unknown part of the country and he did not think the power was unreasonable.

Mr. GILMOUR. As I understand the situation of that country, I agree with what the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has said. I can not see why the Canada Northern Railway should seek for a line from a point near Victoria down south, and land at the Red Deer and stop there. It is going in the wrong direction. They will have to haul back and go away up to Victoria and east again. I could understand it quite well, if they would come down to Medicine Hat and have running powers along the Canadian Pacific Railway, but it would seem to me very peculiar if we granted them this part of the charter because it would stop a line being built there at some future time. I could understand the Canadian Pacific Railway if they were to run a line, and I think they ought, from Medicine Hat north between Alberta and Saskatchewan, but I do not understand what the Northern Company want with this line coming there and stopping there. I do not agree with the member for Selkirk with regard to having no coal at Red Deer. There is coal at the Red Deer but there is no necessity for the Northern Railway coming there for coal, because they can get lots of it along the Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPROULE. This charter says that they shall have power to bond :

> Provided the number of bonds, debentures or other securities issued by the company and at any time outstanding, including those heretofore issued, shall not at any time exceed $20,000 per mile.

I think that includes all the bonds that they could possibly issue over any portion of the road.

Mr. GILMOUR. I should have added to what I said, that no part of that country up there needs a road more than this. As the hon. member for Selkirk has said, the settlers have gone in ahead of the railway and they are too far away now. It is high time a railway went there, but it should run from Medicine Hat and along between Alberta and Saaskatchewan.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Gilmour) is well acquainted with the situation up there, and one would need to be well acquainted with it before he understood this particular branch line. As a matter of fact there is a charter before this House running from Medicine Hat north and west to the Red Deer, along ridge 16 west of the fourth meridian to the Saskatchewan river. That charter goes through a territory that is now being settled by immigrants. It will connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway and also with the branch line running from Lethbridge to Medicine Hat. People who come from the United States via Coutts will be able to come up and go into the northern limit by this new line parallel to the Calgary and Edmonton. It is a strange thing that the Mackenzie and Mann Company never thought of applying for this charter until the other charter had been advertised for some time.

Then it dawned upon them that they would like to have a kind of branch line starting from no place and going to no place, to take the place of the line for which there is a charter before the House. A more ridiculous piece of legislation is not on the statute-book, to any man conversant with the situation, and before I sit down, I am going to move that that branch line be struck out. With regard to the bonding privilege, I am not sufficient of a lawyer or a parliamentarian to know exactly what that means—whether the $20,000 a mile is in such a shape that this company cannot recede from the bargain made with the province of Manitoba. While the bargain made by the province of Manitoba is not exactly endorsed by me, I admit that it is turning out to be a much better bargain than I anticipated. But we do not want to jeopardize that province by placing on it a burden which it never expected to bear. If this provision is going to increase the liability of the province of Manitoba one cent, hon. members should not allow it to pass; because while it is giving us relief from a monopoly, it is an expensive bargain, which will require a great deal of careful handling in the next ten years to

help us out. If we continue to have such crops as we had last year, I believe the bargain will come out all right; but this Dominion government must not place any further burdens on the province of Manitoba, or it will bring that province to a state of very serious indebtedness in the near future. I would ask the Minister of Finance to allow the Bill to stand until the Minister of Railways is here, because he was thoroughly in touch with the Bill that came before the House last session. The Minister of Finance was only at the Railway Committee a very little time, but the Minister of Railways knows exactly what this clause means, and I would ask him to be on hand to explain it. In the meantime I would ask that clause 'E' be struck out of the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would rather hear from members of the committee who are more familiar with the Bill than I am. I understood that this Bill was reported with the concurrence of the Minister of Railways, and I would not like to take the responsibility of making any motion against the judgment of the committee.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not let it stand until the Minister of Railways is here ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to hear what the promoters say, and also the members who were present at the committee and supported the Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I admire the solicitude of some hon. members in regard to the branch line provided for in subsection 'E.' As it is a branch line that entirely concerns the constituency I represent, I might possibly venture to state my views in regard to it. In the committee I objected to the section as it appeared in the Bill, and it was amended with the consent of the company, and with the approval of the committee, so that for my part I was willing to withdraw my objections to it. That being the case, and the matter having been discussed there and settled, as I understood, whether I am particularly friendly to the Bill or not, I feel bound to uphold that settlement now that the Bill comes before the House. I think that is only fair to myself and all the parties concerned. As to the merits of this proposed branch line, my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) objects to it because it does not touch the Canadian Pacific Railway. That used to be a radical objection to any railroad in the North-west.

Mr. GILMOUR. My objection is not that it does not touch the Canadian Pacific Railway, but that there is no way out to the east, without going back north 120 miles.

Mr. OLIVER. Once the Canadian Northern is constructed, back north will not mean anything more than back south. It all depends on where you are coming from and where you are going to. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) insists on coming up to the Saskatchewan river from Montana; but he is not bound to come that way. Everybody coming to the Saskatchewan is not coming from Montana; in fact, a very small proportion are coming from Montana. As a matter of fact, the people are coming from that portion of the United States which lies south and south-easterly from the city of Winnipeg, and it is shorter for them to come to the Saskatchewan district by way of the Canadian Northern than by the Canadian Pacific Railway. So that while I do not wish to argue for the Canadian Northern Railway Company nor for this branch line in particular, I do wish to point out that the objections which are urged against the branch line are not valid objections, and did not prevail with the Railway Committee, and that an arrangement having been agreed to in the committee, it is hardly fair to raise a contention in the House against the arrangement. The country which is to be served by this branch line is already very largely settled. There is a necessity for the construction of such a road as this; and when the Canadian Northern Railway Company propose to take the responsibility of serving a certain piece of country with a certain branch line, I do not feel warranted in taking the responsibility of opposing them. As to what some other company has offered to do, I am prepared for my part to support the proposition of the other company too. I would not feel justified in rejecting their proposition, but neither do I consider that they are justified in asking the House to reject the Canadian Northern proposition.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) apparently takes the same stand as did the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis) a few days ago—that because this particular branch line happens to be in Alberta, no other member has a right to discuss it. Now, I find that great portions of this and other lines are in the province of Manitoba, and therefore I claim the right to discuss all questions relating to them. The hon. gentleman seems to rest a large part of his argument on the point that a large number of the people who are going in to the country do not come from Montana or the neighbouring states; but I find by the immigration returns that nearly 97 per cent of the 3,700 people who came from the United States in the month of March struck the Canadian Pacific Railway main line at Moosejaw, or Medicine Hat. They came in either via Coutts or via North Portal. If they came via Coutts, they struck the main line at Medicine Hat and would go by the Canadian Pacific Railway to where this new line is projected. If they came in on the Soo line via North Portal, how would they reach this line ? They would strike the main line at Moosejaw, and would have to go back 350 miles to Portage la Prairie and then

north-west 350 miles. In other words, they would have to travel 700 miles out of their way to reach this northern point on the Saskatchewan river, and then go south. The Canadian Northern line starts at Portage la Prairie and goes north and west, and there is no other way for a man coming in by North Portal to reach that line. I ask the hon. gentleman if that is not so ?

Mr. OLIVER. I will admit that a large proportion of the settlers come in by North Portal and they do reach the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Moosejaw, but I do not admit that, if the Canadian Northern Railway were constructed they would come by way of North Portal. It would be as short to come by the way of Winnipeg and take the Canadian Northern to the Saskatchewan valley. These men take the present route because there is no other, not because it is the shortest that there will be. And it is absolutely unfair to say that because they take a roundabout route now they would therefore take that route after a shorter one is provided. The bulk of these people, as the hon. member (Mr. McCreary) knows, come in from Minnesota, Dakota and Iowa, with a few from Nebraska and Kansas. They are not going out of their way by coming in by Winnipeg and they could go west to the Saskatchewan by the direct line.

Mr. McCREARY. Where would that be to ?

Mr. OLIVER. Northern Alberta, that is where most of them are going.

Mr. McCREARY. And how will they get to it, except by coming in by Winnipeg and going by the Canadian Northern ?

Mr. OLIVER. That's what I say. They will not need to come in by way of North Portal, but by way of Winnipeg.

Mr. McCREARY. Well, take the hon. gentleman on his own ground—they would come in by way of Winnipeg. They can come in by that way now if they wish. But do they ? No, they take the Soo Line which is chiefly owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway encourage settlers to go in that way by giving a $9.60 rate from the boundary line to Edmonton, against a rate of $15 when they came in by way of Winnipeg. Moreover, they make no change of cars at the boundary line but the same cars run through from St. Paul and Minneapolis, so that settlers are not obliged to change cars or unload. The cars are owned by the same company. But if the settlers came in in a Great Northern car, when they got to the boundary line they would have to unload their settler's effects or pay something like one cent a hundred miles, which is the running rate to go to Edmonton. So, no matter how many Canadian Northern roads we have the settlers from St. Paul or Minneapolis—that means also all western and southern points like Kansas city, Oklahoma, and so on, will take the Soo Line. As I say, the Canadian Pacific Railway favour that route. I have tried hard, and the Manitoba government has tried hard to get immigrants to come in by way of Winnipeg, so that they could get them into Manitoba and up on the Manitoba and Northwestern route, but they have not succeeded in doing so, because they have more favourable rates on a better train service by the other way. There is no change of cars or waiting over as at Winnipeg. A man and his family coming into Winnipeg at two o'clock cannot get a train going west until the next day. What does that mean ? A man may have a family of seven or eight children and he will have to take them up town, and it will cost him $10 or $15 for a hotel bill for his family. But, on the Soo Line he will start from St. Paul and get to his destination without change of cars.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has that to do with this question ?

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) tried to show that if this branch line were constructed immigrants going into Alberta would take that line, would go up the Canadian Northern to Edmonton and then strike south. As the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) says it would be like going around two sides of a triangle.

Mr. COCHRANE. Would it hurt that section of the country if the branch line were built ?

Mr. McCREARY. This branch line will never be built—no fear of that. But what I say is that the branch line, a charter for which is being applied for from Medicine Hat on the Canadian Pacific Railway, will be the only proper line for immigrants to go in on.

Mr. OLIVER. If it is a question between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern as to who shall occupy this country, I am perfectly satisfied for my part that the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be given a charter and a chance to occupy it. That country has been there a good while and the Canadian Pacific Railway has been there a good while too, and the Canadian Pacific Railway has done nothing to occupy the country yet. Now comes another company and wants to occupy it. They are a going concern. I do not know whether they mean business or not, but I ask the House if it is prepared to take the responsibility of refusing to allow a company to give the accommodation that is required and that everybody admits is required.

As to the people wanting to go to Moosejaw by way of North Portal, of course, if they wish to that is the way they will go. They are going to Northern Alberta.

Mr. McCREARY. And how are you going to get there ?

Mr. OLIVER. They go to Moosejaw now because they cannot get in the other way. Every hon. gentleman understands that, I am sure, except the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) himself.

Mr. McCREARY. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman that I do understand that people can go in by two ways, either via Winnipeg or via North Portal and the hon. gentleman is foolish to try to impose upon the House. Either he is deliberately trying to impose on hon. members or it is a case of absolute ignorance on his part—one or other. If I want to go to a point on the main line, I can go better via Moosejaw than via Winnipeg. As to any question between the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway, it makes no difference to me. But I say the only way to get in east of the Calgary and Edmonton road will be by the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and thence by the branch line, and not by a main line that is not likely to be built for three years and thence by a branch line going south. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) that, even though I do not live in Edmonton I know the situation there so far as immigration is concerned, probably as well as he does. I had a great deal more to do with the settling of that country than he had. I have visited the immigrants there over and over again, and have had the question of immigration before me every day for three years and a half. That is why I asked the government two or three years ago—and my letters are on file in the Department of the Interior—to urge the Canadian Pacific Railway to construct this line for immigrants. I did it as a civil servant then in what I believed to be the best interest of the public, and I do the same as a member of parliament to-day. I say this is the only practical way to build the line.

Mr. OLIVER. I would leave it to the judgment of the committee whether the hon. gentleman or I know more about the subject in hand.

Mr. GILMOUR. As to any question between the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway, I have no preference. But any one looking at the map will see that it is a desirable thing not to give the charter. If it should hang fire, it might prevent the other road building from Medicine Hat. Not only should there be the road coming up from Medicine Hat, but there should be a cross road. That should have been built long ago and, had the Canadian Pacific Railway owned the Calgary and Edmonton road, I believe it would have been built before this.

Mr. SPROULE. The argument of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) falls to the ground in view of the fact that there is a charter to build to Medicine Hat now.

Mr. McCREARY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that that was stated clearly in the committee.

Mr. McCREARY. It is advertised and applied for and will come up in two or three days.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, can we not put it through this House ? Certainly we can. And then let whichever company will build the road. We have pursued that policy in different parts of the country before now. It seems to me there is no reason why we should refuse the one that is before us for the purpose of giving it to another. Let us give it to both.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would not object to the passage of this Bill simply because the company is asking for these branch lines. I am willing to give it this charter and to support the other charter as well. It will simply be a case of the survival of the fittest. But if there be anything in the contention of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that this will increase the liability of the province of Manitoba—although I do not place that interpretation upon this Bill—I would join with my hon. friend from Selkirk in asking a postponement for further consideration, especially as no member of the government seems to be present to give us a legal opinion. I believe that the liability entailed upon the province of Manitoba was for the special lines mentioned in the Act we passed last session, and has nothing to do with any of the lines asked for in this Bill; but to avoid all doubt, we should have a legal opinion from the Minister of Justice on that point. With regard to the discrimination referred to by the hon. member for Selkirk, I had some correspondence with the immigration agent in the province of Manitoba in the United States, and he drew my attention to the fact that discriminatory rates are charged in favour of the 'Soo' line. However, that has nothing particular to do with this discussion, and I would favour the postponement of this Bill for further consideration unless some member of the government is prepared to give us an opinion that the province of Manitoba will not have any more liability entailed upon it by the passage of this Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not wish to speak, as a member of the government or as a lawyer, but as having some experience in the Railway Committee, and, speaking for myself, I cannot see that there is anything in this Bill which can increase the liability of the province of Manitoba. It does not require a lawyer to know that

there is not a word in this Bill which can have that effect. All the lawyers in the committee and in the House are satisfied on that point, and unless some one can point out in a reasonable way that there is any such danger, I can see no cause for delay.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would suggest that the Bill lay over and be reprinted. There are a number of amendments which were made in the committee, and the committee agreed to let the Minister of Railways and its chairman re-draft the clause respecting the capitalization and the bonding power. The whole Bill should be reprinted, and the House make sure that the liability of the province of Manitoba is not to be increased.

On section 2,

Mr. McCREARY. I seriously object to the last part of this section. That provides that the lines mentioned in subsections E and F shall be commenced within three years and completed within six years of the passing of this Act. If branch line E is going to be a line by which immigrants are to be brought into northern Alberta, it will be absolutely useless, for long before the six years have expired immigration to that district will have stopped for the reason that there is too long a haul. If that is to be an operative clause, it should be two years and three years instead of three and six.

Section agreed to.

Section 3 expunged and the following substituted :

The directors may make regulations respecting the form of stock certificates and the transfer of stock in the capital of the company.

Section agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. McCREARY. Here is a clause that apparently affects the province of Manitoba. It provides that the total amount of bonds, debentures or other securities by the company and at any time outstanding, including those heretofore issued, shall not at any time exceed $25,000 per mile of the company's lines of railway, constructed or under contract to be constructed. There are 1,300 miles of their road in Manitoba and between Manitoba and Port Arthur, which, by the railway contract made between Manitoba and this company, should not be mortgaged more than $20,000 per mile, as I remember the contract. Notwithstanding the opinion of my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland), I would ask the Minister of Railways, on his responsibility as a minister, to state that this does not affect the province of Manitoba. If necessary he should correspond with the Manitoba government, which has guaranteed the bonds to the extent of $18,000,000 in order to find out from the Attorney General of that province whether this in any way conflicts with that bargain or imposes any further increase of liability upon that province.

As a matter of fact it is now past 9 o'clock and the hour for private Bills has expired, and surely the Minister of Finance will grant us this small privilege of having the Minister of Railways pronounce himself on this subject and if necessary correspond with the premier of Manitoba and the Attorney General of that province in order to remove any doubt.

Mr. COCHRANE. The Minister of Justice is in the House.

Mr. McCREARY. He is not conversant with the Bill, and was not in the Railway Committee, but the Minister of Railways was in daily session in the committee last year when the Canadian Northern Bill went through, and is thoroughly conversant with the facts. At the meeting the other day of the committee, when this Bill was passed, this particular feature of it never dawned on me, but it came to my mind afterwards. If the Minister of Railways were here and gave his opinion, on his responsibility as a minister, that this Bill in no way affected the liability of the Manitoba government, I would have nothing more to say. But I think we ought to have that opinion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was not before the committee, and am bound to believe that these matters were all considered in that committee. If anything new has arisen there will be opportunity to look into it before this Bill reaches its final stage, but I do not feel at liberty to interfere at all.

Mr. McCREARY. Then I call the attention of Mr. Speaker to the fact that the hour for private Bills has expired.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems only reasonable that we should have the opinion of the law officer of the Crown.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I shall mention the matter to the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills has expired.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Commissioner's branch, for agriculture and dairying, &c., $210,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister give us the names of all the inspectors, where they are located, and where they come from, who are now engaged under the Act ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. W. A. McKinnon; Alexander McNeill, who I think comes from the county of Essex; E. Lick, who comes from the neighbourhood of Cobourg or Oshawa; G. Vroom,

from the county of Annapolis; R. Burke, from Prince Edward Island; H. L. Dery, from Rouville, I think; J. F. Scriver, county of Huntingdon; T. I. Carey, also from Cobourg, I think; E. N. Wartman, from Kingston, I think; J. J. Philp, of Winnipeg; Barton Gandy, New Brunswick; Freeman Fitch, from Middleton, N.S. The last seven are temporary appointments; the first five I mentioned are for a year.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman explain why he has changed his policy laid down last year, when he said he intended to appoint only temporary inspectors ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware that I have changed my policy. I said the inspectors would not be engaged necessarily for the whole year. But accepting what the hon. gentleman says, I found that the season for inspection lasted rather longer than I expected; and in the second place, I found that this work in connection with the fruit trade was very beneficial, and I desired to carry it on with some of those inspectors all the year round.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister spent considerable time this afternoon in giving us in detail the purposes for which this vote was to be expended, and he referred to the fruit inspection. Now, it appears he has formed a new department with Mr. McKinnon at the head of it, who has under him four or five permanent officials and seven temporaries. The seven that are temporary are not employed by the year, the other three or four are employed permanently. Any person who is conversant with the fruit business knows that their time will not be fully taken up; but he proposes to send them around as active agents ostensibly to talk fruit business generally over the country, and perhaps they will talk something else in the interest of the ministers. Now we have an Agriculture Committee which meets twice or three times a week; that committee has had before it Professor Robertson and the head of the Immigration Department, and two or three other heads of departments. Now. I suggest to the minister that at the next meeting of the Agriculture Committee he should have Mr. McKinnon, the chief officer of this inspection department, there, and then the committee will catechise him and ascertain his qualifications, and the qualifications of these gentlemen who are under him, and the amount of work that has been done during the last year while this department has been in full swing. I think it is due to the country, and to the fruitgrowers, that the head of this department, Mr. McKinnon, should come before the committee.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I shall be glad to afford every facility for Mr. McKinnon coming before the Agriculture Committee. Of course that will have to be done by the committee, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that Mr. McKinnon will be at the disposal of the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell us if there have been any complaints against the enforcement of this Act by the fruitgrowers or shippers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware that there have been any complaints against the enforcement of the Act. There have been occasional differences of opinion in regard to the manner of its enforcement, and the legal aspect of it. But there have been no complaints, so far as I am aware, that it has been too strictly or too laxly enforced. There have been one or two little points raised as to the meaning of the Act. I think one request was made for a better definition of the word 'packer' under the Act, and a question arose as to whether more than one person could be called a packer. There seemed to be a doubt as to whether an individual workman who put the fruit into the barrel could be called a packer as well as the person on whose behalf he had done it.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the cost of the inspection, including salaries, travelling expenses and all other expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Altogether the sum we have devoted to the enforcement of this Act has been somewhat over $14,000.

Mr. McGOWAN. Would the minister tell us if there have been any shipments of fresh meat in cold storage, and what was the result ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, there was a series of shipments of beef made from Toronto to England in cold storage. The carriage of meat, as a general rule, was quite satisfactory. I believe there was one shipment in regard to which there was some rather adverse criticism as to the way in which the meat had arrived, but I understand from those engaged in the trade that the profits had been unsatisfactory and that after the trial they ceased shipping.

Mr. McGOWAN. Was the transportation quite satisfactory ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I may say the transportation was quite satisfactory. There was one shipment in which the beef was heated before it was put into the steamer and consequently it did not keep perfectly in going across. It was clearly shown that it was in consequence of the condition it was in when it was put on board the steamer and that it was not brought into that condition while on the steamer.

Mr. McGOWAN. I suppose it got into that condition on the way to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. McGOWAN. Then, your cars were at fault.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cars were not the cars that we have dealt with on the railways. That beef was shipped in special cars by the people who shipped it.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems to be rather extraordinary that proper care should not have been taken at the outset to see that that meat was received in prime condition, because the hon. gentleman knows that these experiments are perfectly useless if we are to be told that the goods went all right so far as cold storage was concerned, but that the excuse in the end is, when they are found to be damaged, that they were not received in prime condition. It is rather discouraging and casts doubt and suspicion upon the value of cold storage as it is yet worked out. I think the hon. gentleman will agree with me that cold storage is in its experimental stage to a very considerable extent. It has not been put beyond all question so far, although, I may say there is a disposition, and a very strong one to, if possible, make cold storage a great success. The hon. gentleman has been forced, perhaps, to have it somewhat experimental all through. It seems to me that the greatest care should be taken that when perishable goods are sent as an experiment the first condition should be that they are properly received. I know nothing that will cast more discredit on the whole thing than saying that it was all right in cold storage, but that is came there in bad condition. It is the business of the department to guard against offering any such excuse as that to the public.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the first place I want to say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that these shipments were not experiments of the department, that they were entirely managed by private parties who sent them without any control or supervision on the part of the department. In the second place, I understand that this shipment of meat was made in a way in which I would not, myself, allow any shipment to be made. The meat was not hung in the compartments, but packed on its side like cordwood. I believe that under certain circumstances and conditions, if the meat is perfectly cool when it is put in and kept cool, that can be done, but in this particular instance in which this one shipment failed, the meat was known not to be perfectly cool when it was put in the cold storage chamber of the ship. That is the report of our officers and it is the acknowledged report of the shippers. The failure in carrying it across was due to that. The other shipments which were hung in the cold storage chambers, arrived in perfect condition.

Mr. McGOWAN. There seems to be something wrong with this system of storing meat in cold storage when it goes bad in the way it does. I know that there are thousands of cargoes shipped from Chicago almost every day, and it does seem to me that it is a very important matter, if we are going to establish a trade in Canadian meat shipped in cold storage, that we should be careful to see that we adopt a proper system. These shipments are going every day from Chicago to Liverpool and London, and they have been for years. The Armour and Swift companies are sending meat over constantly.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That meat is always hung as far as I know, and the meat that was hung and not laid on its side went through in a perfectly satisfactory condition.

Mr. McGOWAN. Does your officer not exercise any supervision over the placing of goods in the cold storage chambers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not over these shipments.

Mr. McGOWAN. It is unfortunate that nothing has been done to perfect the system.

Mr. SPROULE. It must be a strong argument against the value of our cold storage system, that, whereas they are shipping meat from Australia, a distance of 7,000 miles, which arrives in perfect condition, we cannot ship it 2,000 miles and deliver it in good condition. The fact is that the department have exercised no control over it. If they had any control such as they ought to have, they should exercise it so as to prove that the system is not only feasible but useful, because, if, as has happened, a shipment is laid down in England in an imperfect condition others will not repeat the experiment. In this case they abandoned it after they had made a trial because it was a failure. It seems to me that there is something radically wrong with the cold storage system that is provided. The hon. minister spoke about three kinds of cold storage, mechanical cold storage and cold storage by refrigeration—I persume, by ice, would it not be ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, there is no cold storage with ice on steamers that I know of. There is none now.

Mr. SPROULE. You had that system at first.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I never had it.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought there was cold storage with ice ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, before I made the change.

Mr. SPROULE. Then we have mechanical cold storage for the passage of cool air in the chambers. How many vessels were fitted out last year with mechanical cold storage, and would the hon. minister give us the freight rate that is charged on such vessels as compared with the freight rate on ordinary vessels ? Because I am told that many shippers choose to take the ordinary vessel rather than the vessel provided with cold storage, finding that it does not pay them to pay the additional expense incurred by shipment in cold storage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For what kind of goods ?

Mr. SPROULE. Cheese and butter. Cheese was one of the articles in regard to which I heard the statement and that therefore they chose to send it in an ordinary vessel without cold storage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Cheese has hardly ever been sent in what we call the cold storage chamber of these vessels. The cheese men, as a general rule, have not considered it necessary to send cheese in cold storage.

Mr. CLANCY. That was tried for a time, was it not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICLUTURE. A few shipments were tried but very little was sent. I do not think any butter is now being sent from Canada except in cold storage chambers. I am not aware of any single shipment being made and if there has been at rare intervals a single shipment it must be very slight. There were about 420,000 packages of butter carried in cold storage last season and one solitary shipment not in cold storage.

Mr. SPROULE. No cheese at all ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No cheese has been carried in the cold storage insulated chambers. The ventilated chambers with cold storage draught for the forcing of cool air through the holds are intended for the purpose of carrying cheese and apples and these are the cold storage arrangements which I am trying to make. During last fall I got four steamers fitted up with this kind of cold storage and I expect to have ten other steamers fitted up for the present season. That is the new arrangement which we have been pressing upon the ship owners and the public for the last year. However, as to the ships that are fitted with the older cold storage, that is to say insulated chambers which you can cool down to the freezing point and below if you choose, we have none of these under contract, but we have a number which were under contract which are still in the trade. Prof. Robertson informs me that there were last year 77 sailings from Montreal of some 17 different steamers fitted up with cold storage accommodation.

Mr. SPROULE. What are relative freight rates on these vessels as compared with ordinary steamers ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Ten shillings a ton extra for cold storage accommodation, I believe, is generally charged. I also hear that sometimes fifteen shillings is charged. I suppose that when there is a great demand for accommodation fifteen shillings is charged, and that when there is less demand, ten shillings. But these vessels being no longer under contract, we have no control over the rates that they charge.

Mr. SPROULE. In what kind of cold storage was the trial shipment of tomatoes and grapes made some years ago ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were sent in the regular cold storage.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you sent any fruit by the new system ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not sent any of the delicate fruits. It is intended for apples.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to get some information which might be useful to the people of the country. I have on more than once been met on the platform by friends of the Minister of Agriculture who have stated that the cold storage system was so perfect that our butter and cheese and eggs and fruit were now laid down in perfect condition on the English market. I contradicted that, but the statement was repeated most positively. I am glad that the minister has been frank enough to admit that in most cases it has been a failure and that they are now experimenting.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, no.

Mr. SPROULE. He tells us that none of the steamers are fitted with the first system of cold storage he introduced.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not at all. As a matter of fact last year seventy-seven steamers sailing from Montreal were fitted with the very system of cold storage that was first introduced by my department. The contracts with these steamers have terminated, but the owners are continuing the cold storage system which under our contracts we required them to put in.

Mr. SPROULE. Has it been a success ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A perfect success.

Mr. SPROULE. And why are you trying something else ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is for a different purpose altogether. This is for cheese and apples which have not been carried in cold storage chambers. The cold storage chambers could not accommodate one-tenth of the barrels of apples that have been sent to England; and the shippers of apples would not pay the extra expenditure necessary for that kind of cold storage.

Mr. SPROULE. That is exactly what I said. The fruit men could not avail themselves of that cold storage because of the expense and therefore it cannot have been a perfect success. Have we had any trial shipment of fruits this season ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. Then in view of the high price of fruit in England, it would appear that we cannot send our fruit over there because there has not yet been devised any means of landing it in good condition. That is an evidence that the present cold storage is a failure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The fruit shipments that were made by the government some years ago were experiments, and the government having proved certain things the shippers of Canada have been taking advantage of our experience and they are now shipping fruit themselves. Last year pears were successfully shipped in considerable quantities and this year in small quantities, because there was a small crop here and the price was good at home. When we succeed in showing what can be done, we leave to the people in the trade to continue the shipments. I would point out to the hon. gentleman that butter requires a temperature under freezing, and chicken meat requires the same, whereas if apples and cheese were put in the freezing chambers they would be injured.

Mr. SPROULE. Why don't you provide something suitable ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is exactly what we are doing.

Mr. CLANCY. What proportion of our butter is sent in cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Almost the whole of the butter that went from Canada during the last five years.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of the apples shipped from Montreal last year were inspected ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I stated this afternoon that about 33,000 barrels were inspected out of probably 300,000. It would be a physical impossibility to inspect all the apples shipped during the three months of the shipping season.

Mr. BLAIN. How many of these inspectors are in the employ of the government at this present time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Practically all of them. They are coming here next week to have a conference and will spend a week at the Experimental Farm with the Horticulturalist, studying the spraying of fruit trees and their growth and their management, so as to be able to do that educational work which is part of our scheme.

Mr. BLAIN. They are all on your pay list at the present moment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so.

Mr. TAYLOR. When was this shipment of beef made that went wrong, and by whom was it made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know exactly when it was made, but it was made by the William Davies Packing Company, of Toronto.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is exactly what I have been informed. Their shipment arrived in bad condition and they have gone out of the business simply because the cold storage system which the Minister of Agriculture said was perfect was found to be of no use whatever. The minister professed to take the meat in refrigerator cars in Toronto, ship it in cold storage in Montreal and land it safely in cold storage in England, and Davies and Sons sent their beef in his charge and it went wrong. His cold storage was a complete failure. One of my constituents has forwarded me a little book lately published by the Minister of Agriculture, and I presume distributed all over the Dominion. My constituent took the cover off but——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When was it issued ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Lately. It is addressed to the farmers of Canada, and pretends to give some facts to the farmers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that was published in 1900.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has lately been distributed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has not been distributed since then.

Mr. TAYLOR. I got one of them through the mail the other day.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. You are behind the times.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will read a sentence or two and the minister will see that there are some references in it to things that happened later than 1900.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What is the date ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Like many other documents sent out by this government, there is neither date nor signature to it. It was sent out by the Minister of Agriculture and on the first page we have the following :

In regard to the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sydney Fisher), I may say that I believe he is competent and able to conduct properly the duties that are imposed upon him in his department. He is a practical farmer, and has devoted a great deal of time and energy in promoting the agricultural interests of the country ; and I am grateful to the Prime Minister for having selected a gentleman from the eastern townships, from which I come, to fill the important Department of Agriculture. (Mr. A. H. Moore, member for Stanstead, in 'Hansard' of September 15, 1896.)

The introduction says :

Of late there has been evident a concerted attack on the part of the Conservative leaders and press upon the Minister of Agriculture and his work for the farmer. This is undoubtedly due to the discovery by these gentlemen of the feeling existing amongst the farmers of Canada that much has been done in their interests by the Liberal government and minister, and they are so frightened by this feeling amongst the electorate that they find it necessary to try to counteract it.

Then he devotes eleven pages to what has been done in the way of perfecting cold storage, and he winds up by saying that the system is perfect now.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the minister repudiate that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to see it. I do not repudiate what Mr. Moore said.

Mr. CLANCY. It seems that Mr. Moore was the only respectable witness the Minister of Agriculture could get.

Mr. TAYLOR. He had to call a Conservative as a witness. He goes on to say in this pamphlet :

To-day our products are going to England in enormously increasing quantities, and our farmers are there receiving prices which they never received before.

To-day Canadian butter, Canadian cheese, Canadian fruits and Canadian flour are being asked for and searched for by the English consumer.

Under the Conservative administration the same articles were being sold in the English markets under other names and false brands.

My correspondent notes on that margin 'this is a lie.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do you endorse that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not think that Canadian goods have ever gone to the English market under false names and brands. I would not belie Canada by saying, as the minister has done, that we send our goods across under false brands and names. I am discussing this system of cold storage, which the hon. gentleman says he has so perfected that we could send fresh meats, fowls, fruits of all kinds over to England and they would land in perfect condition. The firm of Davies & Company, of Toronto, took the minister at his word and delivered a few car loads of fresh meat into his cold storage cars in transit to England. But they received practically nothing for their beef, and have gone out of the business. Is that statement correct or not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is entirely incorrect. As a matter of fact the firm of William Davies & Company last year undertook to send dead meat to England as an experiment. They sent six shipments. One turned out bad when it got there. They themselves reported to us the whole facts of the case. They said that that shipment was put upon the ship in a heated condition and that they were not surprised at its arrival in bad condition. They went out of the business because they found that the price in England and the cost of transportation and the cost of the beef here did not justify them continuing the business. Their decision was not at all due to the failure of the cold storage system, but to the market conditions and lack of profit.

Mr. WADE. I would ask the hon. minister to see, when making a contract with a line of steamers from St. John and Halifax for the London market, that the contract provides for forced ventilation so that there may be an even, cool temperature all the way across.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Only this morning, I met a gentleman desirous to tender for the contract for the ensuing year, and explained the necessities of the case to him in the presence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the hon. minister if he is going to provide steam communication between Charlottetown and Great Britain during the coming season, and if the vessels are to be fitted up with the cold storage system ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In conjunction with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I saw this morning the representatives of a steamship line which has made the offer of a ship, thoroughly equipped with cold storage and forced ventilation, to ply between Charlottetown and Great Britain this coming season. The contract will be made out and sent to these people for signature in a day or two.

Mr. HACKETT. I suppose there will be regular dates of sailing from Charlottetown?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. A gentleman who shipped a quantity of apples last fall from Halifax by the Furness line lost heavily,

owing to the want of proper ventilation, and the consequent arrival of the fruit in bad condition. His English agent had sold the fruit to be delivered on arrival at good prices, but it was found in bad order and they had to cancel the sale and dispose of it on the best terms possible. It is very unfortunate that the people of Prince Edward Island should not have the same facilities for shipping their produce as the people of the other provinces.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would the hon. gentleman be kind enough to send me the name of the shipper, the name of the vessel and the date of shipment, because the Furness-Withy line denied point blank any such condition of affairs, and I would be glad to have the details of any particular shipment.

Mr. HACKETT. I shall be most happy to furnish them to the hon. gentleman. There is another matter which I wish to bring to his attention. It has to do with the inspection of fruit. I find that while we have it stated here that Mr. McKinnon is a very competent gentleman, a fraudulent shipment has been made to Prince Edward Island. Although we shipped fruit from the island, yet our merchants to a certain extent, import fruit from the other provinces in their general line of business. I find in the Charlottetown 'Patriot' of April 9th, which is the latest date we have on file in the reading room, the following comment:

> The usefulness of having a fruit inspector in this province has been practically demonstrated. During the absence of Mr. Burke, in the other provinces, a shipment of apples was received in Charlottetown from a Montreal firm. The apples were originally packed in Ontario. The packer's name was erased by the Montreal firm and their own firm name substituted. On his return to the island, Mr. Burke, in the course of his inspection, discovered that this lot of apples was fraudulently packed by the barrels being faced with No. 1 fruit while below the surface the veriest trash appeared. Mr. Burke at once made complaint against the Montreal shippers and had a fine imposed under the Trade Marks Act.

Well, Mr. Chairman, if this gentleman of all the talents—half lawyer and half fruit-grower—in Ontario had been attending to his duties there, that shipment would not have been made to Prince Edward Island. We are charged with criticising this gentleman because his father is a candidate for a certain riding in Ontario at the local elections. We are doing nothing of the kind, but I believe that if you would sift the matter out, you would find that this lot of apples came from that very Niagara district where his father is running, and where he is intrusted with the inspection of fruit, and no doubt in order to gain favour for his father in the elections, he allowed this fraudulent shipment of apples to be sent to the island. I know nothing about Mr. McKinnon, and if he be a young man and has the ability hon. gentlemen opposite say he has, I am satisfied. I would rather give a young man a push forward than try to keep him down. But if we find such a fraudulent shipment coming from Ontario, under the immediate supervision and inspection of this gentleman, I would ask the minister does he think that this inspector is after all so efficient. It may be impossible for him to inspect every barrel of apples, but the names of those parties in Ontario who shipped that fruit and the name of the Montreal firm which erased the shipper's name and substituted their own, should be made public, so that the public may judge whether the Trade Marks Act is being carried out as effectively as the hon. gentleman represents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the names did not appear in the newspapers, although they must have been in the court record. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, who is casting this serious reflection on Mr. McKinnon, that this case was referred by Mr. Burke to Mr. McKinnon, and that Mr. McKinnon instructed him how to proceed, and that the apples did not come from anywhere near where Mr. McKinnon, senior, lives, but from Cobourg, in the province of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. The minister promised some information with regard to the working of these cheese curing stations. I understood him to say that there would be four of them costing about $10,000 each. It would be interesting to have him explain how the general public is to benefit by this scheme.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The general benefit will be due to the results which are found in this experimental work this year. As I explained before dinner, this is an experiment which, so far as I know, has never been tried in any cheese-making country in the world. It has been projected because of what are considered to be the necessities of the case, and will involve the adoption of what are judged to be the best means of meeting those difficulties and overcoming them. We trust and believe, and the representative cheese-makers in the dairying associations have endorsed the belief, that it is likely to be a successful experiment. It is not being done for the purpose of helping the particular localities that have been chosen for the work. These localities have been chosen because they seem to be distinctly cheese-making centres, where these curing establishments and the experiments carried on in them will be under the observation of those engaged in the industry. The places chosen are Woodstock, in western Ontario, Brockville in eastern Ontario; St. Hyacinthe for the French parts of the province of Quebec, and Cowansville for the English speaking parts. The general results will be published as they are learned; and if, at the end of the season those results meet

the expectations of those who are interested, I trust and believe that the cheese-making centres of the country will adopt the system for themselves and carry it out in a commercial way. There is no intention on the part of the government to do this work all over the country. We shall follow the precedent set in the case of what is called winter dairying. Under my predecessor, Professor Robertson inaugurated in Ontario and Prince Edward Island, and also, I think, in Nova Scotia, winter dairying stations, where butter was made on a considerable scale throughout the winter for the purpose of showing the butter-makers that butter could so be made as well as in summer. Certain localities were chosen because they seemed to be suitable for the experiments. So in this case. The hon. gentleman asked me how it would be worked. Without going into details, I may say generally that we are putting up a building which will be arranged so that we can control the temperature in the curing room, where the cheese will be kept. We also hope to have, in one or two of the buildings at all events, several small chambers where we can try experiments in curing cheese at different temperatures within the range that experiments in New York State and Guelph have shown to be the best. We also expect to box the cheese, and I trust and expect that our work in that respect will lead to improvement throughout the country. The boxing of our cheese, up to the present time, has not been all that we could desire. For many years the defects in this respect have caused a serious loss annually. Arrangements will be made to bring in cheese from the factories which are to supply them to the central curing room. The cheese will be brought in immediately after it is made up in the presses—probably the next day after it is taken out of the press.

Mr. CLANCY. Is there no danger of deterioration ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We propose to arrange a special kind of hoop to carry the cheese in. The cheese will be placed on the shelves in the central curing room and will then be under the control and management of the expert in charge of the building. We do not know yet exactly how long the curing process will take, but we have a pretty fair idea. When the cheese is cured and declared ready for market, it will be at the disposal of its owners, the people who supplied it. We have no control of the sale of it or of the commerce in it. The cheese may be left in the central curing room for a short time, we do not know exactly how long. But I do not think that these central curing rooms ought to be used as a sort of keeping warehouse for the cheese. If they were kept there for a long time the accumulation of cheese would make it necessary to increase the size of the building and spend money in the care of the cheese. That is a business for an ordinary warehouse properly epuipped. We are satisfied—in fact we know from our experiments—that cheese will shrink very much less in these curing rooms than in the ordinary curing rooms in the factories. And we know also, as well as we can know anything in the future, that cheese cured in these central establishments will be worth considerably more than if cured in the old rooms under varying temperatures running sometimes as high as 85 or even 90 degrees Farenheit. We know also that cheese cured in this way can be made softer and moister, that is, the maker will be able to make more pounds of cheese to every hundred pounds of milk than under the present system of curing. Therefore, the profit in the business will be threefold; first, a given quantity of milk will make more cheese; second, the cheese will shrink less in the curing room and so will weigh out more when it comes to be sold; and, third, the price of cheese will be better than if cured under the ordinary conditions. The buildings we propose to make in a substantial manner, in a way which may, I trust, be a model in the future for the buildings put up by companies or individuals for similar purposes. In the course of the summer's work we shall probably find many details which will have to be changed from our present plan. But we believe we have outlined the plan as well as can be done without practical experience. For this is a pure experiment from the word 'go.' I trust that at the end of the season we shall be able to make a report to the cheese-makers of Canada which will enable them to go on to do this work for themselves as successfully as they do other work in connection with this great cheese-making industry.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to establish a central curing house in the province of New Brunswick ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. FOWLER. Why not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because, at the present time there is no cheese-making centre in New Brunswick which would justify the expectation that an establishment of this kind could be satisfactorily worked, besides, the results gained in Ontario and Quebec, where there are great cheese-making centres, will be equally available for New Brunswick.

Mr. FOWLER. I think the minister is misinformed as to the facts. The county from which I have the honour to come is the pioneer of the cheese industry in New Brunswick, and is a great cheese-making centre. Within a radius of ten miles there must be twenty-five or thirty factories, some of them with an output of 100 tons a year.

There are none of them with a smaller output than from 35 to 40 tons. I doubt if in any of the other provinces there is a single county with a larger cheese output than the county of King's. As the minister has taken a large vote for this purpose, I think the province of New Brunswick, although small, should not be beneath his notice, and I respectfully submit that he should establish one of these curing establishments in that county. I would like to ask him further what is the intention of the government with respect to these curing establishments after they have passed the experimental stage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We hope to pass them over to somebody who will take them up as a commercial business, that is we intend to sell them.

Mr. FOWLER. I would invite the minister to examine into the output of cheese in the province of New Brunswick, and to give his serious attention to the question of putting one of these curing establishments in King's county. He might place it in St. John, there would be no difficulty there, because the cheese could come 40 or 50 miles by railway.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This last suggestion is entirely out of the question, we could not send cheese in a green condition by railway for 40 or 50 miles. It will have to be brought in by wagons constructed for that purpose. The probability is that 10 miles would be the outside limit of distance. Our present expectation is that the cheese will only be brought a distance of 5 or 6 miles into the curing establishment.

Mr. FOWLER. About what will be the amount of cheese gathered from the section where you are going to place this curing establishment, that is to say, the section that will be served by the establishment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The number of cheese that would be brought into these curing rooms will be comparatively small. A large section will not be able to send all its cheese in. It would depend upon the size of the factory. In the province of Quebec, as a general rule, the factories are not as large as they are in Ontario, and in the former province it will take more factories to provide the cheese which we propose to accommodate in these curing rooms. But I could not give the exact number of factories that would be accommodated. Our intention is to build rooms which will accommodate in the neighbourhood of 2,000 cheese a month. In Woodstock and Brockville there would be more factories within a narrow radius which could supply that number of cheese. The suggestion has been made that perhaps we should take half the number of cheese from each factory so as to take from a larger number of factories, instead of taking the whole of the cheese from some factories and leaving out others.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the average cost of each one of these curing establishments ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The buildings, plant and equipment will cost between $8,000 and $10,000 each.

Mr. GILMOUR. Will the minister not make a larger establishment at some places than at others ? For instance, at Woodstock there are 2,000 cheese made a month in the three factories in the immediate neighbourhood. I would suggest that Woodstock might have a larger room than some other places where there is a smaller output. I would also ask whether the department will hold these cheese until they are cured, or will allow the owner to take them out whenever he finds a market for them. The owner might find a market and not be able to withdraw them when he wished. There might be a variety of opinions about the time required to cure the cheese, and the right time to market them. Buyers of cheese have methods of curing and holding their own cheese for a time.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Our expectation and intention is to hold the cheese there until they are properly cured and fit for market. In these cool chambers it will take a cheese longer to become fit for market than it does where the temperature is higher. That has been the universal experience. I confess that I would much regret to see the owners of cheese take them away before they were properly cured and fit for market ; but I can hardly say that I would refuse to allow an owner of cheese to take them out when ever he likes. It would be rather difficult for me to say to a man : These cheese of yours are not fit for market, and you shall not have them yet, whether you want them or not. Although I would do everything I could to persuade him to leave them there long enough to have them fit for market.

Mr. GILMOUR. It would not be well to make a hard and fast rule, but the owner should have the option to take advantage of a favourable market.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the difficulty has arisen so much in Ontario, but I do know that in the province of Quebec, in the eastern townships, a great deal of cheese has been sold too green, allowed to leave the factories before it was really fit to be moved, and that has hurt the cheese trade. I hope we will be able to induce the factory owners and the owners of the cheese to leave their cheese long enough to ripen properly.

Mr. GILMOUR. What would the minister think with regard to building a larger curing

room at Woodstock than at other places? As I said, two or three factories could occupy all the capacity.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They may be built of different sizes. They are all planned in such a way that they can be easily enlarged.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like an explanation about this pamphlet sent out by the Department of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Is that a departmental publication, or is it a campaign document?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will send it over to the hon. gentleman. There is a photograph of the minister in the front part of it. I understood from him that this was published in 1900.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE I thought so, from what the hon. gentleman read.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then he does not know whether he has sent out only one document or not, because he has sent out none since, as I understood him.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think I have sent out anything since.

Mr. TAYLOR. It says:

The following is a comparison during the last four years under Conservative rule and the last four years under the Liberal administration.

It gives the quantity of butter exported for the years 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896; and then for the four years under Liberal administration of 1897, 1898, 1899 and 1900. I do not know how he could publish and distribute this book in 1900, when he professes to include the exports of these four articles in 1900. It could not be until after 1900 that the hon. gentleman could gather the statistics and publish them. In another table he gives a comparative statement of the expenditure under four years of Conservative administration and four years of Liberal administration, including 1901. He is trying to prove to the farmers that he is doing more for them in the expenditure of money under these heads than the Conservative government did. So this document must certainly have been sent out to the farmers since 1901, or else he is trying to impose upon them. He can take whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses. I send this pamphlet over to the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think this is a pamphlet which was largely prepared by myself, though not altogether. It seems to have been issued in the election campaign of 1900.

Mr. TAYLOR. How does the hon. gentleman account for giving these tables for the full year of 1900.

Mr. GILMOUR.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When that campaign was made the shipping season from Montreal had been closed, and our butter shipments were known. They were published within a few days of the close of that season by the Montreal papers, a synopsis is always made and given to them. We have besides that a record in our department of the amount of butter and cheese that is shipped from Montreal during the shipping season and the comparison is made with that. As far as the expenditure of the department for this season is concerned the hon. gentleman says himself that he quoted the estimated expenditure and that was included in the statement of the pamphlet and showed what my department was doing during the current year. As far as these statements are concerned I can simply say to the hon. gentleman that they went before the farmers of the country and that the farmers read them, studied them and digested them. These statements were criticised by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their candidates.

Mr. TAYLOR. And they succeeded in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. While they succeeded probably in Ontario they were left in a small minority in the elections of 1900. In the province of Ontario there was a small majority I grant you in their favour, but Ontario is not the whole Dominion of Canada, and when the representation in this House, which has to deal with these matters, which has to judge these matters, has a majority, as we showed the other night of fifty-six in favour of the administration which was exposed and shown in that pamphlet, as far as my department was concerned, the result to me, at all events, is very gratifying, and I can well understand that hon. gentlemen are not so well pleased.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. Minister of Agriculture to say that the figures contained in that pamphlet were furnished by his department?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think probably most of them were.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, I will take up another branch. I understand from the hon. minister that he made several trial shipments of poultry, that they were very successful, that they brought in good prices and that it was a good business for a farmer to engage in?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. Does the hon. gentleman want the details of them?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. I want to ask the farmers of the country if they could do business as the hon. gentleman has done. I see at page D-59 of the Auditor General's report that the hon. gentleman has ex-

pended $6,580.17 in the preparation of poultry for market. I find that a gentleman by the name of A. S. McBean of Lancaster purchased a number of chickens and furnished food to them at the expense of $321.94. They were sent over to England under this system of cold storage and they brought $78.28, the experiment entailing a loss of nearly $200. I want to know how the hon. gentleman can tell the farmers of this country that this is a profitable business for them to engage in, and how he can explain this way of doing business. Altogether the department expended $6,580.17 for the preparation of poultry for market and the receipts from the sales of this poultry amounted to $1,833.45, showing a deficiency of $4,746.72 in the experimenting feeding and shipping of poultry to the old country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At the Lancaster station ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Lancaster was one of them. Then I see that T. L. Brant of Whitby expended $445.64 and Whitby returned $177.73. I presume that my hon. friend, wherever he made his experiments, picked out political friends to give the money to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would be better done probably.

Mr. TAYLOR. And it was probably done. Mr. Brant got $445.00 and returned $177.73. The receipts being shown in the Auditor General's report at page D-68. The Auditor General deducts the refunds for the sale of poultry, cheese, &c. This being the fact, I wonder how the hon. minister can recommend the farmers of the country to go into the feeding of poultry and shipping it to England if better results cannot be achieved.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If these results were such as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has stated them there is no doubt that it would not be very profitable. As a matter of fact, the expenditure which the hon. gentleman stated as the expense on these particular lots of chickens included the establishment of the stations, and the experimental and educational work which these men were carrying on. Prof. Robertson gave the details in connection with these shipments every year before the Agriculture Committee of the House and they are published in the annual report of the department and these details show that the price of these chickens in England is about double the cost that is incurred here. As a matter of fact a number of men whom we started in this work and who at first did experimental work, such as Mr. Brant and Mr. McBean are doing to-day, are doing this work themselves now. They have left the work of the department and are no longer doing it but have entered into business on a commercial basis and are making it pay. The results are also evident from the fact that in 1896, before this work commenced, our whole export of chicken meat to Great Britain was about $18,000 and that during this last session it amounted to $220,000. To-day our chicken exporters say that they will take all the fatted chickens they can get and pay ten cents a pound for them in the centres where they are working. They are sending them forward and making a profit on them and they are doing this business on a large scale.

Mr. COCHRANE. They want these chickens fattened. They do not fatten the chickens themselves.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they want them fattened and the price seems remunerative to those who fatten them and they make a profit in sending them forward. The result is, that from England we have had over and over again reports showing that the Canadian fattened chickens which arrived there have made a good reputation for themselves in the markets and that the people there will take just as many of them as we can send.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman informs the House and the country that the amount of money I stated had been expended was for building the stations at these different points.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For establishing them.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will take the account of Mr. McBean at Lancaster and see how much went for the establishment of the station :—

McBean, A. S., Lancaster, Ont : chickens, 520 pounds at 8½c., 320½ pounds at 8c., 31 pounds at 7c.; corn meal, 904 pounds at $1.10 per cwt.; ground oats, 1,123 pounds at 1c.; oatmeal siftings, 2,964 pounds at $1.20 per cwt.; bran, 428 pounds at 85c. per cwt.; sundry feed, $5.21 ; skim milk, 3,020 pounds at 35c. per cwt., 160 pounds at 25c.; basswood, 1,114 pounds at 2c.; 54 pounds of nails, $2.82 ; coops, 20 at 75c.; altering coops, $3 ; shaping board, $2 ; plucking chickens, 215 at 5c. per pair; freight charges, $16.25 ; man's time, 94 days at $1 ; sundry labour, $6.87 ; advertising, $1.75 ; telegram, 38c.; sundry, $1.71 ; bags, 40 at 5c.—$321.94.

And they brought in $78, showing a deficiency of $243 in the operation. Yet the hon. minister says that was for establishing the station. There is not a dollar in that except that which is expended for chickens, feed and boxes, and to ship them in, and they brought back $78 while the hon. gentleman paid out $321.94. What became of the balance ? What farmer could buy chickens, feed them and ship them on the basis of these figures given by the hon. minister and expect that he will get good results from his investments ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have just received a memorandum from Professor Robertson which says that as far as the Lancaster station is concerned the chickens were taken with a disease and that was the only station which that occurred. At the Whitby station the expenditures were as I have stated. At Lancaster there was an epidemic of which most of the chickens died.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it not a fact that they spoiled in cold storage ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. They did not go to England at all.

Mr. CLANCY. I think I heard it stated that Canadian birds had been fattened too much, and that they were to some extent unsaleable, because when they were sent to England they were found to be too large.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a fancy market in England which takes a large bird and pays an extra price for it, and there is another market which prefers a smaller bird. Some of those dealers who wanted smaller birds complained that the birds we sent them were too large, and consequently we sent the large birds to the market which required such and which pays a larger price per pound.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find here that Mr. Horace Hazard of the Charlottetown poultry station spent $499, received $94, and had a deficit of $405. What became of that $405 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the details, but I can tell the hon. gentleman that the chickens sold at a good profit on the cost of the actual chickens purchased to fatten. At each of these stations we have got to do installation and educational and experimental work, which cannot be charged in a commercial sense against the chickens. We have kept a strict account of the cost of the production of every shipment made this year, and it shows a large margin on the profit side. Last fall, on all the shipments that were made, we netted 13 cents a pound at Montreal, and to any one who has raised chickens it will be evident that there is a large profit at such a price.

Mr. FOWLER. It strikes me that the Minister of Agriculture in his chicken experiment has had a somewhat similar experience to that Horace Greeley had with his pig. That may be occasioned by the class of men to whom he entrusted the working out of this experiment. There was a chicken fattening station in my county at Sussex, and without knowing whether the results were successful or otherwise, I can say that the gentleman who managed it had no experience whatever in that line.

Mr. BENNETT. Was he a lawyer ?

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. FOWLER. No; he did not have the training that a lawyer would have. He was a sort of an agent who sold carriages and agricultural implements. I would like to know if he was successful in his operations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that he was.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to know that.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can tell my hon. friend how successful he was.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps it is as well, because the minister has a peculiar idea about success.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, Mr. McArthur charged $297 to fatten the chickens, and he sold them at $198, leaving $99 of a deficit.

Mr. FOWLER. That was very successful.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was another station at Alberton, in Prince Edward Island, where the expenses were $249, and the receipts $154, leaving a deficit of about $100. Mr. Matthews was in charge of that station, and my hon. friend (Mr. Hackett) can tell whether he is a professional or not.

Mr. FOWLER. So far as the chicken business is concerned, the Minister of Agriculture had better fly the coop.

Mr. HACKETT. I hope the minister will give me the information now, which I asked from him the other day as regards the sale of chickens from the Alberton station. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) referred to Mr. Horace Hazard, of Charlottetown. I can say that Mr. Horace Hazard knows nothing whatever about fattening chickens. He is a commission merchant in Charlottetown, and I do not know how his name got mixed up with fattening chickens, because I think he could repudiate the idea that he is a chicken fattener. He does a large business in Prince Edward Island; he is one of the largest exporters in the province and he is not in the chicken fattening line at all. If the hon. gentleman from West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) were in his seat, he would remember that Mr. Hazard was going to be his opponent at the last election, and now we find that Mr. Hazard is in some way brought in connection with fattening chickens.

Mr. COCHRANE. He is a kind of political rooster.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Hazard having made this amount of money out of fattening chickens with the least possible difficulty, he was able to retire to make way for the member for West Queen's. If Mr. Hazard had not that fattening chicken job, he would certainly have contested the election against the hon. member (Mr. Farquharson). But the gentlemen who now occupy the

Treasury benches always seem to be able to provide a solace for any of their friends who get out of humour. Joking apart, it may be possible that the fattening industry would become of some importance as a by product of the farm in the province of Prince Edward Island. Mr. Gilbert, from the Experimental Farm, was in the Island last year, and he really did some very practical work, and by his addresses to the farmers he showed them, I think, that they might increase their revenue by poultry raising. I want to have it understood, however, that as a government proposition it has been a complete failure in the province of Prince Edward Island. Mr. Gilbert or a gentleman like him who so thoroughly understands the chicken business can do a great deal of good by explaining to the farmers how to raise these chickens, the best breeds to raise, and how to place them on the market in the best shape.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The government stations are for experimenting and we give the results of the experiments to the farmers.

Mr. CLANCY. Very encouraging.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is so encouraging that in Summerside the man who did our work gave it up, and has ever since been doing business for himself, and making money hand over fist at that business. The same is true in several other instances throughout the country. Had the government not undertaken this work, that business would not in all probability have been done in Canada for many years later than it has been. The result of our work has been that a very large number of people are engaged in this business with profit to themselves and to the country. As far as Mr. Hazard is concerned, it was two years ago when he did this work for us and consequently that could not have influenced him very much in the election that took place a few months ago.

Mr. SCHELL. With reference to the station at Glengarry, I may say a few words, as I am somewhat conversant with the circumstances. For some time the government had been issuing bulletins advising the farmers to take up the fattening of chickens as a profitable by-product, and adjunct of their general farming business. But those who had tried it up to the time the government started these experimental stations, did not seem to have made a success of it. When the station was started at Lancaster, an official came down from the Experimental Farm, and he showed us how to do the work. He showed the young men how to go through the mixing and feeding and the methods of taking care of the chickens, and the result has been that dozens of people have taken this up as a part of their business in the county of Glengarry, and have found it very profitable. I could give a number of names of prominent men who have taken the business up in connection with their farming. For instance, there is Mr. Macdonald, in the village of Glengarry, who has fitted up for this purpose a part of his stables, which he had been using for fattening cattle. And he told me a short time ago that he intended using another stable for chicken fattening, and drop the feeding of cattle as a business to that extent. My own brother shipped last year thirty tons of chickens partly fed and partly bought.

Mr. TAYLOR. That has been going on for the past fifty years.

Mr. SCHELL. No, it has not. These parties never shipped any before these stations were instituted. I do not think it is fair to expect that the government must make profit out of every experiment they undertake. They are expected to carry on these experiments to find out whether a certain thing may be profitable or not. When they discovered it is not profitable, they are conferring a benefit by pointing that out to the people. The result of these chicken stations has been a large export of chickens to the old country. People had been talking about that business and the papers had been writing it up and the government had been urging the people to go into it during a number of years, but the people did not go into it in Glengarry until this experimental station was inaugurated.

Mr. CLANCY. I have listened to this discussion all evening and naturally expected to find that the government had made some mistakes. But it seems they never make any. Their goods shipped in cold storage arrive in bad condition, but the government is not to blame. They undertook the chicken business and the chickens got sick and died. But still the minister asserts that it has been a very profitable business. The hon. minister proves to the country by his own failures that his administration is a marked success in every respect. I cannot see the logic of it, and it seems to me that if the hon. gentleman would frankly admit his failures, the country would take that admission in the proper spirit. We all know that the work is largely experimental and must expect failure in some instances, but the hon. gentleman has an excuse in every case and makes out that he is infallible. I hardly think he will persuade the country to take this view of his administration. I did not quite understand the hon. gentleman's statement with regard to the cheese-curing stations, but I drew from it that a different kind of cheese is now required, somewhat softer in texture, and which cannot be cured by the old process. But there can be no doubt that Canadian cheese attained great success many years ago before this process

was thought of, and I would like the hon. gentleman to explain why he suggests the manufacture of a different class of cheese requiring a different treatment from the cheese we made in the past and which met with such success.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For a number of years the English market has been asking for a moister and softer cheese than the Canadian cheddar usually has been. It is impossible to send such cheese successfully forward in heated ships or to cure it successfully in a heated room. For that reason we have been trying to get ventilated holds for the ships to carry it in and to get curing rooms where it can be successfully cured. We have not been able to make that cheese in Canada because we had not properly constructed cheese factories. We have explained that to the people for three or four years back and have experimented to see whether that kind of cheese could be made in a cooler chamber. Our experiments show that it can be, and that there was nothing inherent in the Canadian climate or soil to prevent our making it. By a series of experiments extending over a couple of years, we have been trying to find the cause of the difficulty and a remedy for it. And we think that, to a certain extent we are likely to attain the object desired. There is no doubt that the cheese that went forward in the four ships I have referred to arrived in much better condition than others. We have the reports of the receivers, and also resolutions passed by the shippers, and resolutions passed by the produce dealers in London, declaring that they wished all cheese carried in this way. But I do not think the remedy will be complete until the place in which the cheese is to be cured can be kept at a low enough temperature. The ordinary curing room in the country is not of that construction. We have tried for a couple of years to get the people to change their curing rooms, but they have simply ignored the advice. In a few instances they may have adopted it, but so few that it has made no impression upon the market. By inaugurating these central curing rooms, we think we may make an impression on the market and induce the people to adopt the reform.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is there any idea that the process of making cheese may be changed as well as the process of curing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not a cheese maker, but I understand that it is expected that, with the new facilities for curing, they will be able to leave a little more moisture in the cheese in the process of manufacture.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am inclined to think that factory men will not greatly favour putting their cheese into these buildings. It would be more likely that the buyers would do so. I would urge upon the minister to consider the propriety of building a larger building at the places where the most cheese is made. Then, if it were near a railway line, so that cartage could be saved, it is possible that the building could be sold without much loss when the experiments are finished.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may explain that these buildings are to be placed right in the railway yard, where there will be every facility for shipment. The cheese will be brought there from the factories and held for the owners. We do not require it to be sold to anybody. The cheese is as much under the control of the owner as it would be in the factory curing room. The only limitation, if you call it such, is that we cannot allow the cheese to remain indefinitely in the central curing room, for we should choke up these curing rooms and disable ourselves from curing the new cheese coming in. These buildings are not intended for warehouse purposes, but for curing purposes. After the cheese is cured, it must be sold or removed to an ordinary warehouse or cold storage building.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is the hon. minister sure that green cheese right from the press can be put on a wagon and drawn five miles in safety ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We believe so—of course, with special arrangements for transportation. And in reply to the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) I may say that I have been overwhelmed with letters from the factory men asking for the privilege of curing their cheese in these buildings.

Mr. FOWLER. If this cheese is to be hauled five miles over a country road, I do not see why it cannot be taken thirty or forty miles by rail.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a different thing altogether. A spring wagon does not jolt the cheese anything like the rattling of a railway train.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the hon minister making any arrangements for the carrying of the cheese by train from the curing houses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the owner ships in any way he pleases.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any cars on the different railways suitable for carrying that cheese to the seaboard ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cheese would go from these curing rooms just as it goes from the curing rooms in use to-day.

Mr. BLAIN. Returning to the subject of poultry. I desire to ask one question. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Schell) has stated that the poultry trade in his county has developed very largely since the introduction of this system of poultry feed-

ing. But, from the presentation of the case by the hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) it appears that nearly all the experiments were failures financially. Will the hon. minister explain, if the poultry feeding station under the government was a failure, how an ordinary man commencing the feeding of chickens under the guidance of the government can be expected to make a success of it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The stations were not failures financially.

Mr. BLAIN. If I understand correctly, in every case they lost money.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I explained that the government carried on at these stations a great deal of educational and experimental work which the farmer would not carry on, and we have to charge up the expense of it to the several stations.

Mr. BLAIN. How many of these were in the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Four last year I am told.

Mr. BLAIN. Where are they located ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The four last year were at Whitby, Chatham, Holmesville and Renfrew.

Mr. VROOMAN. I understood that one of these stations at Lancaster was not successful because of an epidemic disease. Is that a thing that happens frequently, and what is the reason for it, and what is done on the discovery of it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We had about ten stations and this is the only one at which it occurred.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister says that the reason the fattening station cost the government more than it would have cost a private individual was the educational work they had to do. I would ask the minister what amount of educational work was done at the Sussex station which was in charge of this agricultural implement agent, and what qualifications he had for imparting this information ? I would like to know also what education he gave the people ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His work was not a failure so far as the fattening of chickens was concerned. But besides this work the people who came to learn from these experiments had to be shown what was being done, that took time, and the time had to be paid for.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that the ground the minister takes is that because the chickens were sold for more than was paid for them, therefore there was a profit. They cost, I believe, $85 and were sold for $117. But there were other expenses of over $200. Because the chickens were sold for more than they cost, the minister claims the experiment was a financial success.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Without going into details, I am informed that the original cost of the chickens bought and the feed given to them was about two-thirds of what they brought.

Mr. FOWLER. The report that was read by the hon. member for Leeds does not bear out the contention of the minister. All these items, with the exception of a few of the crates, were the same sort of items that would have to be paid for by any private individual engaged in the same enterprise. I cannot understand how it can be, as the hon. member for Glengarry said, that on account of the success of this experiment in Glengarry where it was a dead failure and the chickens died, it encouraged the people of that community to go into this enterprise as a private speculation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is a kind of encouragement that brings them money.

Mr. VROOMAN. I have heard it said the chickens died owing to the way they were fed. Has the department discovered by this time if that is the case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not able to answer that question.

Mr. VROOMAN. I have been told they were fed on buttermilk, and it caused the liver to grow.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think they were fed on buttermilk. We did not make any such experiments.

Mr. FOWLER. Were the chickens who died of this chickenpox examined by veterinarians ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think they were.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I think, to remove all doubts, we should issue a commission to go down to Glengarry and ascertain the cause of these chickens dying. But speaking seriously, this business of feeding and shipping chickens is now in its initial stage. Some parties have been successful, and others have not. But people are getting better acquainted with it, and if you allow this process to go on you will find that next year and the year following the export of chickens will keep on increasing in value. One man may try the business and fail, and another may try and succeed. That is the way in every business, because if every man succeeded we would all be so rich that the country could not contain us.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister will persist in making a statement to this House that the business has been profitable, and he answers my hon. friend here that the cost

of the chickens and the feed, saying nothing about anything else, leaves a small balance on the right side. I have read an account of the expenses at Glengarry, and there is not a dollar included for this instruction work. The officer went down there two or three times a week to supervise the work, but there is no charge of that kind in the account that I read; still it showed a big deficiency. The minister makes a statement to this House which the Auditor General's Report contradicts. Take up the account of Mr. Thomas Sainsburg, of Chatham:

Thomas Sainsburg, Chatham, Ont.: Services, $85; 398 chickens, $107.90; milk, 4,105 pounds at 25c. per cwt.; tallow, 60 pounds at 6c.; sawdust, $1; freight charges, $11.62; rent of scales, $4; horse hire, $1; cartage, 50c.; sundries, 59c.; dressing and selling chickens, 50c.; paid to pickers, $27.36.

Now, Mr. Sainsburg may have been a farmer, and there is not an item there that any farmer would not have to pay for in the chicken business. There is nothing there for experimental work or instruction to the farmer. The chickens were shipped and sold, and there is $16 return, leaving a deficiency of $237. Now, did these chickens die? There is the published statement of the hon. gentleman. I simply read the items that he furnishes the department of the Auditor General, including the expenditure for chickens and their feed, boxes to ship them in, and freight, that any other farmer would have to pay. Besides, he allowed his political friends where he established the station, some pay for looking after them. But the experimental work was done by the department the same as in Glengarry. At Bondville, Que., there was a loss of $239; at Charlottetown, a loss of $405; at Sussex, N.B., a loss of $198, and at Chatham, of $237; and so it goes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to establish more of these fattening stations the coming year, and at what points?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We will have more stations going on this year, I cannot say yet the exact points, and some will be continued where they are.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the minister made up his mind which ones will be continued, whether it will be the most successful or the least successful?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think they have all been so successful as to justify me in continuing them.

Mr. KAULBACH. As the discussion has been carried on with respect to chickens and cheese, I would ask the minister if he has given any attention to the supervision of the milk carried to the factories, so as to secure its being of a proper quality? It needs a good quality of milk to make a good cheese for export. Has he taken pains to see that none of the ingredients of the milk have been extracted? And could not the distance from the centres where cheese are manufactured be widened considerably by the use of proper carriages?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course the milk requires to be in good condition. I am glad to say that in Canada there is practically no skim milk cheese made, nor is there any skimming of the milk at the factories. That matter has been thoroughly gone into by our dairy officers. We have our inspectors, and the cheesemakers themselves look after the quality of the milk.

Mr. KAULBACH. Would not the milk suffer from being drawn a long distance to the factory?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The milk will be drawn to the factory in the future as it has been in the past. It does sometimes suffer from being carried too long a distance.

Mr. KAULBACH. Are the manufacturers confined to certain weights of cheese for shipment, or can they make a cheese of any weight they please?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They can make it of any weight.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister did not give me information in reference to the great discrepancy in the case at Chatham, where there was a deficiency of $237.63.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot explain those figures. No doubt a full explanation can be made in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman get it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have given a full statement of the expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister says that with the exception of the station at Lancaster all the others paid a profit. Now, the chickens that were sold from this station brought $16.09, and he paid out $253.72 to Mr. Sainsburg. A cyclone must have struck those chickens up there. That is worse than a disease.

Mr. KAULBACH. As to the milk, I understood the hon. minister to state that a certain test is required. What is that test?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think that I said anything particularly about that. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is alluding to the ordinary working of cheese factories or not. There is no change in the method of handling milk in the cheese factory. That system has been pursued for many years. It

is thoroughly understood and we do not propose to make any change in that at all.

Mr. HACKETT. After having had a fair share of chickens and cheese I wish to go back to apples again. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has arranged for the appointment of a man to do grafting and pruning in Prince Edward Island, and to assist the orchardist there? I understand that a gentleman down there, Mr. D. A. Sharp, has applied for this position. The hon. minister will remember that a few years ago he sent a man of the name of Kinsman from Nova Scotia to Prince Edward Island who was totally unfit to carry on this work and made a failure of it. I understand that there is a largely signed petition in the department of the hon. minister asking that Mr. Sharp be appointed to do the work of pruning and grafting. Mr. Sharp is a Liberal, a personal friend of mine, though a strong political opponent, but he has been in the nursery business for a long number of years, and he is thoroughly conversant with the cultivation of fruit trees. In view of the fact that the hon. minister has a memorial in his hands signed by a large proportion of the people engaged in that industry in Prince Edward Island, I hope he will pay some attention to it. We do not want to have a repetition of Kinsman coming over there from Nova Scotia. Mr. Sharp is a nurseryman who has been selling his trees to the farmers of Prince Edward Island for a long number of years. I think he represents a nursery situated somewhere in the vicinity of Sussex, and he deals in trees that are suitable for Prince Edward Island. He has taken a deep interest in the cultivation of these trees. He goes around as far as he possibly can, being a man who is dependent for his living on the work he is doing, assisting the parties to whom he has sold trees in the cultivation of them. But he cannot give his whole time and attention to that without some compensation from the government and I would, therefore, as far as I can in this parliament, make known the capabilities of Mr. Sharpe and his thorough knowledge of and acquaintance with orchard work in Prince Edward Island. I would like to ask the hon. minister, having this memorial signed by a large number of the people of Prince Edward Island, that he would be good enough to pay some attention to it.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the hon. minister what his practice is in respect to giving bonuses to storehouses where butter is kept in cold storage by creamery companies, on what principle he gives these bonuses and what the initial value of the buildings is to which these bonuses are given?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The buildings in connection with the creameries which earn these bonuses have to be constructed according to specifications and plans which are supplied by the department, which have been published for years, which have been explained before the committee and drawings of which were put before the country in bulletins three or four years ago. The bonus as given is $50 for the first year and $25 for two succeeding years on the condition that the buildings themselves are properly constructed, and that the temperature is kept at the right point during the hot weather. We require first of all that an inspector shall visit the creamery and see whether the building is all right, and if it is we get a report from the butter maker there who fills up the form which is sent by the department. When that is done we pay the bonus.

Mr. FOWLER. Then application is made for this bonus?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. Made by the creameries and then we supply all the information necessary as to construction and forms for making reports upon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who inspects these buildings?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The officers of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. In every case?

Mr. FOWLER. What is the average cost of these buildings?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That would depend on whether they are built inside of an existing creamery or outside. It costs about $150, Professor Robertson says, to fit up the inside of a building, but when an additional building has to be built it will probably cost $250 or $300. The government gives $100 in the course of three years, $50 the first year and $25 for two succeeding years.

Mr. BLAIN. How many creameries have earned that bonus?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. About 500—not the full bonus; some of them are still earning their bonuses, but about 500 have put in the cold storage chambers. Some of them will come on next year or the year after.

Mr. BLAIN. How many of them have earned the full $100?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. About 330, Professor Robertson says, have earned the full bonus.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice in this pamphlet, containing figures which have come from the department, the number is placed at 317 that have earned the full $100 up to 1900.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That will be about it.

Mr. BLAIN. How many does the hon. minister say now have earned the full $100?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am only speaking from memory, but I understand about 330. If it was 317 then it must be more now.

Mr. FOWLER. How many applications have been made from New Brunswick for this bonus ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Professor Robertson thinks about six. There are not very many creameries in New Brunswick.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see, at page D-65 of the Auditor General's report, that there were 6 in Prince Edward Island, 5 in Nova Scotia, 6 in New Brunswick, 170 in Quebec, 15 in Ontario and 3 in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. The hon. minister informed the committee a moment ago that in order to get this bonus, a room had to be built according to the plans and specifications supplied by the department, and that in every case these compartments were inspected by an officer of the department. I would ask him to account for $485.18 paid out to different parties in the province of Quebec and for $22 paid out to parties in Ontario for inspecting cold storage rooms. I see here T. Corbeil Laurentides, 21 days at $2 a day, inspections for bonuses, and so it runs on.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was employed for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. An officer of the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. For twenty-one days ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then I asked him if these inspections were made by an officer of the department from here, and he said yes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman did not ask if he was from here. He is an officer of the department. He is one of the syndicate inspectors for Quebec, and we asked him to do that work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then there is J. O. Danis?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not recognize the name.

Mr. TAYLOR. You will find it in the Auditor General's report, page D-64.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I dare say, but I cannot recognize the name.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, there is A. P. Purvis, Maxville, Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is one of the Ontario inspectors that we employed for that work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then there is A. B. Rabb, of Brockville, who got $2 a day ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know any one of that name.

Mr. TAYLOR. These are not officers of the department but there is $485 paid to about thirty inspectors in the province of Quebec and $22 paid to six in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were employed for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister led us to believe that before this money was paid out an officer of the department certified that these places were completed according to law. Here we find that they are not inspected by an officer of the department at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Wherever it was possible the work was done by an officer of the department and in every other case it was done by a person engaged in similar work for some provincial or local organization.

Mr. HACKETT. Have you one of those cold storage places at Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We engaged a room in a cold storage building there.

Mr. HACKETT. And the buyer of the cheese pays a rent for the use of this building during the time the cheese is there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He pays a storage charge.

Mr. HACKETT. You are building one of those cheese curing establishments in Eastern Ontario, another in Western Ontario ; one in French Quebec and one in English Quebec. Why in the name of all that is good and gracious cannot you build one in Prince Edward Island, where the people have gone largely into the cheese industry owing to the energy of Prof. Robertson and prior to this government coming into power. Prof. Robertson came down to Prince Edward Island under the Conservative government and established these cheese factories, and they have been a great success. The cheese industry has been a success there without any assistance from this government, only that they rented this cold storage room from the Rattenburys, friends of their own in Charlottetown. The least the government ought to do is to build one of those cheese curing establishments in Prince Edward Island. The minister tells us that when the cheese is treated in one of those places it will come out perfect and be worth from three to four cents a pound more than ordinary cheese. Why should not the people of every province have the benefit of them. Why build two in Ontario and two in Quebec and not build any in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Manitoba. We should have in the province of Prince Edward Island this means of turning the dairy products of the people to the best advantage. I trust the minister

will see his way clear to establish one of these places in Prince Edward Island.

To promote dairying interests by advances for milk and cream, to be recouped out of the proceeds of sales of such butter and cheese, to be placed to the credit of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, $40,000.

Mr. CLANCY. What has been the outcome of the partnership business with the government in respect to the North-west creameries. As was predicted by some gentlemen here when the minister first submitted the plan, it has resulted in a loss, and I think the minister told us that he was disposed to discontinue the assistance. How far has he been successful in recouping that loss.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that some of these factories have not been as successful as we had anticipated. The late boom in grain-growing—

Mr. CLANCY. Another excuse.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, another excuse ; possibly a mistake in placing some of these factories in the grain-growing region. We have discontinued one or two, and I fear that we will have to discontinue some others. We have lent altogether $43,540.63. Of that $24,528.87 has been repaid at present, leaving a balance of $19,011. Eight of these factories out of twenty-one have repaid the whole of the advances, four others have paid very nearly all, and I am certain will entirely repay next season if there is anything like the work that has been done lately. There are a few which I fear will lose money. These are, Edmonton and its tributaries, Maple Creek, Prince Albert and Duck Lake, and Wolseley and Moffat. The others owe much smaller amounts and it is likely they will be able to pay off. After all that is not a bad showing although I confess that the anticipations have not been realized as far as the actual financial view is concerned. I think, however, that the progress of the country there has been benefited to an enormous extent, and that the encouragement to settlers on the whole is quite good compensation for the investment which was made, even if in some instances we lost.

Mr. CLANCY. Has the minister discontinued the assistance.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope to be able in another year to let those who have repaid the whole amount, run their own business without any control from us. Some of the others will have to be run for a year or two perhaps to ensure the successful paying off of what is due. With regard to some others it is rather a blue lookout. This is very similar to the work done in Prince Edward Island some years ago, but on a smaller scale.

Mr. GILMOUR. What creameries have paid up ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Churchbridge, Kootenay, Grenville, Moose Jaw, Red Deer, Regina, Saltcoats, Saskatoon, Whitewood, Yorktown. These owe nothing. Four of the others have nearly paid off everything, and seven have not paid much.

Mr. GILMOUR. Has the one at Calgary paid off its debt ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At Calgary the money was not lent to the corporation, but to the patrons, and they have paid it off.

Mr. GILMOUR. What is the output of the whole of the creameries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1897, 473,000 pounds of butter were made, value $85,000. In 1898, 484,000 pounds value $73,000; in 1899, 501,000 pounds, value $103,000; in 1900, 637,000 pounds, value $128,000; in 1901, 677,000 pounds, value $129,000. There has been a steady increase both in quantity and value.

Mr. GILMOUR. Does the hon. minister control the sale ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We manage the sale. Most of it was marketed in British Columbia and the Yukon, but this last season we shipped some to Europe. Some has been sent every year to Japan—not a very large quantity, but gradually increasing.

Mr. GILMOUR. I am surprised that any should be required. I thought that the Yukon would have taken the whole of it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is due to the fact that a great deal of Manitoba butter was sent to British Columbia this year and some Ontario and Quebec butter. In the early spring there was some sent from the east.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 14, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CHINESE—JAPANESE IMMIGRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I beg to lay on the Table of the House the report of the Royal

Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration, second part.

REPORT.

Summary report of the Geological Survey for the calendar year 1901.—Hon. Mr. Sifton.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 53) respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

On section 4,

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Chairman, before this clause passes, as we have now the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) in his seat, and as that gentleman was not present during the consideration of private Bills on Friday night, I would like to state one or two objections I have to this Bill. In the first place, I object to the Bill on general principles. The Bill authorizes the construction of 5,000 or 6,000 miles of railway, and this power, to be given in any one charter, is altogether too great. I object also to the Bill because it authorizes the construction of certain branch lines, but the descriptions of these lines are so indefinite that we do not know where the roads are going to run. But, my most serious objection to the Bill is the fact that by its terms it entirely controls the only two available passes through the Rocky Mountains. These are the Pine River and the Yellow Head passes. There was an engineer who went through the Pine River Pass about twenty-five years ago, and a gentleman named Mr. Hunter also went through about twenty years ago. Neither one of these gentlemen reported on the feasibility of this pass for a railway. There is no information on that point as far as I can learn. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should take steps to see, if any other transcontinental road should endeavour to get through the mountains as there are no other passes available, that they should have running powers over the line in one of these two passes. I notice that the Board of Trade held a meeting in Winnipeg a few days ago to discuss a resolution sent to it by the Halifax Board of Trade dealing with the Intercolonial Railway. I may say that the Winnipeg Board of Trade represents practically all the large and influential corporations loaning moneys on the prairies. That board took the ground that a commission should be appointed to look into the question as to whether the Intercolonial Railway could be made a factor in the transportation of that country, and if it could that it might be feasible on the part of the government to extend that system to the Pacific coast to serve as a feeder for the road. That proposition was very fully discussed by several gentlemen who are deeply interested in that country, and the partner of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), Mr. Nanton, seconded the resolution. I am not going to say whether this is feasible or not, but, if it is feasible and if it should transpire that it should be necessary in the future for the government to extend the road to the Pacific coast, they should adopt the policy of reserving these passes with that end in view. But, there is another factor in connection with this charter to which I wish to draw attention. As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, a bargain was entered into between the Manitoba government and the Northern Pacific Railway, which bargain was passed also by this government. That arrangement was something like this: The Manitoba government leased from the Northern Pacific Railway Company for a period of years the company's lines in the province of Manitoba, having a mileage of 350 miles for which they were to pay an annual rental of $210,000. The Manitoba government released those lines to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, and a bargain was made that on certain bonds issued by the Canadian Northern line the government were to guarantee interest to the extent of $20,000 a mile on 300 miles, and on certain other bonds covering 1,000 miles of road, the Manitoba government were to guarantee interest at the rate of $10,000 per mile. That is 1,300 miles in all on which interest is guaranteed. Out of the receipts of the railway company they were to pay, first, the running expenses of the road, secondly, the $210,000 rental to the Northern Pacific, and thirdly, they were to pay interest on these bonds, amounting to about $14,000,000, but in default the Manitoba government had to pay any arrears of interest accrued. Should there be a surplus at the end of two years that might be applied to a reduction of freight rates. This was the consideration for which the Manitoba government became the endorser of the bonds of the company so that the farmers of the western part of Manitoba should get a material reduction in freight rates. The reduction was to be 2 cents a bushel on wheat on the first year's operation. If the road proved a paying concern, there was to be a further reduction in the rates. This Bill goes on to say that they should have power to bond the road for $25,000 per mile, not only on any lines to be constructed, but also on the lines now constructed, and the question arises: Is that $15,000 extra per mile to be in addition to the 1,300 miles for which the Manitoba government are responsible as endorser? If it is, it seems that in addition to guaranteeing the interest on what is provided for in the agreement now that government will have to become responsible for the interest on $15,000 per mile extra and there will be no opportunity of gaining any further reduction in freight rates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the bonding power on the 1,300 miles that have been already constructed ?

Mr. McCREARY. I am sorry that I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information he asks me for.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If they bond it for $25,000 per mile and it is completed it would not affect the matter.

Mr. McCREARY. I suppose not. But the Manitoba government assumed responsibility for $10,000 a mile on a portion and $20,000 on another portion. I may not be correct in my contention, but I want to have it shown that I am not correct. I want to see that the Manitoba government will not have to guarantee interest on $25,000 per mile instead of $10,000. I want to see that the farmers of Manitoba who are supposed to get the benefit of that road will not have to pay interest on that extra bonding per mile. It is the duty of the Minister of Railways to clear up the point. He was thoroughly cognisant of the matter when it came before the Railway Committee and I have no doubt he will be able to explain.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The hon. member from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has invited my attention to some provisions of this Bill, and he particularly mentions the fact that it is proposed to construct an enormous mileage which he thinks we are not justified in empowering the company to construct. The hon. gentleman said that if this Bill passes the company will have authority to occupy not only the Yellow Head Pass but also the Pine River Pass under existing legislation. It will be remembered by members of the Railway Committee that two or three times I called the attention of the committee to the extended character of this proposed undertaking, and I mentioned that the company were asking to occupy a very great deal of territory. As far as my observations then impressed themselves on the committee the result was that considerable lengths of mileage which were embraced in the original Bill were stricken off, and it appeared to be the sense of the committee that the balance of the Bill should stand. I did not carry the controversy further ; I do not propose to continue the controversy now. I called explicit attention to the very point which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) has dwelt upon, and the committee after listening to the arguments on both sides concluded that it was not improper legislation. Considerable respect is due to the decision of the committee with respect to all of these Bills, and unless the circumstances are of an extraordinary character, or unless something has been done under a misapprehension of the facts I think it is better to consider the decision of the committee as approaching finality. What my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) has said with regard to the necessity of providing that running powers shall be secured to any railway that may desire to use any of these passes, is covered by existing legislation completely. We would have added it to this Bill if it were necessary, but it is not necessary. The hon. gentleman seems to be under the impression that we have no information in the department as to the character of this Pine River Pass from a railway point of view. The hon. gentleman is not fully informed with respect to that, because my deputy tells me that the records of the department show that a very careful survey was made of the Pine River Pass, with the result that the opinion of the engineer, Sir Sanford Fleming was, that there was only room for one track through it. While that is the case, some one must build the track. It is quite immaterial it appears to me by what company the track is built, because there is ample power in the government under existing legislation to secure to any companies who desire to use the same pass, all the rights which they will need for such a purpose.

With reference to the effect of this legislation upon the contract entered into by the Manitoba government with the Canada Northen Railway ; that point occurred to my mind before this question was disposed of in the committee, and I made such inquiries that I felt were necessary. I did not see how it would be possible for this legislation to enlarge or to restrict in any degree the contract as it affects the existing bonds which were already issued ; and upon inquiry I was very well satisfied that my opinion in that regard was well founded. I think I can safely assure the hon. gentleman that he need have no anxiety on that account.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I would like to say that while I would be only too glad to accept the assurances of the Minister of Railways on the subject of the responsibility likely to be laid upon the province of Manitoba by this legislation it is not altogether clear to my mind that the province is not placed at a disadvantage by it. I must admit my lack of legal training, and therefore that I am at a disadvantage in discussing this question. But it is an important question. We are going to do something that we cannot undo, and it is well that we should proceed with the fullest information, even to those of us who are not thoroughly versed in legal questions. The Manitoba government lies under its present responsibility in respect of the Canadian Northern Railway because of legislation by this parliament. That responsibility is limited to a certain amount. This parliament by legislation now in hand permits the adding of a certain load of responsibility, not on the province but on the company. This brings up the question as to whether the company, by reason of this legislation would not be at liberty to provide for the discharge of the interest upon the additional bonds before giving that advantage to the people of Manitoba which they

expect because of the responsibility they have assumed. That is to say, that the company being only allowed to provide for a bonded liability of $10,000 a mile ; this legislation will permit them to provide for a bonded liability of $25,000 per mile. It is an arguable question it seems to me, whether they will not be able to hold that legislation up as a defence for paying interest on that additional $15,000 per mile before discharging their obligations to the people of Manitoba in regard to the reduction of rates. The fact of giving them the privilege to place these additional bonds upon the road may be used by them as a protection against the terms of their present agreement with the province of Manitoba. I may be wrong in that and I may be right ; but I would make this suggestion : That the lines in the province of Manitoba, or the lines covered by the agreement with the province of Manitoba, be exempted from the provisions of this section. Then there will be no question about it. Then the province will be perfectly safe. We would know certainly that we had done no harm anyway, and I can see no objection to that provision being made.

Further I would like to say, that the idea that a railway company pays the interest on its own bonds is now exploded. The company does not pay anything. It is the people who use the road that pay the interest. They pay it through the rates which it costs them to have their traffic carried. If the company is permitted by parliament to bond its line through the prairies of the Saskatchewan valley at the rate of $25,000 per mile, the future population of that valley must pay that interest, if the interest is to be paid. The government in exercising its authority as to control of rates must take into consideration the fact that it authorized the issue of these bonds to the amount of $25,000 per mile, and thereby became a party to the charging of rates sufficient to earn interest on that amount of bonds. I claim that it is the duty of parliament to restrict the issue of bonds on a railroad to the necessities of the case. It is necessary to do that if parliament is to exercise effective control of the rates to be afterwards charged on that road by means of a railway commission or by any other means. If the bonding power of $10,000 per mile is sufficient to construct the line of the Canadian Northern through the prairie sections of the province of Manitoba, $10,000 a mile should be sufficient to enable them to construct through the prairie regions of the Saskatchewan—if not absolutely then aproximately. The fact that they were willing to make a bargain with the province of Manitoba to build a line through the prairie sections of that province on a bonding privilege of $10,000 per mile is absolute proof that the bonding power of $25,000 per mile applied to prairie construction through the Saskatchewan valley is needlessly large, and as a matter of fact lays a burden of future taxation upon the future population of that country, for which, they, nor we, nor any one else outside the men composing the company, receive any value whatever. I would ask the Minister of Railways and the House to protect beyond question the province of Manitoba against any additional obligation, and further to protect the future interests of the western country by restricting the bonding powers of this railway to the necessities of the case. The experience of this country in the past proves that such safeguard is necessary, in order that the country may get the proper benefit from the expenditure made in aid of railway construction.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I was in the Railway Committee when this clause was passed, but I have just had the explanation of the Minister of Railways that it does not interfere with the bonds already issued. If that be so, there can be no objection to it. But taking the wording of the clause, 'The company may from time to time issue and secure by mortgage, bonds, debentures, or other securities for the purpose of the acquisition by purchase, &c., there is nothing to show that the bonds so authorized to be issued will not rank pari passu with those already issued.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Those already issued are secured by a first mortgage under the agreement with the province of Manitoba.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember at present how these bonds stand, but I was simply pointing out what appeared to be the effect of this clause. Even if the bonds already issued be secured by a first mortgage, the House should still be careful to see that by this Act we are not in any way taking from their precedence. That could be guarded against by providing an additional clause, which would give these bonds already issued priority beyond doubt over those authorized to be issued.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see how there can be any doubt as to the position of the bonds now issued. They are the subject matter of a special contract between the Manitoba government and the Canadian Northern Railway. The papers were before us last session, and most of us will remember that a mortgage was executed by the company, whereby the bonds then issued, up to the amount of $10,000 per mile, were made the first lien on the road. No authority which may subsequently be granted by parliament to issue additional bonds could possibly change the position of those previously issued. The bonds now authorized will have to follow and be a second security. We have not, are not giving them any priority, nor are we putting them on an equal footing. Therefore, whoever holds the existing mortgage, holds the property in security for the bonds issued prior to

this arrangement. The Manitoba government no doubt have been made thoroughly acquainted with the character of this proposed legislation, and if there were anything in it which might infringe on their rights, they would have quickly called our attention to it.

In reply to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) I may say that it was the understanding of the Railway Committee, when that committee agreed to report the Bill, that I should take the third and fourth clauses into my consideration. I had called the attention of the committee to the very large capitalization powers, and said that these two clauses might well receive further consideration, and that if the committee were content, I would look into the matter and suggest any change, and in the meantime they could report the Bill. My hon. friend is therefore right in asking me for some explanation why I have advised that the bonding power should be retained at the amount first stated. It is all very well for my hon. friend to talk about the cost of the construction, but taking the least costly of the railways mentioned in the present Bill, I had inquiries made by the best of my engineering staff, and they told me that to build this road and to bridge it—and there will have to be two very expensive bridges across the Saskatchewan river—and pay the cost of the rails and their transport and properly and adequately equip the road, would take in the neighbourhood of $15,000 to $20,000 per mile. When my hon. friend speaks of $8,000 or $10,000 per mile, he is entirely astray in his calculations. Take the matter of equipment alone. If the country through which this road is to run is as fertile as represented, it will soon be filled up with producing settlers, and to carry their crops which will have to be carried by that railway will require large quantities of freight cars and locomotives. It is not a trifling matter to equip a railway with sufficient freight facilities to carry a traffic such as has been produced along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and as will no doubt be produced along this line. And when you count the cost of the locomotives, freight cars and other equipment, I do not think that $5,000 or $6,000 per mile would be an unreasonable sum to expend in that way. Then when you come to realize on your bonds, what do you find? I do not care how strong a company may be, or what may be its prospects, these bonds cannot be sold except at a considerable discount. Even bonds that bear the guarantee of the Manitoba government, when brought to the English market, have to be sold at a very substantial discount. I am not at liberty to say, but have been credibly informed what the extent of that discount is. If you undertakae to sell the bonds of a company with the brightest prospects in the world, in the English or any other market, not guaranteed by any government, and you have to submit to a still larger discount. I do not believe that $25,000 of bonds will more that suffice to furnish the money necessary to construct and equip a road of this character, as it ought to be. Having that opinion, I did not think I should ask the committee to make any reduction of the bonding powers.

I would suggest that the following words be added to the last line of the fourth clause: 'Should not at any time exceed $25,000 per mile on the government line of railway authorized to be constructed under this Act.' That will exclude the application to lines chartered under previous legislation and not chartered under this.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would call attention to the fact that there is a section of the road from Winnipeg to the Northwest not authorized to be constructed under this Act, but under a former Act, which, possibly, is re-enacted by this Bill. I refer to the forty miles running north-west from Winnipeg.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend Mr. Hughes, (Victoria) will look at the sub-clause of section 1, he will find there mentioned and described all the lines authorized by this Act. The previous Act which he has in mind authorizing the construction of a line from Winnipeg West would also authorize the issue of bonds, and under that they could issue bonds without further legislation from us.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Possibly that Act is being revived by this Bill?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is no reference to it or to this piece of road.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 4.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The language of this clause seems peculiar. It does not authorize the company to mortgage its railway, but authorizes it to mortgage vessels, hotels, terminals and other property required for use in connection with the undertaking of the company. If the intention is to empower them to mortgage this railway, the language seems peculiar. It may be that power is given to them to mortgage the railway under some other section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I understand the section to mean that, covering any subsidiary undertakings they may take up, such as the building of hotels, &c., their total power of bonding for all purposes in connection with their undertaking under this Act shall not exceed $25,000 a mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have power to mortgage the railway under some other statute?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. But this is their own language.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If they are satisfied with it, I suppose we must be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am satisfied with it because it limits—I am not framing this legislation.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 16) respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Douglas.

On section 1.

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to present here the resolution in amendment of which I gave notice the other evening, and which is to this effect—I wish to have inserted in this section the following, 'the company shall construct in the year 1902 thirty-five miles, and thirty-five miles in each and every year thereafter, including the year 1906.' I do not wish to take up time in discussing this matter for it was discussed fully in the Railway Committee. I brought this resolution up in the Railway Committee and they saw fit to disagree with me. Still I think it nothing but right to move it in the House. This company is in a different position from any other company that has come before the House asking for legislation. The Manitoba and North-western Railway Company was chartered in 1882, just 20 years ago. I have here copies of the statutes that were passed at that time and subsequently relating to this company. I find that in 1884, the company came back and received an extension of time. It was provided, however, that fifty miles of road should be built each and every year so long as the extension of time lasted. On the understanding that this would be done, a great many settlers went in on the proposed line. There was, in effect, a contract, with three parties to it—parliament, the promoters and the settlers. The settlers going in there figured that, under the arrangement made by parliament, the railway would reach them in a certain time. But the company did not build fifty miles a year—they did not built anything a year. At the end of the time to which their powers had been extended, they came and asked for another extension. Parliament in its wisdom, saw fit to give them a further extension, but inserted a clause in the Bill providing that the company should build twenty miles of road in each and every year. They came back again a few years after that, after they had built, I think, about 20 miles, and they got another extension of time for nine years, if I remember right, with the provision that they were to construct something like 20 miles a year. In an Act respecting the Manitoba and North-western Railway Company of Canada I find the following:

Section 2 of the Act passed in the 51st year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter 86, is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor:

The company shall complete during the calendar year 1890, the 17 miles of railway to the west of Saltcoats, in the territory of Assiniboia, partially constructed by it during the year 1889; and, in addition, the company shall complete not less than 20 miles of its railway, as described by the Acts relating to the company, on or before the 31st day of December, in the year 1892, and also during each calendar year thereafter, to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council; otherwise the power granted to the company to extend its line of railway then completed shall be forfeited.

Now, they came back again in 1893 and got a further amendment to their charter which provided that they should build as much of the road as the Governor in Council should prescribe. That was something like nine years ago, and there has not been one foot of road built there from the time they got that charter to the present time. It is true, we are told this is not the same company. The Canadian Pacific Railway only got control of this road three or four years ago. That is true, but at the same time when the Candian Pacific Railway bought this charter, as I believe they did, and when they took over this road, they took it over subject to these conditions. They knew the conditions and knew they ought to be fulfilled, and therefore when they took it over they had no right to assume they could get an extension of time, and I think they should have shown their bona fides by building twenty miles a year for each year, and as this was four years ago, there would have been eighty miles built now. Two years ago they came back to parliament and asked for an extension of time. The Bill came before the Railway Committee and was rejected, because they had not built any road at all. They came back this year without having constructed any road at all, and the committee has given them an extension of time for another five years. They told the committee, and I believe they informed the gentleman who is handling the Bill, that they had let a contract for thirty-three miles. Well, my eyesight may be very bad, but I don't see anything about thirty-three miles in this Bill. I suppose the hon. gentleman that is handling the Bill knows more about it than I do, but there is not a word about it here. It may be on the back of it, but it is not in the Bill. I would like to be sure that we are going to get something done this year. Surely after this charter has been in existence for twenty years it is not a fair proposition to give them five years more, saying they must commence in two years and complete in five. As I understand this Bill, they might build one mile this year, and then they would have five years more to complete that road; and if they did not do it they could come back and ask for another extension

of time. The argument has been used that there were no settlers along that line. I say that there are a great many settlers going in there; but if there was not one settler there, the fact that immigration is pouring into that country at the present time necessitates the opening up and developing of all the vast portions of the country. This railroad charter runs through one of the most fertile portions of the North-west Territories; it covers 230 miles of the finest lands in the Saskatchewan valley. We know that immigration has turned in the direction of the Saskatchewan valley, and I want to ask the House if it is fair to tie up that district for five years by giving a charter of this kind without something being in the charter to provide that a certain amount of work should be done within a given time. If you provide that thirty-five miles should be built each year the settlers will go in there on the strength of that provision, for they will know that the company is compelled to build a certain amount of road every year. If you do not do that, you are going to injure that district. They say that they have already promised to build thirty-three miles, and if they want to hold this charter for such a length of time, they should be prepared to construct thirty-five miles this year, and thirty-five miles each subsequent year, including 1906.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 59) respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. McCormick.

Bill (No. 62) respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

Bill (No. 66) respecting La Compagnie du chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.—Mr. Lemieux.

PACIFIC NORTHERN AND OMENICA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Pacific Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—Mr. Morrison.

On section 12,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask why it is that the amount of the bonding powers are so large—$30,000 a mile. It is rather unusual.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The matter was considered in the Railway Committee and we felt that we had very little data to go upon to enable us to form a judgment as to what would be the approximate cost of railway construction in that country. I take it that this will be an electric tramway, and the plant for such a purpose, getting in the rails, wages, and all the expenses incidental to the constructing, operating and equipping of railway there, are out of all comparison with what they would be in eastern Canada. We know that. We had occasion to examine into the question of the rates from the White Pass Railway not very long since and our officers had detailed information in reference to the cost of things there, showing that it was enormous as compared with the cost of the same articles in this part of the country or throughout our own North-west. The sum of $30,000 a mile I think would not be an exorbitant sum. I think they would require it—or at least they would require the proceeds of that amount in order to equip and complete their road.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

COSMOS COTTON COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company.—Mr. Flint.

On section 7,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why was the special provision stricken out of this Bill, that the majority of the corporation should be subjects of His Majesty.

Mr. FLINT. This is frequently done in private Bills at the request of promoters, and the committee felt that it was very proper in this case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have not heard of it before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been done, but I do not know why.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Can the promoter of this Bill give one instance out of the numerous cases in which it has been done. My memory is that the practice of late years has been the very reverse.

Mr. FLINT. I imagine that three out of every five private Bills have this clause. Based on broad ground, there is really no reason for the prohibition. At present such an enormous amount of foreign capital is invested in our enterprises that it is only proper that occasionally it should be provided that the directors need not be British subjects.

On section 8,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This clause gives the directors the power. I think that power should be in the stockholders.

Mr. FLINT. The next clause provides for that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The next clause requires the consent of the shareholders of

the other company to sell, but that has not the slightest application to section 8. Under section 8 one company can do this with the consent of the board of directors but they must have the consent of the shareholders of the other company.

Mr. FLINT. The main object of this is to purchase the assets of the other company. This is quite an ordinary clause and is on the line of similar clauses in other private Bills. I really do not understand how any one can be injured in any way by this clause. The Bill was considered very carefully in the committee and no objection was taken to it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When they come to purchase it requires the consent of every shareholder of the company purchased, but the purchasing company can do so without the consent of any shareholder.

Mr. WADE. Care is taken to safeguard the rights of the old company by requiring the consent of its shareholders to the sale, but if you were to put in any provision requiring the consent of the stockholders in the present company there might be difficulty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not an unusual provision to enable the company to pay for property purchased by stock instead of money. Probably the objection of my hon. friend from Lanark is because we are enabling the purchase of a large property to be made without the consent of the shareholders.

Mr. FLINT. I do not think that any difficulty need be anticipated on that account. The rights of the old company are safeguarded by requiring the consent of the shareholders, and the directors of the present company are simply authorized to issue paid up stock to the extent of the value of the property which they may purchase from the old company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not wish to offer any objections for the purpose of delaying the Bill. If the hon. gentleman wants to consult any one with reference to it, we will consent to pass the Bill through the committee, but not allow the third reading until another day. In the meantime my hon. friend may look into the matter, and we can see whether any amendment be required on the third reading.

Bill reported.

THE ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Ross Rifle Company.—Mr. Thompson.

On clause 8, subsection 2,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This section provides :

> The aggregate amounts borrowed shall not at any time be greater than seventy-five per cent of the actual paid up stock of the company, but this limitation shall not apply to commercial paper discounted by the company.

This is the first time I have seen such a clause in any private Bill. What does it mean ? There seems to be no limitations at all to the borrowing powers. Who is the member of the government in charge of private Bills ? This simply means that they can borrow as much as they like.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So can any company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that we ought to treat this question of the borrowing powers of companies in quite so frivolous a manner. Instances both here and in the old country will readily occur to the mind of every hon. gentleman showing the necessity of some restraint in the matter of borrowing powers of private companies. Some member of the government should be ready to answer questions put from this side of the House with regard to these matters. This question of incorporated companies should not be treated as if it had only a humourous side.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I understood the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) to call attention to the borrowing powers given to the company under this clause. The committee unanimously agreed to the grant of these powers and we have not heard any reason advanced why the decision of the committee should be changed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If there is no limitation of the borrowing powers, what is the use of this clause ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think there are some limitations.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what respect ?

Mr. RUSSELL. The clause, it seems to me, is not an unreasonable one. I understand the limitation to be a limitation upon their making a permanent loan on the strength of stock. This is a commercial company; it will be buying and selling, and it will have notes given it which, in the aggregate, may be more than the whole amount of the stock. It is provided that notes of that sort which are discounted with the bank, and which are held against goods supplied by them, shall not be included in the proportion of their borrowing, based upon their capital stock. It seems a reasonable clause, and the limitation seems a proper one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see the object of restricting it in one way only. I want to understand what the clause means, and I do not intend to enact it until I do understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suppose the promoters would be satisfied to have it struck out.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This is the rule adopted by this parliament and in use for many years, in relation to joint stock companies. It has been applied in almost all Bills that have gone through. Personally, I never did agree with it, and do not agree with it now. But, until our general method of legislation in these matters is changed, I suppose this will be carried through in these special charters. There is this limitation of borrowing on debentures in the cases of borrowing in all commercial companies. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) knows better than I do that it is a limitation in the Joint Stock Companies Act. As to this point with regard to commercial paper, I suppose the solicitor put it in to avoid doubt. But all companies can borrow all the money they can get the banks or other people to lend them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But this phrase 'commercial paper' is a new phrase in legislation so far as I know. I do not know what the phrase means.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think there is no ambiguity in the expression, for it is an expression in general use, and the meaning is well understood. There is a clear distinction in everybody's mind between a debenture or bond issued by an incorporated company and business paper of that company, and it is that distinction which this section, I apprehend, is meant to deal with. My hon. friend the senior member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) asks the principle upon which this limitation of 75 per cent was introduced. Almost every one of these companies' Acts, both English and Canadian, contains such a limitation as this. I think the precise limitation in England is just this 75 per cent; I know it is in many of the provinces. I think parliament desired that there should be a limitation placed upon the formal and more solemn—if you may so describe it—obligations issued by the company, which go into the hands of investors and are held for a term of years, and obligations that are made to-day and that mature in a few weeks or months, and which are closely watched and turned over and over. I think there is reason why the enduring obligations in the form of bonds issued by the company should not be unlimited, and if there is to be a limitation, it is not unreasonable, I think, that it should be in the neighbourhood of this 75 per cent. People that would be asked to invest in these bonds would have a guarantee by reason of this legislation that three-quarters only of the capital could be encumbered by the issue of these bonds.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the statute is concerned, the expression 'commercial paper' is mere slang, and nothing else. In the ordinary way of public business the expression 'commercial paper' may be used among business people, but these words are not used in statutes. The expression that should be used is 'negotiable paper' or something of that kind, or 'bills of exchange, or promissory notes,' but commercial paper' does not seem to be a very apt phrase to use in a statute. However, it is a matter of good taste, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend will admit that there is a legal slang in use as there is what we call a journalistic slang. But these words 'commercial paper' I find in the authorities. In a work entitled :

White, 'Treatise on Canadian Company Law :'

Section 40. The language of this section requires that before commercial paper is issued by the company the board of directors should pass a by-law designating which officers of the company shall sign such paper on behalf of the company. . . . . The practice is to pass a general by-law in regard to all commercial paper, designating the officers who are authorized to sign and execute these documents.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I said was that I thought it was slang so far as the statute is concerned. I do not suppose my hon. friend would care to employ in a statute he was drafting every expression that could be found in a text book. I think if he will consult modern works on the drafting of statutes he will find that any principle of that kind would be rather dangerous. I admit that the expression 'commercial paper' is used among business people, and may be used in text books ; but when you wish to be exact as you should be in a statute, it is not a very proper expression to use.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is a mere question of drafting. The first part of this section provides merely that the company shall borrow on its own security, that is to say, by way of mortgage, and the limitation is put of 75 per cent of the paid up capital stock of the company. With respect to their issue of commercial paper, to an unlimited amount, I think that is quite proper, because it is a well settled principle with us that commercial companies can issue negotiable paper to an unlimited extent. That is a mere matter to be settled as between themselves and their creditors. These words are used in this Bill to eliminate any doubt that might exist on the subject, and that is the only justification I can find for their occurrence here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The limitation here is not to the extent or 75 per cent of the value of the property mortgaged, but it is a limitation to 75 per cent of the paid up capital of the stock, or something of that kind. The two things do not seem to have very much relation to each other. I can see the force of the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, but the statute does not seem to be in that form.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think if my hon. friend will read it over again he

will not find it open to his criticism. It would be restricted as a matter of course, because subsection 2 provides that they shall not go beyond 75 per cent of the paid up capital stock of the company. It comes to the same thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hardly think so, because 75 per cent or the paid up capital of the stock of the company might be much more or less than 75 per cent of the value of the property mortgaged.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

INDIAN RIVER RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) moved that the amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 14) to incorporate the Indian River Railway Company, be agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill will explain what the amendments are.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) is not here. But I understand that the amendment added to section 11 provides that this railway, which is only 20 miles long, may transfer its franchises, and that without this amendment it would be practically impossible to operate that railway successfully. The intention is to enable these corporators to hand over the franchises and privileges of the company to either one of the three or four railway companies mentioned in the amendment.

Motion agreed to, and amendments agreed to.

THE WINDSOR AND DETROIT UNION BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. CALVERT (for Mr. Cowan) moved that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 24) respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company be agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill explain what is the purport of the amendment?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The clause inserted by the Senate is similar to the clause which was adopted in another Bill, during the present session, of an almost similar character. We provided in that clause that the work should be commenced within two years after an Act of congress is passed. But there is a limitation providing that if such consent is obtained within five years after the passing of this Act, this legislation should be null and void. The same reasons which warranted us in passing this section in the other case would sufficiently justify us in adopting the amendment of the Senate in this case. I do not know any reason why there should be any difference between the two. It only happens that the one came before us in this form and the other came before us in the other form.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It provides apparently that the work shall be commenced within two years after the Act of congress, or after the executive of the United States, or other competent authority, has consented, or approved of the work, but the period shall not exceed five years in all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We added that in committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And that the work must be completed within five years after its commencement ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think that in the other Bill, there is a provision, not for the commencement of the work, but that the work shall be completed within a certain time after obtaining the consent of the American authorities to the building of the bridge.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They had the other Bill when this amendment was made and it is taken from that.

Motion agreed to, and amendment concurred in.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Huron and Erie Canal Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 95) to incorporate the Penny Bank.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

QUESTIONS.

POSTMASTER AT McDONALD'S CORNER, QUEEN'S, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. Why was Hiram Humphrey, postmaster at McDonald's Corner, Queen's County, N.B., removed from that position ?

2. Upon whose recommendation was his successor appointed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Because of political partisanship.

2. The Hon. A. S. White.

CONTRACT WITH A. I. AUGER, QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Has the government given a contract to A. I. Auger, of Quebec, for spruce planks of 2 x 6

and 7 and 8 feet in length at a cost of $11.50 per thousand feet ?

2. Did the government call for public tenders before granting the said contract ?

3. What quantity of such planks should the said A. I. Auger furnish according to his contract ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We cannot find any such contract in the department.

I.C.R.—DITCHING.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

Is the Department of Railways and Canals aware that damages have been caused to the lands of the farmers, particularly in Temiscouata, by the fact that the ditches along the line of the Intercolonial Railway have not, for several years back, been dug out ? If so, is it the intention of the honourable minister to give strict orders that the digging out of those ditches be, during this most favourable season, proceeded with as soon as possible ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The Department of Railways is not aware that damage has been caused particularly in Temiscouata county by the fact that ditches have not been cleaned out for several years back. The officials of the railway looked into this last season and it could not be seen that any ditching was necessary.

It is the intention to make the usual and customary examination of the ditches and to have any necessary work done after the working season begins.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—REPRESENTATION.

Mr. CLARKE—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. To what number of representatives in the House of Commons of Canada was each of the provinces of the Dominion found to be entitled, and given, as a result of the census taken in 1891 ?

2. To what number of representatives in the House of Commons of Canada is each of the provinces of the Dominion entitled as a result of the census taken in 1901 ?

3. What number of representatives will each such province be given in the House of Commons of Canada, as a result of the census taken in 1901 ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This question is premature and cannot be answered now.

NORTH-WEST RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. What number of acres of land have been, to date, patented to railway companies, other than the C.P.R., and C. & E. companies ?

2. What areas of lands which have been earned by such companies and by the C.P.R. and C. & E. companies, remain unpatented ?

3. Do certain of said companies and especially the C. P. R. company have lands held in reserve to fulfil their earned grants, which lands such companies have not signified that they will accept, and which state of affairs prevents said lands being acquired by other persons or otherwise disposed of by the government ? If so, what steps does the government propose to take to end this state of affairs, and when ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), I beg to say :

1. That the total number of acres patented is 2,027,128 acres.

2.

Name of Railway.	Land Grant earned and unpatented.
Alberta Railway and Coal Co..	11,374
Calgary and Edmonton Railway.. ..	479,043
Canadian Northern Railway	1,597,920
Canadian Pacific Railway	8,742,413
C.P.R., Souris Branch..	1,408,704
C.P.R., Pipestone Extension of Souris Branch	200,320
Great North-west Central Railway...	318,720
Manitoba S.W. Col. Railway	1,221,225
Manitoba N.W. Railway	876,326
Q.L.L. & Sask. R. & S. Co...	1,004,481
Sask. and Western Railway..	98,880
Total area earned and unpatented..	15,959,406

3. In all cases where land grants have been secured by railway companies, areas containing a larger acreage than the amount due the companies have been set apart by Order in Council, within which areas the companies are entitled to select the odd-numbered sections. Large areas have been selected and the different companies are now engaged making further selections. The government is urging on this work as rapidly as possible.

POSTMASTER AT CRATHIE.

Mr. SHERRITT—by Mr. Tolton—asked :

1. Has the postmaster of Crathie, Ontario, resigned ?

2. If so, has his resignation been accepted ?

3. If so, has his successor been appointed ?

4. If so, has he assumed the duties of postmaster at Crathie post office ?

5. Has a petition been presented to the Postmaster General asking that one Augustus Burchick be appointed postmaster at said office ?

6. If so, is it the intention of the Postmaster General to appoint him ?

7. Is it the intention of the department to grant a daily mail service to the Springbank post office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Miss Margaret Brown, postmistress at Crathie, has resigned.

2. Her resignation has been accepted.

3. Mr. Thomas Brenton has been appointed to the postmastership.

4. The post office inspector has not yet reported whether he has completed the transfer of the office to the new postmaster.

5. No such petition has been received by the Postmaster General.

7. The question of increased mail service is under consideration.

BRITISH ARMY PENSIONS.

Mr. OLIVER—by Mr. Scott—asked :

What are the rates of pension, under British army regulations, for disabling wounds, or to dependent relatives, in case of loss of life ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I beg to refer the hon. gentleman to the Army Pension Act of Great Britain, which will be found no doubt in the library, and in which he can get all the information on the subject of pensions.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—HORSES FOR FOURTH CONTINGENT.

Mr. OLIVER—by Mr. Scott—asked :

1. Are horses for the fourth contingent to be purchased in the North-west Territories ?
2. If so, how many, and at what minimum standard, and maximum price ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I am informed that a number of the horses will be purchased by the Imperial government in the North-west Territories. I am also informed that the minimum standard of size will be 14·2 hands. I cannot answer the hon. gentleman as to the maximum price.

IMPORTATION OF MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS FROM GREAT BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax), asked :

1. What are the quantity and value of magazines and papers published in Great Britain and imported into Canada for the years 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900 and 1901 ?
2. What are the quantity and value of magazines and papers published in the United States and imported into Canada for the years above mentioned ?
3. What is the cost of postage or express for transmission of magazines and newspapers from Great Britain to Canada, and from the United States to Canada, respectively ?
4. What concessions or arrangements exist between Canada and each of the said countries with respect to the importation of or postage and charges upon magazines and newspapers and are the conditions more or less favourable for the importation thereof from Great Britain than from the United States ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The department is not in possession of any figures which enable it to give an answer to the first three questions.

4. The terms and conditions regulating the exchange of newspapers and magazines with the United Kingdom were fixed by the Postal Union Convention, and those with reference to the exchange of newspapers and magazines with the United States were arranged by a special Postal Convention between the United States and Canada, both arrangements being prior to the present government taking office. According to the terms of these conventions, the rate of postage on newspapers from the United Kingdom is the postal union rate of 1 cent per 2 ounces, whilst the rate on newspapers and magazines entering Canada from the United States is the domestic rate thereof which at present is 1 cent per pound, if from the office of publication, otherwise it is the transient rate which is 1 cent per 4 ounces, and the rate on Canadian magazines and newspapers entering the United States is also the domestic rate thereof, which at present is one-half cent per pound when published in Canada and sent from the place of publication, otherwise the rate is 1 cent per 4 ounces.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). Perhaps I may be permitted to supplement the answer of the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), by saying that magazines and newspapers published in Great Britain or in the United States have been admitted into Canada free of customs duties under the present tariff and under preceding tariffs. As the magazines and newspapers are delivered free, without the formality of a customs entry, there is no customs record of the quantity and value of such magazines and newspapers imported into Canada from Great Britain or the United States for the years 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900 and 1901, except when imported in bulk. The value of such importations (in bulk) including fashion plates appears, according to the Trade and Navigation Returns to be as follows :

	From G. B.	From U. S.
1896..	$22,303	$ 82,122
1897..	21,618	100,011
1898..	25,695	111,020
1899..	28,151	102,000
1900..	27,589	107,340
1901..	36,775	113,444

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Return showing :

1. The number of seine licenses issued for the province of British Columbia for the year 1901.
2. To whom the said licenses were issued.
3. The number operated by those to whom they were issued, and by whom.
4. By whom those were operated which were not used by the parties to whom they were issued.—Mr. Earle.

Copies of all petitions, correspondence and any and all other documents addressed by any person or persons to the Honourable the Postmaster General upon which he or the department acted in dismissing, or which led to the dismissal of David Clinton, lately postmaster at Wellington, Ontario.—Mr. Alcorn.

MONUMENT TO GENERAL MONTGOMERY.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto) moved for :

Copies of all memorials, petitions or protests received respecting the erection of a monument to General Montgomery at Quebec, with dates ; also, copies of replies sent thereto.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no objection at all to bringing these papers down. I might intimate to my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) that the gentlemen in the city of Boston who asked from the city of Quebec the privilege of erecting a tablet commemorative of the death of General Montgomery, have withdrawn their application.

Motion agreed to.

I.C.R.—PURCHASE OF LOCOMOTIVES AND RAILWAY CARS.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto) moved for :

Return showing :—

1. Number of locomotive engines purchased for the Canadian government railways each year since 1st of July, 1896, and up to date, giving—

(a.) Date of purchase of each such locomotive engine.

(b.) Name and address of person or company from whom purchased.

(c.) Price paid for each such locomotive.

(d.) Whether tenders were called for in each case.

(e). How many of such engines were manufactured in Canada, and how many purchased in the United States.

2. Also, number of railway cars purchased since 1st July, 1896, specifying the kind of cars purchased, the number of each kind purchased and the capacity; the price per car paid for each kind, the place where manufactured, and the total number of each kind manufactured in Canada and the United States respectively.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There will be no objection to this motion provided my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) will consent to change the date to a more remote period. The hon. gentleman asked that this information should be furnished from the 1st of July, 1896, to the present time. If the hon. gentleman would consent to insert in the dates '1890' in place of '1896', I would consent to the motion.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. minister say 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman would have no object in excluding '1890.'

Mr. CLARKE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then we will say from the 1st of July, 1890.

Mr. CLARKE. Very well.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

THE ACTIVE MILITIA—TRAINING OF OFFICERS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, the system of training citizens of Canada for the positions of officers in the active militia should be such as would furnish the greatest number of properly qualified persons in each regimental district necessarily required, upon a war basis, at the least possible cost consistent with efficiency ; and that all needless hindrances, customs and expense in the way of any and every citizen obtaining such military education should be removed.

He said : In presenting this motion to the House I am merely carrying out the policy that I have for the last ten or twelve years advocated in this House, namely : That the cost of training the officers in Canada should be reduced to a minimum, consistent with due efficiency being maintained. It is well known to every one connected with our militia force that the trained officers are not at all numerous enough in that force at present. There is in fact a dearth of officers, and it is no secret that in fitting out the few regiments we sent to South Africa, there has been considerable trouble in getting properly qualified and trained officers to accept these commands. It was my intention to bring this matter up in its present form last year, but I deferred it in the hope that the unfortunate and prolonged war in South Africa might be brought to a close. In view of the undoubted approach of peace now, I feel justified in laying before the House and the country my views on this question. The subject is not at all new to me. In England as well as in Canada I have noticed a deficiency in qualified officers to command the men who have voluteered to serve. I have visited on various occasions military centres in Canada and in Great Britain, and I found that a spirit had grown up and had been perpetuated among the regular officers of the Imperial service and of the permament corps—a spirit of, what they themselves call superciliousness ; a spirit which must bode ill to any nation perpetuating it. The officer who is merely an officer for the sake of the position it may confer on him ; the officer who does not give his whole heart and his whole soul to the cause he is engaged in cannot by any possibility be a proper officer to lead men on active service. The Montreal 'Gazette' of to-day, commenting on a very carefully prepared article by the American Col. Charles W. Larned in the 'International Monthly,' says :

It is not, however, from the recognition of the long acknowledged merits of our soldiers, but from the admitted shortcomings of those who command them that the profitable lessons of recent warfare are to be drawn. Col. Larned finds the British officer of to-day pretty much what his predecessor was in the days of Frederic the Great—'without knowledge of war, without fear of death.'

This, as we all know, is an extract from Thomas Carlyle. I do not for a moment pretend to say that the officers of the Canadian permanent corps and the British regular army are not in every sense of the word brave men, but I say that they are not thoroughly trained to command in the face of the modern conditions of war. That there is need of reform is admitted on every hand, and my only reason for taking the stand I do is to insist, so far as it lies in my power, that the required reform should be carried out, not only in our colonial system but in the Imperial system as well, because it cannot be too well understood that Canada is a part of the empire and purposes remaining so. We all know, however, that once war is over, things have a strong tendency to fall back into the old groove, and I have no doubt that unless the sturdy, intelligent commercial classes of England and the empire take this matter up, in a year or two you will find the Piccadilly ring in full sway again, and the zeal for reform completely set at naught, and it is in order to do what little I can to bring about reform and prevent a relapse into our old staid condition of apathy that I take this opportunity of placing myself on record.

In the olden time—and not so very many years ago after all—the weapon used by the British was a muzzle loader, with a range of from 250 to 300 yards. Frontal attacks were then possible, and in such attacks the stern, unflinching bravery of the British soldier was unexcelled. As soon as the enemy had discharged one volley and before they could reload, the British troops were into them with the bayonet, and the British bayonet invariably carried the day. Times, however, have since then changed. In the Crimean war many of the British regiments were armed with the Minnie rifle, which had a range possibly 150 to 200 yards longer. This struck terror into the hearts of the Russians and largely assisted in the demoralization of that force by greatly inferior numbers of British troops. In the American war, the Springfield rifle was chiefly used, but the Americans also purchased a large number of the Enfield muzzle loaders. In fact, very few, if any, breech loaders were then in use. Now, take any record you choose of that war, take the record of the proprietor of the Ottawa 'Free Press,' Mr. Chas. Mitchell, who fought gallantly through it, take the record of any historian and you will find that they all bear out this statement, that with the muzzle loading rifles, having a range of from 305 to 400 yards, a frontal attack is out of the question, and it is absolutely impossible to capture any position by such tactics. In the Egyptian campaign, we find the same conclusion borne out. And I do not know that I can do better than quote from an unbounded authority, Henderson's History of the American Civil War, to show the effect of the old muzzle loading rifles on troops advancing in frontal attack.

And we must not forget that although in those days, a man could not load and fire more than two shots while the enemy was advancing against him, yet even then it was absolutely impossible for a frontal attack to succeed. Here is Mr. Henderson's description of how persistently the Northern troops endeavoured to drive the Southerners from their entrenchments, and how, though the Northerners were in overwhelming numbers, their attacks were repulsed :

> Morell's attack was directed against Jackson's right. In the centre of the Federal line a mounted officer, whose gallant bearing lived long in the memories in the Stonewall division, rode out in front of the column, and, drawing his sabre, led the advance over the rolling grass-land. The Confederate batteries, with a terrible cross-fire, swept the Northern ranks from end to end. The volleys of the infantry, lying behind their parapet, struck them full in face. But the horse and its rider lived through it all. The men followed close, charging swiftly up the slope, and then the leader, putting his horse straight at the embankment, stood for a moment on the top. The daring feat was seen by the whole Confederate line, and a yell went up from the men along the railroad, 'Don't kill him ! don't kill him !' But while the cry went up horse and rider fell in one limp mass across the earthwork, and the gallant Northerner was dragged under shelter by his generous foes.
>
> With such men as this to show the way what soldiers would be backward ? As the Russians followed Skobeleff's grey up the bloody slopes of Plevna, so the Federals followed the bright chestnut of this unknown hero, and not till the colours waved within thirty paces of the parapet did the charge falter. But, despite the supports that came thronging up, Jackson's soldiers, covered by the earthwork, opposed a resistance which no mere frontal attack could break. Three times, as the lines in rear merged with the first, the Federal officers brought their men forward to the assault, and three times they were hurled back, leaving hundreds of their number dead and wounded on the blood-soaked turf. One regiment of the Stonewall division, posted in a copse beyond the railroad, was driven in, but others, when cartridges failed them, had recourse, like the Guards at Inkerman, to the stones which lay along the railway bed; and with these strange weapons, backed up by the bayonets, more than one desperate effort was repulsed. In arresting Garnet after Kernstown, because when his ammunition was exhausted he had abandoned his position, Jackson had lost a good general, but he had taught his soldiers a useful lesson. So long as the cold steel was left to them, and their flanks were safe, they knew that their indomitable leader expected them to hold their ground, and right gallantly they responded. For over thirty minutes the battle raged along the front of the closest range. Opposite a deep cutting the colours of a Federal regiment, for nearly half an hour, rose and fell, as bearer after bearer was shot down within ten yards of the muzzles of the Confederate rifles, and after the fight a hundred dead Northerners were found where the flag had been so gallantly upheld.

I might refer to another battle, the battle of Sharpesburg, where out of 19,400 South-

ern troops, 5,754 were placed out of action in the short space of three hours, while making a frontal attack in the face of muzzle loading rifles.

In the present day our rifles have a range five times as great as those with which Jackson's troops faced the Northerners at the battle of Bull's Run. But no account seems to have been taken of the changed conditions by our British officers. In the face of this improvement in weapons, despite the great advantage of smokeless powder and the consequent impossibility almost of ascertaining exactly the enemy's position, we have seen in Africa frontal attack after frontal attack made by British troops. We have seen brave men storming the heights of Belmont—an acclivity steeper than the banks of the Ottawa river here—when they could have walked around the position, thrown up their entrenchments, and rested on the plains smoking their pipes, waiting for Cronje to be starved into surrender for want of food and water. We saw our troops advance on the Modder river in like manner. We saw them following the same tactics at Magersfontein, Colenso, Stormberg, and Graspan. To this blundering system we can attribute a series of disasters. British troops, whose courage no man dare question, advanced fearlessly in the face of rifles, with a range at least five times as great as those used in the American war, and that was called generalship. It is time we should realize that the strategy and tactics of the old days are worse than ineffective at present. Greater attention must be paid to scouting. Formerly it would have been safe to march across country, with a patrol 400 yards distant on each side, because that was the range of the enemy's rifle. But to do so to-day would simply make one food for powder for an enemy occupying positions a mile distant on either side. But our British officer seems unable to recognize the changed conditions. As Carlyle says of them : He knows how to die, but not how to lead. With a rifle having a range of 3,000 yards, the old formation is absolutely impracticable. To face a line to-day, with each man distant fifty yards, is a much more dangerous performance than it would have been, with the old style of rifle to have placed the men only a yard distant. But this evidently has not dawned on many of the officers in South Africa at present, and you have distinguished generals placing their men almost in close formation, waiting for the Boers to round them up, and then you have another of these unfortunate surrenders that have saddened the hearts of so many in the empire. I have an extract here from a western Ontario paper, and it sums the matter up in very terse form :

> In hand-to-hand fights the British have no equal. In brain-to-brain contests they appear to be seriously handicapped. Strategy counts in modern warfare. Our British officers do not appear to be strategists. We must honestly confess that from what we have seen of the Englishman 'just out' from England we have not been very favourably impressed with his tact or his abilities. We are of the opinion that the British army needs a thorough re-organization, based on promotion by merit and not birth. When that system is introduced in the army we may then expect to see capable and efficient service on the part of the British military forces.

I have pointed out, incidentally, that no fault can possibly be found with the British soldier. In the war in South Africa he has been the marvel of the world for the bravery, endurance and heroism he has shown. The British soldier has never complained, he has done his duty on any and every occasion, and wherever he has been led he has followed. Nor can any fault be found with the bravery of the British officer. I am free to say the British officer is a well-meaning fellow, as a rule, a very genial fellow. Still, the great weakness of the British army is the training of the British officers. No army hereafter can expect to have an officer for every half company and have his men within reach of his voice, or to have a sergeant for every section. Training in the future must be in the direction of fitting every individual to control himself, subject to an elastic discipline covering the whole force. And, in this very excellent article by Col. Larned to which I have already referred, it is pointed out that the logic of events has necessitated a further reduction, and, in the future, the fighting unit will be the individual soldier. With that conclusion any one who has studied the modern conditions will agree—that the object of the training must be to make each individual command and control himself, subject, as I have said, to an elastic discipline covering the whole body.

In discussing a question of this kind one is very liable to be misunderstood. My good and intelligent friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Hon. Mr. Borden), entirely misunderstood the tenor of my remarks in a recent discussion. And when an intelligent man and one accustomed to the discussion of these things, such as my good friend the minister is, will take one up wrongly—yet I thought I spoke very clear English—how much more easily may one be misunderstood by the uninitiated in the country, particularly when his remarks go before them in partial form. However, I trust that on this occasion there will be no misunderstanding. No one, I trust, will run away with the notion, for instance, that I am, in any sense, a pro-Boer. At the same time I want to say that the Boer individually is a splendid fellow. As I reminded the House a year ago, the Boer is descended from two grand races, the Dutch and Huguenots of France, and finer men individually, considering the opportunities they have had, it would be hard to find. And when they have received the benefit of British civilization and British institutions, when they have

learned to be free men in the true sense of the term, I am satisfied that Britain will find very few of her colonists more progressive and more loyal than these Boers in South Africa. I trust that the day is not far distant when this result will be attained. While a man may respect an opponent he fights with, yet it is his duty to take every honourable advantage of him, that is, it is his duty to defeat him as speedily as possible and bring the war to a close. The greatest friend of the Boer I maintain has not been the Hollander, it has not been even the Irish American. And on that point I may say that those on the British side in South Africa have the highest admiration and respect for the gallant soldiers of the Irish race who fought so nobly and so well on the side of Britain in that war. And they had a complete respect for any soldier fighting against them who stood up and gave them a severe fight. But they have nothing but supreme contempt for the so-called Irish brigade led by Col. Burke, who ran whenever a shot was fired against them. The Germans were supposed to be friendly to the Boers. But that is a mistake, because the people of German birth in Africa, whether living among the Boers or among the British were almost unanimously pro-British. One would naturally expect the sympathy of these people to go with the Boers because of their smaller numbers in this war. But, Sir, the greatest friend of the Boers to my mind is the badly trained British officer. We all know that Britain has never been loved by foreign nations. Rivalry in trade, in progress, in civilization and liberty have made Britain more or less detested by other powers, yet she was always feared by other nations because of her supposed prowess in war. But I very much fear that to-day, owing to the number of failures in the field in South Africa, there is less of that tendency to respect Britain through fear than there formerly was. However, with proper reform in the army, with better training for her officers, she will be able to keep the proud position she has held in the respect of other nations. Here let me quote further from our American friend Col. Larned some words that will show the solidity of Britain's power :

> No other power on earth could have placed an equipped army of 200,000 on another continent 10,000 miles away.

And he goes on :

> And for that matter what warrior on the globe can show a like record of endurance and glory in foreign climes as the British Grenadier who, from equator to pole, has marched and bled and conquered, founded empires, overthrown despotisms and made ready the ground for an imposing structure of equity, order, sound finance and peace.

These are the opinions of an American critic, and I heartily endorse them. And when the British army is properly trained, that is when the officers of the British army are properly trained, I am satisfied that the one weakness in that great body will have been remedied. There is a delusion harboured by many that an officer must be one of the aristocracy, that an aristocratic army is necessary to the up-building of a limited monarchy. People in this country will hardly have any such opinion. We have seen the sons of tailors, shoemakers and farmers rise to the proud position of Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain. We have seen these sons of the same class of men rise to the highest places in the commerce of the nation, and also in the church. I fail, then, to see why the sons of these same men, given the proper opportunity should not rise to similar positions in the army. As Mr. Hales, the very able correspondent of the Australian paper pointed out in an article which I see in the 'Montreal Star' of January 18th, 1902.

> I contend that there is nothing, or there should be nothing in a properly constituted army, to cause a man to lose caste by joining as a ranker. Put a gentleman and a farm labourer side by side in the ranks to-morrow, and the gentleman, if he is made of the proper material, ought to distance his opponent in every kind of legitimate competition. He starts the contest with all the advantages that an excellent education carry, he has knowledge of many things which must help him if he is an earnest soldier, knowledge which the farm labourer has had no chance of obtaining. If, with such a handicap as that, he cannot win his way above the heads of his fellows, win it fairly like a man, it must be because he is lacking in qualities which he should possess, and if he lacks those qualities the army is no place for him, because the Imperial army of the future must not be a hothouse for exotics. I would make no distinction. If the King's son desired to wear a soldier's uniform, he should first of all wear the humble dress of one of his royal father's privates. Why should he not ? Is it a badge of disgrace, a mark of dishonour ? Have not thousands of well-bred men all over the empire donned the private's uniform, and fought in it during the present war, and are they any worse for having done so ? Have they contracted any moral leprosy. Have they forfeited the right to call themselves gentlemen ? Personally I think not ; a gentleman can be a gentleman in a lance-corporal's uniform quite as surely as in a Field Marshal's if he is made of the correct material ; if not, then why all this talk of native superiority ? Is it the Bond Street tailor who makes the gentleman and the East end sweater who makes the 'Tommy ?' I don't believe it, I won't believe it.

These are the words of Mr. Hales, the very able correspondent from Australia, who has made himself a name throughout the British Empire in his criticisms of the Imperial army. Then we hear the statement made that the men prefer fighting under officers of the aristocratic class. I fail to see that that is the case either, and I maintain that the history of the British Empire shows that the men who fight under officers of their own class fight as bravely and as willingly as the men of any other corps in the

service, and the same is true of Canadians. However, I do not object to the officers of the British Empire being taken from the aristocratic class. By all means give them every opportunity; but first of all let it be required of them, as Mr. Hales says, that they should be equal in every respect, and superior in many respects, to any other type of men that they may seek to discipline. Let them be trained for the position of leading men, so that when they are placed in control of the lives of their fellow citizens they will not make the fatal blunders that have too often been made in the present unfortunate war in South Africa. A very eminent Dutch Reformed minister in South Africa, in writing to Mr. D. J. Malan, a pro-Boer of Wellington, Cape Colony, says :

> I believe those who keep this miserable struggle going are the pro-Boers of England, and the merciless Kruger clique on the continent of which Paul Kruger is the head. They have not sent their people (women and children) one cent as far as I know ; while the British nation is spending thousands upon us.

This is an extract from an open letter of this very prominent Dutch Reformed minister to a pro-Boer living in Cape Colony. Now, the British pro-Boer is a man who should have some respect for his own mother, he should love his empire, he should back his own people against the enemy, come from what source they may. He knows, if he knows anything, that the British never fought in a more righteous war in the whole history of the empire; yet the British pro-Boer, for the object of gaining some political point, or to uphold some fad, and yet realizing the tolerance of Great Britain, never misses an opportunity of helping the Boers. This man, Sir, I maintain is the most despicable of creatures, and as this clergyman rightly says, is no doubt the cause of the war being prolonged.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, the British pro-Boer has assisted the Boers in demanding a peace, which, in the opinion of the best men of the empire is not honourable. He has helped the Boers by condemning the humane action of the British in caring for the women and children of the Boer forces in South Africa. This is, I think, the first instance in the history of warfare where a nation which has conquered another has taken care of the women and children and thus relieved the enemy of one of the greatest burdens that any people could possibly have placed upon their shoulders. In this respect I have to point out that we find no commiseration from these British pro-Boers for the thousands and tens of thousands of loyalist women and children who have, since the month of October, 1899, been refugees, who have been encamped at various parts in the loyal districts in South Africa, refugees from the districts included in the war area of Johannisburg, Pretoria, Bloemfontein, Kimberley, north of Kimberley and the various centres where these people had, in thousands, to seek refuge in the concentration camps. You find no sympathy for these women and children on the part of these British pro-Boers. Yet, when you bring Boer women and children into one of your concentration camps you do something that shocks all these pro-Boers. In that way they have encouraged the Boers in the field and have assisted them in continuing the war. But, the British pro-Boer has also helped the Boers in arms by censuring the men to whom the British Empire owes so much in this matter—Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Milner, Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour. These men have been unstintingly condemned by the British pro-Boers. Money in thousands, I believe, has been expended by the Boer agencies throughout the world to create an adverse opinion to these men. But, on the other hand, it has assisted in creating a kindly sympathy for them in South Africa and other British colonies. By these actions I claim the British pro-Boer has been disloyal to his country because he has encouraged the Boers to continue in the war. He has also been disloyal by giving assistance to the enemy, by encouraging the demand on the part of the Boers that in consideration of laying down their arms they should have certain concessions granted to them in the way of independence or semi-independence. This, I am satisfied, would be regarded with the greatest antagonism by all loyalists throughout the empire. The Boers from the outset have known the terms upon which they could obtain conditions should they surrender. I am not going to speak of any negotiations that may have taken place at one time or another during the war for a settlement honourable to both parties that might have been reached, but any settlement granting the Boers independence, or semi-independence, free from British supremacy, free from the British flag, could not be tolerated by the British Empire or by Great Britain as a unit. This district, as I have previously pointed out to this House, is absolutely necessary to be held for Great Britain as underlying the integrity and peace of South Africa. Great Britain must have her naval stations and coaling stations at the Cape. Therefore, I claim that those who have been instrumental in encouraging the Boers in the field have been disloyal and are so still. The British pro-Boer also helps the Boer by holding out a helping hand of encouragement to those pro-Boer emissaries who have been roaming Europe and the United States. Then, he has helped the Boers in the field by slandering

one of the grandest of men. I refer to Mr. Thomas Atkins. The British soldier has been unstintingly slandered in this war. Foreign nations have not hesitated to charge him with all kinds of atrocities. I venture to say that not one case of outrage or atrocity from the beginning to the end of the war has been proven against the British soldier. On every occasion, so far as any definite record can show, the British soldier has conducted himself towards women and children with the same kindness that always characterizes the British soldier. He treats the enemy just as he would treat a fallen friend; so that, there is nothing in that charge. I can give instances—in fact I have given instances—where attempts were made to assert that unkindness and harsher methods than were necessary had been resorted to by the British soldiers towards these people, but I am satisfied that these assertions find no echo in the hearts of any loyal persons or of any persons who understand the conditions of South Africa. The Boers have also been helped in the field by those who have been ever apologising for Boer outrages. I do not say that the Boers have been outrageous towards the loyalist women. I am proud to say they also have shown that magnanimity of spirit that characterizes the races from which they sprung and from which the British soldier has sprung, but that they have been tricky, cowardly and brutal in the manner in which they have entrapped the British soldier no one can deny. They have again and again shown the white flag on one part of the field in order to decoy the British soldiers while they have had, on another part of the field, a force of men concealed ready to shoot down the British soldiers like so many rabbits. This occurred more frequently early in the war than during recent times. They have again and again held up their hands in token of surrender and as soon as the British would advance they would pick up their rifles and shoot them down. They have been allowed through the kindness of heart of the British generals to retire to their farms when they saw the British advance and, taking up their rifles, which had been buried, they have waylaid and captured British convoys. When they would be waited upon by a British officer they would place their hands to their hearts, look the British officer in the face and say: We did hear some firing last night and they went away over there. I could give instance after instance of this sort of thing. These British pro-Boers always have very great sympathy for that type of fellow. It is not my intention, in my criticism to build up that sort of man. My desire is to strengthen the bonds of the British Empire and the British army which has been weakened by the inferior training of the British officer. It is also my desire to make it clear that no one class in the empire is absolutely necessary to the building up of the empire, that no one class has a monopoly of loyalty to this country. To pass through Britain and to listen to many of these gentlemen who constitute a large number of the army officers, one would imagine that the English army officer was himself the great bulwark of the British Empire and that he had a monopoly of loyalty. I wish it to be understood that the inhabitants of the farms in the back parts of Canada, of the remote stations in Australia, in New Zealand and in South Africa, the rank and file, have as high an appreciation of their duty to the British Empire and as great an affection for the old land as the most highly titled aristocrat in the empire, and his good will and assistance are just as necessary for maintaining the supremacy of the empire as are those of any one on the other side of the water. In speaking of the campaign in South Africa, I may be permitted to point out that the departments—I trust the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will make a note of this even if I do not go into that point in detail, and specify clearly as I can the particulars—that were brought in contact with the British business heart have been successful. The mobilizing of the troops, the merchant stations, the transport of troops, the merchant ships engaged in handling the freight, the supplies, the munitions of war, the transport of these commodities to the seat of war, by that magnificent Cape government system of railways—all those services have been a success. I hesitate to mention the name of any one officer above that of another who deserves credit, but I will mention the name of Mr. Price the assistant superintendent of the Cape system of railways. All these departments connected with transportation, organization, rations, equipment, supplies, the management of trains and of ships, all of these departments which came into immediate contact with the civil, commercial and business communities, have been an entire success and only one department, the combatant department, has been found a failure. Do not misunderstand me, Sir, there have been found in the combatant department, in spite of the inferior system of training, men who have succeeded beyond all measure, men whose names will go down in history as having shed lustre on the British arms and men who invariably brought honour to her cause. In spite of the lack of training their innate adaptability has found vent and they have succeeded in retaining the prestige of Britain—names such as White, the hero of Ladysmith, French, whom I consider to be after all the most modern soldier, General Alderson, Lord Kitchener, Knox, Kelly-Kenny, Lord Roberts, Settle, Hunter, the Hamiltons, Brabant, Scobell, Smith-Dorrien, Dundonald, Pole-Carew, Rimington and some others. These men proved that, despite the dwarfing system of Great Britain, the greatness of the names which they bear have sur-

vived and that they have made themselves an absolute necessity to the success of the British arms.

I did purpose speaking in detail in reference to the treatment of the colonial officers by the Imperial officer in Africa, and when I refer to Africa I would extend my remarks to include the treatment of the militia officer in Canada and the militia officer in the old country, by the Imperial officer generally. No one doubts that there is a very bitter feeling between the colonial officers in Africa to-day, and the Imperial officer. That goes without saying. It is dwelt on in every newspaper. The Toronto 'Telegram' has a long article on the subject from which I read the following extract:

> The complaints which come from South Africa over the English officers' treatment of the colonial officers may be explained partially by misunderstanding and partially by the narrow intelligence of the worst sort of English officer. The cause of the trouble is deeper than the contempt of the Englishmen for the colonials. The real trouble is the arrogant intolerance which marks the attitude of the professional soldier toward the amateur soldier.
>
> This arrogance is a folly not peculiar to English officers. Hundreds of English officers are free from such a feeling, and Canada's permanent force has bred in many of its officers as fine a line of contempt for the volunteer officer as any Aldershot Englishman can display.
>
> It is not a question of old countryman and colonial. It is simply a question of brains or no brains.

The Toronto 'Globe' has also commented on this matter, and the 'Mail' published an article of considerable length in reference to it. These officers of the permanent corps have a kind of close corporation among themselves, and they fear that if any extension is encouraged in the militia it will threaten the permanency and the exclusiveness of their system. I have, I think, successfully explained to a number of those gentlemen that the result of the establishment of a large militia force along proper lines in the old country as well as in Canada, would be to immensely strengthen the hands of these officers, if these officers are what they should be, and if they are not, then they should be relegated to other walks of life where they will not be as so many pensioners on the pay sheet of the nation. I may point out that in the early part of the war, no colonial officer, no matter how high his rank or how great his experience, was given any post of command. At Belmont; at Gras Pan; at Modder river; at Maggersfontein; at Stormberg, there were no colonials, and there were but a few at Colenso, under Lord Dundonald. None of these colonial officers held commands and in many cases British officers of lower rank were placed over them. I trust that the Minister of Militia will take note of this. We have in Africa to-day, colonials who should be perfectly qualified to command these corps, and to command in action if necessary; but yet, there is not one Canadian in Africa who has ever commanded a corps independently in an engagement. Col. Otter of the first contingent was never entrusted with a command. He planned the Sunnyside expedition, furnished all the data in connection with it, but when it came to carrying out the plan, an officer junior to him—a very good officer indeed, and I have nothing to say against him—but an officer the junior of Col. Otter was sent to command the expedition, and Col. Otter remained at the base to play second fiddle. In the advance on Stormberg, that memorable night when General Gatacre met with disaster; a colonial officer who had been born and brought up in the region and knew its dangers, ventured to caution General Gatacre upon the blunder he was about to make, but he got his dismissal there and then. That colonial officer showed me the note from General Gatacre dismissing him from his command, because, knowing the region, he dared to point out to the General that he was taking a wrong route and that danger lurked ahead. Where ever you go in South Africa you will find that no colonial officer got any prominence or any command in the field. If the British officer is at all competent, the colonial officer is, by hook or crook, put under him. The premier of New Zealand has taken a very pronounced stand upon this matter, and I trust that our Minister of Militia will look into it. Mark you, I have not changed one whit in my belief that it is Canada's duty under proper conditions to continue to assist Britain for the protection of the empire at large, but in all such matters as this Canada should see to it that her officers are properly commissioned and entrusted with proper commands in the field.

I now come to the discussion of the Canadian as well as the Imperial permanent forces. We are told that any departure from the present system would be the breaking up of discipline. I dare say many hon. gentlemen in this House have visited the barracks of a permanent corps, and have seen some illustration of what they call discipline. Let us take for example how our young fellows attend these institutions, and I have a case in mind now which will illustrate what their idea of discipline is. Three sons of a family go to the city of Toronto; one enters as a private in one of the schools; one happens to be an officer, and the youngest attends the Toronto university. The private enters the school through a doorway guarded by a man with fixed bayonet; he is taken to the barrack room where he is made to sleep with a lot of fellows possibly congenial spirits and possibly not. His food and his clothing and his bedding are of the commonest kind. I find no fault with that, for if a fellow is going to be a soldier he should take soldiers fare. The other brother passes into the officers quarters; he has no fixed time to regulate him; he has not to turn his light

out and go to bed at a certain hour. If the young private wants to study he has to do so in a room where there are a great many others, but when the officer wishes to study he can retire to his room, although there is always more or less entertainment provided for him. The private must have his light out at a certain hour of the night the same as a penitentiary bird. Now take the lot of the young man attending the university. He lives where he wishes; he is a free man. The one is a young fellow with a desire to serve his country; the other is training to be a business man, but the latter is free and the other is not. I venture to say that the so-called discipline to which the private is subjected, unmans him and unfits him to as great an extent as the independent surroundings of the other tends to make him a good, and self-reliant citizen. There are 6,000 young men studying at the universities in Toronto, and I venture to say that they are better men in the end than if they were subjected to this so-called discipline of the military school. In the military school they call the rule and restrictions of prison life, discipline. Why, under the present ticket of leave system, the prisoners in Kingston penitentiary are not far removed from the discipline which the soldiers are subjected to in one of our permanent corps. The serfdom of the dark ages, they call discipline; the slavery of the old time and the subjection of the blacks, they call it discipline. The repressing of the human mind and of the human soul; they term discipline. The plebeian spirit which a great many endeavour to infuse into the people, (which we find unfortunately in the ignorant and the broken spirited poor) and the fawning of flunkies, that is what these gentlemen term discipline. They do not understand that anything which tends to unman a man, to humble and to humiliate him and to degrade him, is the reverse of discipline. Discipline to them is repression and not freedom. Discipline to them is fear and debasement, and not the ennobling or the uplifting of our fellow man. Their so-called system is control from without, without any self-control or control from within. One English paper speaking of the war says :

> Battles cannot be won without systematic training in the science of war. But what is the science of war ? The Boers have made successful war without caring a fig for the so-called science that Europe has been slavishly and systematically following for generations.

I maintain that history proves that where an equal number of free men have met an equal number of these so-called soldiers of rigid discipline similarly armed, victory has invariably rested with the free men. Read history from the earliest days to the present, and you will find that wherever regular armies have met irregular armies equally equipped, the regular armies have always suffered defeat. Long before this Boer war began, I pointed out to the general officer commanding in Canada, that unless the British tactics in the coming war were changed, disaster sure and dire would befall the British arms as it did in the African war of 1881.

The British system has the result of converting freemen into serfs or slaves, or men whose liberty is oppressed by so-called discipline. The discipline of these gentlemen belongs to the days when tyrants and divine right rulers held sway, which fortunately have gone by. It belongs to the period when manhood was considered a crime, when freedom and liberty were unknown, and human hearts ground down beneath oppression and repression. That form of discipline should long since have vanished from liberty-loving, self-governing communities. It survives only in prisons and similar institutions in the Dominion of Canada to-day, in the permanent corps, and in the British regular army. Let me give an illustration. Here are two young fellows in the city of Toronto. One is a university student, and the other is a private attending the school in order to gain his certificate. They both go to the theatre, and the one comes home just as sober as the other. The student sits up a good part of the night and studies and gets up and goes to lecture in the morning and nothing is said to him. But the other, because he arrived in barracks a few minutes late, is locked up in the guard room all night, brought before some officer in the morning, and treated with greater indignity than if he had robbed a bank. He is probably confined in barracks for a certain number of days. I remember in the old days, when our annual camps were surrounded by fixed bayonets, the young fellows used to break out at night on purpose just to start the guards and give them a run. I have often done it myself when a private, and when any of the boys got caught, they simply put it down to their bad luck. But there was always more disorder in the camp in those days, when surrounded by fixed bayonets, than in the camps we have had this last couple of years, where there are no guards except where the stores are kept. That goes to show simply that trained men can control themselves and that self-control is the highest form of existence.

A destructive critic, I may say, I regard as a nuisance, and I do not intend to put myself in that category. If I point out the failures in the system, I am always prepared to suggest a substitute. I have shown that I would give the greatest freedom to the young men in the permanent corps as well as to the young men attending the schools. To-day, when we want an officer to attend the military schools, what do we do ? We send in an application for such an officer to attend a course at the permanent schools at a certain time. Let me give an instance that came within my own experience last year, to show how this system

works. A young officer was anxious to attend the school, but his business engagements prevented his doing so at any other time than the beginning of the year. He sent in his application to be allowed to attend at that period, but a few weeks later he got an order to attend the 1st of November—a thing which it was absolutely impossible for him to do. He therefore gave up all idea of attending at all. Two days, however, before the 1st of January, an order came for him to go to the school, but of course not having anticipated this, he had made other arrangements, so that it was absolutely impossible for him to comply with the order. Thus he lost his opportunity. I would pursue a different plan. Instead of educating a limited number of men herded up together in a barracks, subjected to the indignity of so-called discipline—the discipline of prison repression—I would allow these young men to board in and around the city. They would then report for drill at certain hours, and go through all the routine in barracks necessary for a soldier to learn. And let me tell you, Sir, that two-thirds of the so-called training, practiced in the schools, is absolute nonsense. As described by a writer in the 'Free Press' of Saturday last—a gentleman whose name I happen to know, and who is an officer occupying a very distinguished position—it is 'absolute rot.' I would have these young men board outside and report themselves each day. I would not have them there as soldiers, but as cadets, wearing a separate uniform from the regulars. They would have to report at certain hours, which in itself is great discipline, as they have to get up in the early morning and sometimes walk miles for the purpose of attending drill. I would have them go through their drill and routine, item by item, and let them fill position after position. I would even have them in the lecture room instructing their juniors and doing the same work in the field. In other words, I would have our permanent corps officers occupy a much more dignified position. Instead of storming around the barrack yard and bullying a few poor cadets, I would have them occupy rather the positions of lecturers or professors in a college, and all this routine of scrubbing floors and making up beds, which it is of no earthly use for men to learn, I would do away with altogether, and let these recruits attend the schools as students, learn everything they could, and then go home. How is it now ? We have a course amounting to usually three months for the privates and non-coms ; then we have a course for subalterns of another three months ; then there is another course for captains and field officers' certificates, and commanding officers' certificates, and musketry instruction certificates. A man has to loaf around Ottawa five or six weeks in order to get a musketry instruction certificate, which any one of ordinary intelligence, and who has ever handled a rifle, could pick up in a day or two. Then there is the signalling course. But not one of these things is done systematically. A bit is done here and another bit there. The equitation course, the musketry course, the signalling course, the maxim gun course—all these various courses are scattered about, and instead of a young man being able to take the whole thing and go through it all in about fifteen straight months, he has to take them at intervals and breaks up three or four years in the work. All this instruction should be centralized. Let us have a school at Toronto, another at Ottawa, and so on, but have everything centralized in the one school. And I would have the young cadet enter at sixteen years of age or even younger. General Wolfe was an adjutant of his regiment, and a very good soldier, when sixteen years old. Nearly one-third of the men who stormed the heights at Alma were under twenty years of age. Nearly one-third of the men who stood in Wellington's veteran squares at Waterloo, were under twenty years of age, and had been enlisted less than six weeks. What we require is officers, and I would turn them out in unlimited numbers. And when they return to their homes you can always call on them again as part of the reserve. By having these young officers trained, you would have a large number of men on whom you could call at a moment's notice, fit to command your troops and trained in the best way possible. I would have discipline from within—the unit controlling himself, rather than hampered and hedged in by these so-called disciplinary rules of the school. I cannot do better than quote from this very able article in Saturday's Daily 'Free Press.' I happen to know the pen of the writer as well as the young officer who edits the column in that paper. The writer, speaking of an article in the 'Canadian Military Gazette,' says :

> These facts hold good under prevailing conditions. If the schools were as efficient as they should be, a provisional school would not be the most suitable and would not give better results, but as things exist to-day there is no doubt but the advantages are in favour of local training.

Some time ago, I took the liberty of making a slight criticism on the schools, which excited some attention, and I was charged by the minister with wishing to abolish the schools entirely. Far from it. Ever since I have been in the House—some twelve sessions—I have brought this matter up and endeavoured to bring about reforms. And I am proud to say that the reforms I advocated many years ago, have, many of them, been carried out by this and previous administrations. What I ask is reform of the schools and not their abolition. The writer in the 'Free Press' goes on to say :

This is an exact statement of the facts and the only difference is that in both cases it is drill, drill, useless drill—one on twenty yards square of gravel, and the other on a boarded drill hall floor and the lectures and everything else are practically the same. In spite of the fact that at Toronto and London there are large commons available for field exercises and ranges for practice, these are never used, but the time devoted to squad drills, company and battalion, including all those senseless movements which must be forgotten the moment fighting begins.

I trust the minister will note that these words are not from the man of the active militia, but from a gentleman who has in the past held one of the most distinguished positions in the permanent corps. He is replying to the 'Canadian Militia Gazette' which is edited by a very able militiaman, also an ex-permanent corps man. But one of these gentlemen takes one view and the other takes the other view :

An officer joining any of the infantry schools——

Listen to this Mr. Speaker,—

—is simply handed over to the drill sergeants, who, forced to fill in the time, wire off reams of detail or how to 'stand at ease' and 'turn to the right or left.' If they took him out and gave him some outside field work or musketry there might be some advantage in attending at the schools, but they don't.

He goes on :

The editor of the 'Canadian Militia Gazette' speaks of the 'discipline they learn at the schools.' What rot ! I suppose he thinks that visiting the men's dinners, dressing for mess, and seeing a few other obsolete customs gravely carried out in barracks imparts discipline. Bosh ! Of what use is it to the ordinary militiaman ?

This appears in the 'Free Press,' a journal supporting the government and it is to be found in last Saturday's issue. In support of my contention as to the manner of discipline from within I might point to our lumber camps. Throughout the length and breadth of northern Ontario there are thousands of men in these lumber camps to-night. There are no fixed bayonets over these men. Yet, you enter one of these camps and you find the order is as perfect as in room 16 or room 6 of this House. And the conduct of these men is just as proper as that of any member of parliament here to-night. Go into any of our railway camps where the roughest men in the community are to be found at work. Yet, in these camps where the discipline is from within, you find perfect work and perfect discipline. Only in the prisons and in the regular corps do we find this repressive discipline maintained.

On a previous occasion I entered into the cost to the country of the certificates given to these officers under the present system, so I shall not take up the time of the House with that to-night. But. I may say that if you figure out the cost for an officer to the people of Canada—regarding the permanent corps as an educational institution simply—you will find that it amounts to far more than $1,000. One year I found, it amounted to over $3,000 for each certificate. Counting the permanent corps as an educational institution simply, we find that the cost is a little less this year. But I wish to be fair. I do not want to abolish the permanent corps. They have performed good work in connection with the schools and in connection with what you may call police service. And besides they are the nucleus of an army in case we are called upon to defend our frontier. But we must not depend upon this as an army ? We must have throughout the length and breadth of this country men trained for the officer's command and non-com. officers' position, and they must be ready at any moment's notice. And I maintain that this can be done at infinitely less cost and for infinitely greater numbers than under the present system. I again point out that in these schools I would have these men assembled more as they are in colleges and would have the young men treated as free men. I would have them uniformed in a special cadet outfit different from the soldiers, and I would have them perform certain evolutions of drill, but I would not have them perform drill that this writer in the 'Free Press' is pleased to call 'absolute rot.' I would not have them waste time with such absolute nonsense as that, but would train them along the lines of a regular college. In that way we could turn out these people at a minimum cost and we should have a proper reserve of Canadian officers.

I shall not enter upon the details of the arguments advanced by those who believe in the intra-mural residence as against the extra-mural, nor upon the points of decorum or etiquette that these young men should learn. There are not many young men from our farms, and I fancy there are still fewer from our towns who could learn much in etiquette from these schools. Take the young men from our farms throughout Canada, to-day and, as a rule, for everything that makes up real etiquette, they can be placed side by side with our permanent corps officers. That is, even before they are trained. There are not many of them who eat with their knives, and fewer still who peel their potatoes with their fingers in these days. Even if they did these things, it would not take many lessons to teach them how to act in the company of such distinguished people, and also to impress them with the fact that they should be careful whether they pick their teeth with their forks or with their fingers.

Our good friend the editor of the 'Militia Gazette,' in discussing a former debate in this House, took me seriously to task for something which I never said. But I would call attention to the fact that every contention I made on the former occasion as

well as on the one I am making to-night is admitted in the editor's own article. He admits that the schools have very serious defects and are in very great need of reform. He admits that he has himself advocated reforms in these schools. And the only thing for which he criticises me is that I am in favour of the young fellows boarding out and attending as cadets rather than being inside and subject to this so-called discipline. On everything else that I said he agrees with me. Unfortunately, he accepts the minister's statement that my object seems to be to abolish the schools rather than to reform them. He takes that as his text, and upon it he writes the homily. In the same issue of the 'Militia Gazette,' I find an article by a young officer. It is signed 'Full Marks.' The writer concludes his criticism of the school in this way :

I have just procured a fresh certificate, but if Sir John——

Speaking of Sir John H. Macdonald, K.C.B., who recently delivered an address in Scotland.

—is right I fear it is of little good to me. I know how to open the breech of the Lee-Enfield rifle but have never fired even a blank cartridge out of it. I never saw the magazine of the rifle loaded. In fact, I could teach my men 'twenty-nine modes of forming battalion square' and 'changing the front of a battalion in line,' but am absolutely ignorant of imparting any instruction in the actual working of the rifle, because I was never taught.

And he concludes with the statement :

'But I am qualified.'

That is from one of the officers trained in one of the minister's own schools, and trained under a system which some are endeavouring to perpetuate in this country to-day. There are other interesting points in the young fellow's letter. But I point out that, whether you take the minister's own officers or the permanent corps officers, the testimony is the same, and I am proud to say that many of the permanent corps officers understood perfectly well that in what I said I was not criticising them. There are men in that corps who would be a credit to any nation. I was criticising the fact that some had received full colonelcies who were no more entitled to them than scores of others, both in the permanent corps and in the militia. That is what I was speaking of at that time and not of the officers of the permanent corps of that time.

In Britain to-day no one will gainsay the statement that the British government, in so far as the conduct of this war has been concerned has been more or less powerless in the face of the rings, cabals, sets, and cliques in connection with the army there. I shall illustrate that by reading an extract from the Montreal 'Star,' from the famous article by this Australian writer, Hales, an article which has attained exceedingly large circulation in the old land, and which has aroused much favourable comment. He says :

We have first of all to purge the British army of abuses, to do away with her old, worn-out rules and regulations. The British home-bred stock constitute the heart of the empire, the heart pumps the blood and vitality through the whole circle of our dominions, and the heart must be pure from taint of all kinds, if the far spreading members are to be free from corruption. To this end, the purification of the life-giving centres, our energies must be concentrated.

Now, will follow language which, if used in this House by myself, would have been termed extreme and extravagant. But it is written by this officer for the British public and the world public. This is what he says :—

To-day the army of Great Britain is rotten to the core, cliques abound, 'rings' are rampant, there exist 'circles,' and inside each circle lesser circles revolve in varying degrees of magnetism ; men are made or crushed according to the power of dominant parties, not in accord with personal merit. Read the life history of Colville, Gatacre and Buller, read the deeds they did for the nation in the field of battle, then turn the page and read their reward—not the reward of the nation, not the reward of the crown they served, but the reward of a clique, the vengeance of a coterie, the venom of a 'ring.'

Let in the Light.

Before we can hope to handle colonial armies satisfactorily, we must purge the 'home' army of all uncleanliness, we must make it plainly understood that a spirit of unbending justice presides over the destinies of every man who wears the King's uniform, no matter whether he be a simple private or a full-fledged general. The first thing that should be abolished is the system of secret trials. No good thing ever came from behind closed doors.

Let me urge upon the minister the importance of this matter—never to allow any one to influence him to condemn an officer under him upon a confidential report. I maintain, and I have always acted upon the principle that in the case of every officer in my regiment concerning whom I have sent a confidential report to the minister through the official channel, if it is not absolutely favourable to him he knows exactly what I have written. Never directly or indirectly did I ever send an adverse confidential report.

We Britons oppose that sort of thing in every other walk of life, why do we allow it in our army. If a man is accused of wrong-doing while wearing the King's uniform, let the charge against him be made publicly, let the witnesses be heard publicly, let him speak in his own defence publicly; then, if he be guiltless, let the shame of a false accusation fall upon the heads of those who are guilty of making it. If the soldier is guilty then let his disgrace be branded upon him under the gaze of the public, but once and for all time let us stamp out everything that savours of hole-and-corner work, for until this system of secret trial is abolished, no man can be sure of getting even-handed justice. It is useless to argue that an open court for soldiers would damage the service, that argument

can be advanced with just as much force by any other branch of the public service. If secret trials are right and just for the soldier they are just and right for the civilian. We must do away with the 'star chamber' business, no matter by whom it is upheld : it is a relic of days that are past and gone, and the secret trial must go with the days that spawned it.

These are words that cannot be much better expressed. I shall read now from a famous writer on British constitutional law, Dicey, pointing out the danger that exists in the old land, has always existed, and will always exist in any free governed nation, from a standing army. Dicey says :

A permanent army of paid soldiers, whose main duty is one of absolute obedience to commands, appears at first sight to be an institution inconsistent with that rule of law or submission to the civil authorities, and especially to the judges, which is essential to popular or parliamentary government; and in truth the existence of permanent paid forces has often in most countries, and at times in England—notably under the Commonwealth—been found inconsistent with the existence of what, by a lax though intelligible mode of speech, is called a free government. The belief indeed of our statesmen down to a time considerably later than the revolution of 1689, was that a standing army must be fatal to English freedom, yet very soon after the revolution it became apparent that the existence of a body of paid soldiers was necessary to the safety of the nation. Englishmen therefore, at the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth century, found themselves placed in this dilemma. With a standing army the country could not (they thought) escape from despotism ; without a standing army the country could not (they perceived) escape from invasion ; the maintenance of national liberty appeared to involve the sacrifice of national independence. Yet English statesmanship found almost by accident a practical escape from this theoretical dilemma, and the Mutiny Act, though an enactment passed in a hurry to meet an immediate peril, contains the solution of an apparently insolvable problem.

I want to point out that step by step the British war office and its satellites have gradually sought to remove from the Mutiny Act one of the safeguards that it was intended to convey to the free men of England, and we find to-day that the old civil officers of the war office are being dismissed and men under the absolute control of the commander-in-chief are placed in their stead. We find to-day, through the length and breadth of the regular system in England, that this branch of the service has obtained almost supreme control, that it can almost make and unmake governments, and that the Prime Minister himself is almost powerless to resist the influences I have just quoted.

Now, Sir, I have always been a great believer in the militia of a country. It was the militia that won the battles of Cressy, Agincourt and Poitiers in the old days ; it was the militiamen who won the battles of Waterloo and the heights of Alma—because, as I pointed out, a man who is only six weeks in the army is nothing more than a militiaman. It is men such as these that have won Britain's battles through the long period of her history. Therefore, from various view points, I am greatly in favour of a strong militia force. It is the only way to keep down militarism in a country, it is the only way, under our modern conditions, to defend an empire. Speaking of the militia, Dicey says :

The militia is from its nature a body hardly capable of being used for the purpose of overthrowing parliamentary government. But even with regard to the militia, care has been taken by the legislature to ensure that it shall be subject to the rule of law. The members of the local army are (speaking in general terms) subject to military law only when in training or when the force is embodied. Embodiment indeed converts the militia for the time being into a regular army, though an army which cannot be required to serve abroad. But the embodiment can lawfully take place only in 'case of imminent national danger or of great emergency.'

I would respectfully draw the attention of the minister to the fact that in Canada certain militia officers—I do not refer to the present general officer commanding—have claimed and still claim that an officer of the Canadian militia is at all times subject to the Army Act under the King's regulations. I need not again point out to this House the utter absurdity of any such contention, and I trust the minister will have backbone enough, in framing his new Militia Act, to remove all possible ambiguity upon that point, and that he will lay it down clearly that it is only when militia men are actually called out by Order in Council, or by himself, that they are amenable to the King's regulations and the Army Act. I trust that he will allow nothing in the shape of British red tapeism to influence him in framing his new Militia Act, so that by no possible construction of it will an officer have any control of a junior officer when he is not actually summoned out under the law.

Now, there are a great many weaknesses in any system of a permanent corps, but those, as a rule, are well known to those interested. I may mention, though, that in this country it has been pointed out to us again and again as a thing to be greatly desired that we should do away with civilian control of our militia and place the absolute authority in the hands of the general commanding. I have always opposed that, and I incurred the enemy of that great and pious man, General Hutton, on that very ground. That gentleman offered great inducements to many officers to bolster him up in his demands on the minister that he should be made absolutely independent of the minister as regards the discipline and training of the militia of the country. I pointed out to him that this was a responsibly governed country, and that the minister was the only man who should be the master in the premises, that the minister un-

doubtedly should be his master, and that the general should be subject to his control. I may point out that the system which he wanted so much prevails in England; I want to tell you that there to-day, in the British regular army an officer who has a grievance dare not bring it to his superior officer. Under the law he has authority to do so. It has been shown to them again and again that they have the authority, but they will tell you: 'O! certainly, we know that, but we dare not appeal under the law to our superior officers. The very officers who would pronounce us right in this instance would never forgive us, and they would regard our conduct as insubordinate.' One of these gentlemen who was labouring under considerable disability from a superior officer was asked: 'Then how do you obtain redress?' O! he said, 'my wife's aunt is a very intimate friend of General Wolseley, she is working the screws and it will come out all right.' There is the way justice is obtained, through rings, cabals and coteries, in the great heart of the British empire to-day. They have men that have given the world liberty, the brave bold men of Runnymede, those who have upheld the honour of the empire all through its history, are reduced to-day to getting their grievances redressed by pettycoat influence and back door intrigue. I trust sincerely that the minister will not allow any such influences as these to be potent in the Militia Department of Canada, but that he will stand out above all that and treat every one upon his merits and according to the principles of parliamentary government.

I have previously referred to the feeling of Imperial officers towards the Canadian militia. I have before me an extract from the Toronto 'Daily Mail' in which it says:

> The story is an old one, and in the history of soldiering in this country many instances can be cited showing how the air of superiority often displayed by officers in the regular service has been the cause of much bad feeling, and has led to an estrangement that has impaired the efficiency of the individuals concerned. Colonel Denison, in his recently published book of reminiscences, has referred to a number of cases in which this peculiar trait in the regular was the cause of annoyance and offence to officers of the Canadian militia, and it is no secret that among the Canadians who have returned from the front there are many who, although they speak with the greatest satisfaction of the relations generally existing between themselves and the regulars declare that their patience was frequently severely taxed in their efforts to preserve amity and concord. It is not necessary to go away from home to find a similar strained relationship, and there is no reason for its existence.

Following upon this we notice that Lord Roberts, himself, after the shooting of those Australian officers, of which I hope to have something to say on another occasion, was forced to come out and in order to placate the colonials after the gallant stand made by the Canadians at Kleinhart the other day he issued an order—I have not seen the order but it will not amount to much, I can guarantee that—to which the following has reference:

> Unstinted Praise.
>
> London, April 5—The gallantry of the Canadian troops at the engagement with the Boers near Hart's river, South-western Transvaal, March 31, attracts unstinted praise from the British press. Their comments form a striking contrast to the recently printed notification that the attention of Lord Roberts, the commander-in-chief, had been drawn to various cases where colonials who had been awarded commissions were treated as inferiors by the regular officers and otherwise made to feel that they were only members of the mess by sufferance.
>
> Lord Roberts, it was semi-officially announced, was making an investigation and intended to inflict the most serious penalties on any British officers found guilty of such conduct. Privately, and in letters to the press, many colonial officers have frequently complained that 'they are good enough at the front, but are not wanted at a Cape Town hotel or in a London drawing room.'

Personally I have no reason to complain of anything of this sort specially. I chanced to be a senior to most of these gentlemen and with that spirit of sycophancy and fawning, which I regret to say is a characteristic of the British officer, these men are always ready to fawn and cringe before any one who happens to wear an extra star or crown on his shoulder. The tendency of the British officer is towards sycophancy to a great extent but to those who chance to be of junior rank nothing could exceed the superciliousness of the British officer. This must all be changed. The British empire is going to hang together and the British officer must be taught that the empire is too great to tolerate conduct of that kind. Great Britain is going to hang together and the supercilious British officer must disappear. The late Cecil Rhodes, after the relief of Kimberley, had the same complaint to make. There were from six to eight thousand brother colonials who did not happen to belong to the British ranks but who were fighting for the empire just as loyally as those in the British ranks were. I am not saying one word against one class or the other. The colonials fell day after day and no notice was taken of them in the lists that were sent out, but when a regular happened to be bowled out his death was sure to be properly chronicled in the list. One day mule No. 6217 was chronicled as having departed this life because it belonged to the British regulars in South Africa, but those colonial soldiers who gave up their lives in scores never received a word of notice in the records from the commander in Kimberley at the time. The colonials form an important part of the empire to-day, they are as much interested in the welfare of the empire as the people of the old land, they are prepared to do their part for the maintenance of the em-

pire and it is just as well to give these gentlemen to understand that the army system of Great Britain to-day is not the British empire and it is not fit to stand in connection with the British empire. It is time that it disappeared. In the British organs items are appearing in the papers now-a-days apologizing for certain victories which were won by the Boers over the British. You cannot point to a victory that the Boers have won in South Africa where, according to the British officer's statement, the British officer was at fault. It was always Tommy, or the yeomanry, or the militia or the colonials. At Belmont, at Modder River, at Magersfontein, at Stormberg, at Spion Kop and at Nicholson's Nek there were no colonials. These disasters occurred and they cannot attribute the blame to the colonials. In this connection I include the British regulars and that type of soldier. We find these British officers coming out and saying: Oh, you know, Tommy is from the slums; we can't trust him. He cannot be depended upon. You cannot show an instance in South Africa where Tommy has failed them. They say: We will have to pay him a little more. We will give him a penny a day more, cabbage and some potatoes extra per week. These are the apologies you find from the British officer to-day and the suggestions he makes for building up the great British army. I hope the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence will listen when I say that we must make the system of training British officers inexpensive and one that will develop all that is good and noble in him. I would ask hon. gentlemen not to run away with the notion that what I say applies to all of the British officers. I have given the names of a number of very capable generals who have distinguished themselves. I would ask hon. gentlemen not to run away with the notion that all these British officers are of the lawdy-daw type—not by any means. There are hundreds of these fellows who would, if they were allowed by the system, devote their attention to the upbuilding of their forces, so as to make themselves fit and proper men to lead their fellowmen in battle. Men intrusted with the lives of their fellowmen should be properly trained and there are hundreds of these young British officers who would only be too anxious to improve their opportunities and their usefulness were it not that the system of repression, regimental messing and club work in connection with this institution drives the young man out of his regiment or forces him into a groove and he becomes a fit subject to be described by what is a general term in the old country a Piccadilly dude. At the beginning of this war General French, a man who has distinguished himself in South Africa, and who has never met with a reverse, was placed on the retired list because he did not happen to be of the school that happened to be dominant at the time. Many another good officer was placed where he would be of no use to his country until the stern needs of time brought him back again. Now, I have gone into this matter at more or less length but there are a few items which I have now here and which I propose discussing but which I will reserve until we come to the consideration of the supplementary estimates when we will have the opportunity of entering into the subject at greater detail than we will here to-night. I could refer to extract after extract from the leading newspapers of the country in support of the views that I have upheld here to-night—not only Canadian but English. I shall quote a brief extract from an article written by the Rev. Dr. G. M. Milligan, referring to a visit he paid to England last year. He said:

> I found quite prevalent in Britain the feeling that social favouritism is responsible for much hurt done in military matters. Unfortunately the evil is not dead against which Carlyle declaimed when he wrote. Where now are your Hengists and Horsas shooting partridges!'
>
> 'The flannelled fools' are those who make pleasure a finality of their lives. Such are a danger to any community, when they affect to discharge important functions.

I could quote scores of articles from the leading editorials published in the best English newspapers, among them the 'London Times' itself, a paper which is most favourable, as every one knows, to Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Alfred Milner in regard to the conduct of that war, but I have done enough to show that there is need of a revolution and that the old system of red tape must disappear and that British officers must be properly trained. We have the rifle shooting and the manouvering. These must of necessity be retained, but we must adopt some cheap system of training our officers and the only cheap system possible is the one I have pointed out. Star chamber methods must vanish. All these cabals and rings and sets; political influence and stock gambling favours and their attendant weaknesses must be banished from the training of the British officer. The manhood of the old land must reassert itself, and in case that one department of the British army, the combatant officers training, is reformed, then the old empire will be in a position to deal with the world.

> Go tell the world our watchword now,
> Let deep proclaim to deep.
> The crown that shines on Edward's brow,
> His sons right hands will keep.
>
> The empire that our fathers won
> Will still be greater yet.
> And on it as e'er shines the sun
> No sun shall ever set.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I am sure the House has listened, as I have, with a great deal of pleasure, to the very interesting address of my hon. and gallant friend

(Mr. Hughes). I had no idea, I am bound to confess, that the hon. gentleman's remarks would take such a very wide range. It would really seem as if his speech was one to be replied to by Mr. Broderick, the British Secretary for War, and not by the Canadian Minister of Militia, because his strictures were very much more severe upon the British army system than upon ours. I presume that my hon. friend was endeavouring to illustrate what he considers to be the evils of the conditions which he disapproved of in Canada, by the effect of them on Great Britain; more particularly in the conduct of the war in South Africa. However, the House will hardly expect me to undertake the task of defending the conduct of that war from the British point of view. I was glad that my hon. friend was able to admit that in so far, at any rate, as the work done by the non-combatant or civil branch of the army in South Africa was concerned, he thought it was admirable, and indeed that it could not have been better. I entirely agree with the hon. gentleman in that. I would be inclined to go further. Although I confess I am not a judge of such matters, and have not had the advantage that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has had of being on the ground, I would be inclined to hazard the statement that no nation in the world could have coped with the serious difficulties which the British nation has had to meet in South Africa, as ably as Great Britain has done. That is my opinion after having given the matter as careful attention as I have been able to. That mistakes, and grave mistakes, have been made there cannot be a question. But in the main, and in view of circumstances of the most extraordinary difficulty, I think the campaign has been well conducted.

My hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) finds fault with my having stated on a former occasion, that the observations he made on a kindred subject meant that he would wipe out the permanent force altogether. I did not intend to say that. What I intended to say was this : That the arguments which the hon. gentleman used were arguments which any one might use against the continuance of a permanent force, and I think any impartial listener to the statements made by the hon. gentleman to-day could draw no other conclusion from his arguments than that they were addressed against the system of standing armies and the system of permanent corps ; although he did say that he was favourable to the continuation of the permanent force in this country.

To come at once to the consideration of the question which more particularly directly concerns us, let me say a few words with refernce to our permanent force. Without making this in any way an excuse for existing conditions, if excuse be necessary, let me first say that the permanent force has been in existence in this country for a good many years; long before I became Minister of Militia, that the very officers who are outside of the permanent force to-day and from whose writings my hon. friend has quoted, were members of the permanent force not so very long ago; spent many years in it; passed through it and came out of it without apparently having discovered, while in the force, the necessity for any great reform. It is only after they left the force that they were prepared to make criticism of it. It seems to me that it would have been very much better for them to have addressed these observations during the time they were in the force, to their superior officers, and if they could not get their ear to have endeavoured to get the ear of the minister of the day.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister permit me ? The officer who is outside of the permanent force to-day and who was formerly in it, defends the system. I hope I was not misunderstood in that. All the time that officer was in the force he took the very same ground that he takes to-day and did not hesitate to let it be known. The other officer to whom I refer, I think, is in the permanent force to-day, and is one of the best men in it. I may be wrong in that, but at all events I do not want to get that officer into any trouble.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think I know the officer to whom the hon. gentleman refers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That officer is one of the best men in the force.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. He is an able man, but I think he is a bit of a faddist and somewhat extreme. As to the condition of the permanent force I must take issue with my hon. friend on the picture which he drew of life in the barracks. He compared the existing conditions in the barracks of the permanent force in Canada to the conditions in a prison. I dissent absolutely and entirely from that statement. I have had the pleasure of visiting all the depots in Canada except that at Winnipeg. I have been in the men's rooms ; have seen them getting their food, have been through the hospitals, have seen the men at their games, in their reading rooms, and I must say that I never met anywhere a more contented set of men than are to be found in our permanent force so far as appearances go, and so far as my observation could lead me to form an opinion. I have heard no complaints. The men of the permanent force in this country are average Canadians. They enjoyed perfect freedom before they went into the force; they know perfectly well what the laws and customs of this country are, and they have scores of friends outside of the force who, if they were being ill-used, would very soon make the fact known to the minister, or to

some superior officer. Nothing of this kind so far as I know has taken place, and it is therefore fair to assume that there is no serious grievance of the kind to which my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) referred. I think that the vivid imagination which my hon. friend possesses led him a step too far. If he had been content to stop at the point, which I think he was endeavouring to make: That the military system now in vogue in Great Britain and in the permanent force in this country, has a tendency to narrow a man's mind and ideas, I would be very much inclined to think that there was some force in what he said.

When my hon. friend says that there was a deliberate attempt to enslave the members of the permanent corps he is going entirely too far. We must not forget that in the British army and in the permanent force of Canada there is no conscription. The citizens of both countries are absolutely free to enlist or not, so that the system is entirely different from that on the continent of Europe, where conscription is the order of the day. It is not at all likely that men would voluntarily enter a system where they become enslaved. My hon. friend has found fault with the permanent corps because, he says, it takes too long for an officer to become qualified under our regulations. He seems to think that a man who wishes to become an officer has to attend different depots and different schools. If I remember right, this is not the case. An infantry officer can go to Toronto and become fully qualified, including the course of equitation, in from four to eight weeks, according to his ability and previous knowledge. I do not see any great hardship in that. A cavalry officer can do the same and so can an artillery officer in Kingston or Quebec. This objection of my hon. friend therefore is not well founded.

He also says that the cost to the country of every certificate to every officer in Canada each year is about $1,000. I have not made the calculation and am not prepared to dispute his statement. If he takes the total amount of money spent upon the permanent corps and divides it by the number of commissions issued, I do not know what that will give for I have not made the calculation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It was over $3,000 two years and it is now $2,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. But my hon. friend must not forget the work these depots are doing in the way of garrison duty.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did I not point that out?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The statement I took down was that each certificate cost so much money. But we should give the permanent force credit for the work done in garrisoning the different cities or places where these depots are located, and we must not forget also that these different depots are really the nuclei of an army in the case of sudden attack from within or without.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I have pointed that out.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Then we agree on that point. My hon. friend referred to the permanent force officers' treatment of the men who come in from the country districts and take a course at the depots. I assure him that any such conduct as he describes, I should condemn quite as strongly as he. Possibly some weak-minded members of the permanent force may be inclined to act in that way.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They do it not only to those who come in from the country, but to those who are their superiors in knowledge and position and everything else in this country except military rank.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If they do, it is a very strong indication that there heads are not very well balanced. I should hope that only a small percentage of the officers are guilty of any such contemptible conduct. Whenever I have had opportunity to visit the depots, I have always tried to point out to the permanent force officers that they are militia the same as all the rest, the only difference being that they are paid for their whole time and are expected to give the best of their time and ability to the improvement and assistance of their brother officers in the country districts. That is the true spirit which should animate the force, and I hope it is that which animates the majority. Because, we can never get the most out of the permanent corps, we can never really have an effective militia unless there is the strongest bond of sympathy between the permanent force and the active militia. The very reason d'etre of a permanent force is to help along and support the active militia. Otherwise there would have been no permanent force thought of.

As my hon. friend has explained his object in bringing up this resolution and as I have assured him that I shall give the greatest attention to his many valuable suggestions, and in view of the statement I have had the honour to make, and of which he has no doubt seen an outline in the press, with reference to proposed changes, I trust he will consent to withdraw his motion and wait another year, when, if we have not profited by the discussion which has taken place this afternoon, he can renew it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I warned the House when I began that I was likely to be misunderstood, and apparently have been so incoherent that my good friend the Min-

ister of Militia has completely misunderstood the views which I submitted to the House. He says that Mr. Broderick the English Minister of War would have been the one to reply to the strictures I made. But I pointed out that all the evils of the British service were being grafted on our Canadian system; and in criticising the Imperial army, I was simply aiming at the fountain head of all the iniquity. I cordially agree with my hon. friend, and so stated that Britain has no equal in the conduct of a war such as that in South Africa. I believe there is no nation in the world which possibly could have placed the men there she did in the field, feed them and maintain them there, but the mere fact that the men are well clothed and fed is no excuse for the incapacity of generals or officers, and is no reason why our soldiers should be buried in South Africa and the nation left to mourn their loss. Let the men be well fed, by all means, and well clad, but also see that they get the best of the enemy instead of the reverse, which has too often been the case in South Africa. My hon. friend took exception to my comparing the permanent force to a prison. I did not say that the discipline was exactly the same. I admit that it has a little advantage but not much over the modern system of discipline in an ordinary prison. But I say that in no other institutions, except prisons and the British and Canadian permanent forces, are men treated as they are, owing to the military discipline enforced in these services.

The minister spoke of the men in the permanent force being contented and happy. Well, the reply which he gave to a question I put to him not very long ago does not bear out his statement. I asked how many courts-martial there have been in the corps, and the hon. gentleman told me that there were nearly two in the year for every man in the permanent corps and that the number of minor punishments numbered away up in the thousands. And this is in a force of a few hundred men. I fail to see how that force can be well governed or happy when courts-martial and punishments are so numerous. In a school where the teacher has to wallop, on a average, each youngster three times a year there is something radically wrong with his discipline or with himself. The youngsters are always all right. Then, this takes no account of the number of desertions and the number of men who are up for petty punishments, for they are not recorded. Now, the minister puts words into my mouth that I believe I did not utter —certainly did not intend to utter. He would have hon. members believe I said there was an aim on the part of the permanent corps officers to enslave the men. The permanent corps officers are merely carrying out the dark-age traditions respecting the management of men, that have been handed down from generation to generation. And it has applied to all types of humanity. It is the only kind of discipline they know, poor fellows. Many of them, I have no doubt, would prefer carrying out a proper system of discipline, if they had been instructed in it rather than his repressive system. Then the minister refers to the point that it takes an officer too long to become qualified. But he must remember that, before an officer can go up for his certificate, he must have his non-coms' or private's instructions. He must come here for his musketry, he must go elsewhere for his signalling, somewhere else for his equitation and somewhere else for his maxim gun drill. My object would be to so arrange it that when a cadet comes up—and he would come merely as a young citizen of Canada—he could get the training at whatever place he was. And, moreover, he would be free to enter the school at any time he pleased, and not be obliged to await the whim of any officer in command. I shall not refer to the other matters touched upon by the hon. minister, as they are of no consequence. He agrees as to the cost of certificates, but I was particular to point out that in addition to doing educational duty, these corps performed police duty and also form the nuclei of a standing army for the defence of the country in case they should be called on.

Motion withdrawn.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What government business is likely to come up tomorrow ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are very few government Bills. If they are ready they will be proceeded with ; after that, Supply, the Minister of Agriculture proceeding with his estimates.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 15, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). In the absence of Mr. Belcourt, I would move seconded by Mr. LaRiviére :

That Bill (No. 107) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE ORTHODOX GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I beg to move seconded by Mr. Davis :

That the petition of the Right Rev. Tekon for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church be referred back to the Select Committee on Standing Orders for further consideration.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). I wish the hon. gentleman to explain the object of this motion.

Mr. OLIVER. The purpose of the motion is to secure further consideration by the Committee on Standing Orders of an application for incorporation made by the bishop of the Orthodox Greek Church, so as to enable church property to be held in the name of the bishop as incorporator. The Standing Orders Committee found on examining the advertisements which were required to be published in both English and French, that the word 'Bishop' which was used in the English advertisement in the 'Canada Gazette' was translated 'Diocese' in the French. For this reason I understand the committee took the ground that the advertisements were irregular, and that they were justified in rejecting the Bill. I am not complaining of the action of the committee, for no doubt it was within the letter of the law, but the Bill having been placed in my charge I think it is only fair to point out that the parties interested have spent a very considerable sum of money on the extensive advertising required, and that although the committee possibly was right in throwing out the Bill on this technicality, yet the applicants were entirely within the spirit of the law. They had complied fully with every requirement as to advertising so that all parties interested had full notice of the application. There was no mistake as to the application itself, and it seems to me that it would be fair for the House to consider the matter in its broader light and not throw out the application, thus rendering useless the large expenditure which has been made by the applicants, because of what was merely a mistake of translation, and which has no bearing whatever on the real purpose of the application.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There can be no objection at all to the incorporation of the Greek Church in Canada, and, I for one, look at this question in its broadest aspect. At the same time I contend that these things must be done regularly, and according to the rules of parliament. The committee has thrown out the petition in this case because the rules of the House had not been complied with in regard to advertising. But there are other reasons than that, which the committee did not go into. I shall cite one reason which in my estimation is fatal to this application. Here is a person living in San Francisco and claiming to be the bishop of the Greek Church of British North America, applying as the sole incorporator. In the first place he is a foreigner, and in the second place he does not live in this country, and according to May and all the authorities, no foreigner has the right to petition this House if he is not living in this country. That was not considered by the committee because the House had, through error in the first instance, received a petition which should not have been received. If I take an interest in this question it is because there are quite a large number of these Greek Church people in my own riding and I am satisfied, in fact I know that none of them have been apprised of what has been going on; none of them know what the so-called bishop in San Francisco is asking from this parliament. But, Sir, I look on this question from a broader standpoint, and I find that in the State of New York——

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. member (Mr. LaRiviére) pardon me if I ask him a question? Is he aware, whether the Galicians or Russians in his constituency do or do not belong to the Greek Orthodox Church, because if they do not belong to the Orthodox Church, the bishop does not claim any jurisdiction over them ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. There are a large number of Galicians in my riding belonging to the so-called Orthodox Greek Church. Others belong to the Ruthenian, and others to the Latin Rite Church, both of which are branches of the Roman Catholic Church. But I speak with regard to the Greek Church Galicians of whom some reside in my riding and some in my hon. friend's riding ; and I say that the Greek Church, which is now seeking to be incorporated, is a government church, that is to say, the official church of Russia. In the state of New York, where that Church is incorporated, it is incorporated only upon the application of the Plenipotentiary Minister of Russia. He is the person incorporated, because the bishop and other officials of the Greek Church are appointed by the government of Russia. Therefore there is more than the incorporation of this bishop involved in this question. There is the fact that we are asked to incorporate the whole Church, which is a State Church in Russia.

Mr. FRASER. Will the hon. gentleman answer a question ? That may be all very good when the Bill comes before us, but does he think that is a reason against granting the application now being made, which is that it may come before us ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I say that incidentally these other questions may be discussed ;

but more than that, the committee has found that the rules of this House have not been complied with, and upon that finding the petition has been set aside ; and I think it would be just as well for us to wait a little longer and study this question before passing prematurely an Act of parliament to incorporate a church which is under the control of the government of Russia. Another year is not long to wait, and then the proper notices can be given ; because we do not know this bishop from San Francisco.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). My hon. friend, by forcing the course which he appears to have forced in the Committee on Standing Orders, is preventing this House getting any opportunity whatever of studying the question. I do not suppose that my hon. friend thinks we should take the statement of a member of the Standing Orders Committee as to the merits of a Bill. If the Standing Orders Committee constituted themselves a committee for the purpose of deciding on the merits of legislation, and sought some technical ground to prevent legislation coming before the House, it would be very difficult for this House to get any legislation of that kind before it. According to the statement of my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), the Standing Orders Committee, no doubt in the strict exercise of their powers—I am not questioning that—have seen fit to throw out an application for incorporation on the ground that while the English notice was quite correct in form, the French notice had the word 'diocese' instead of 'bishop.' I submit that the reason and common sense of this House will not sustain that position. If the Standing Orders Committee took a position of that kind in regard to all the legislation that came before it, it would be impossible for this House to do business. I know nothing about the Bill ; I never heard of it until the hon. member for Alberta stood up a moment ago ; but I think the hon. member for Alberta should have an opportunity of going before the committee——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the hon. gentleman if the report shows the ground for the committee's action ?

Mr. FLINT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to read the report, as chairman of the committee, I will make that clear. The report is :

> That while the notices have been published for the full time required, they are irregular in other respects.

While on my feet, I may be allowed to remark that the irregularity was the one mentioned by the Minister of the Interior ; and another point that came up was that although it was not denied that the advertisement had been published, there was not before the committee a copy of the paper in which it was published. The promoter of the Bill stated to the committee that he could produce the evidence later, and the petition was thrown out with the hint that if he could produce the evidence later, the House would send the Bill back to the committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is what my hon. friend from Alberta asks to be done, and surely this House is not going to prevent any person who applies for legislation and has spent the necessary amount of money for the purpose, from getting his right because the promoter of the Bill did not have a copy of the newspaper when the committee met. I think I am within the common sense and reason of both sides of the House when I say that the committee should at least reconsider the matter, and later on, if there is anything in the objections of the hon. member for Provencher, the House will have an opportunity to consider them.

Mr. MACLEAN. Does not the whole question rest on the mistranslation of a word ? Two or three letters are dropped out, so as to make 'diocesan,' which is often used for bishop, read 'diocese' ; and I think the contention is well made that because of a mere formality of that kind, the Bill ought not to be prevented from reaching the House. These are growing times, and if there is anything we want in this country, it is more bishops. If we have not one from Russia, let us get one. Let us have free trade in bishops—I think that is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite—and the more of them the merrier.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is not the question before the House at all. I think it is the regularity or irregularity of a petition. If this House is petitioned by a foreigner, who is neither a British subject nor a resident of the country, I do not see how this House can receive the petition, or send it to the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. DAVIS. That question, according to the hon. member for Provencher, never came up at all.

Mr. SPROULE. The House is the only place to deal with it.

The PRIME MINISTER. The rule which we have invariably followed, as far as practicable, in every case has been to sustain the report of the committee, unless a very strong case be shown to the contrary. If I understand the report, the petition was rejected because of a certain irregularity in the notice. The report is as follows :

> Your committee have also considered the petition of the Right Reverend Tikhon, for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church, and find that while the notices have been published for the full time required, they are irregular in other respects.

I regret that the report did not say what was the precise irregularity; but I apprehend that it is not the fault of the promoter of the Bill if the report is not as full as it might have been. I understand—and there is no controversy on this point—that the only irregularity on which the Bill was rejected was that the word 'bishop' was translated by the word 'diocese' instead of the French word 'eveque.' This is the statement made by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). But that was not the only objection. Though the notices were published the full time in the territories, they were only published a week in Manitoba. That is shown by the declaration of the promoter of the Bill. At all events the committee considered the notice as sufficient, because they say so in their report. But it appears the committee found there was an irregularity in the translation. The word 'bishop' being translated 'diocese.' If that be so, the promoters should not be punished for a mistake for which they were not responsible; and if that be the only point of objection, the committee, it seems to me took an extreme view. Without going into a consideration of the point adduced by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) that this bishop is a foreigner, I may say that that is a question, not for the committee, but for the House, and therefore I am disposed to support the motion of the hon. member for Alberta.

Mr. SPROULE. You do nothing about the petition although it was presented to the House and read.

The PRIME MINISTER. When the House has received a petition which it should not have received, that is a waver of any objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The irregularity does not seem very serious, but at the same time I would like to remind my right hon. friend that if the rules laid down by him on several occasions were carried out, this report should not be sent back because it does not show on its face the exact grounds on which the Bill was not reported.

The PRIME MINISTER. In the Public Accounts Committee, to which my hon. friend refers, the minority framed a report on which they wanted the opinion of the House. But the promoter of a private Bill has no standing in a committee and no voice in framing its report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax): But there is usually some one present representing the promoter, who could have had a minority report made, just as one might have been made in the Public Accounts Committee, and if the rule which the right hon. gentleman laid down were carried out in this case, the report should not be sent back. I also agree with my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) that this is a case in which the greatest possible care should be taken to see that the notices were properly published. It relates to a subject on which people are more or less sensitive. At the same time, if the defect is only what has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Alberta, it does not seem very serious, and I would be rather inclined to agree that the report be sent back to the committee, and if there be any difficulty about the petition, that can be dealt with when the Bill comes before the House later.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved,

That from this date to the end of the session Government Orders have precedence on Wednesdays, immediately after Questions to be put by Members.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that there is some arrangement for taking up the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) to-morrow and this motion will prevent that being done.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am not aware of any such arrangement, but it may have been made between the whips. However, I think we might very well give this Bill precedence next Monday.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). Several members on both sides have asked me not to bring it up on Monday as some of them, who take great interest in the measure, cannot then be here. That is why we arranged with the government whip that it should be taken up to-morrow, not expecting this motion. Why not let the taking of Wednesdays by the government begin a week from to-morrow.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Why should the government ask to take Wednesdays at all. They have not brought down any measure of public importance this session, whereas there are some very important public Bills introduced by private members, and some consideration should be given us. Outside the supplies I do not see any government proposal of any kind whatever on the Order paper. On the other hand, there is a number of important Bills on Public Bills and Orders, and we should have a couple of days to discuss them. I have one of some importance that I intend to have discussed.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend had a good opportunity yesterday if he had been in the House. I do not think he should treat with such levity the measure of the government. We are asking the House to vote some $40,000,000, which is somewhat important.

Mr. MACLEAN. That is the question.

The PRIME MINISTER. I should have thought that my hon. friend in his anxiety to vote that money and go home, would have been prepared to support the motion to take to-morrow and make it a government day. If Monday is convenient, it will be easy to arrange to have the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln taken up on that day.

Mr. LANCASTER. As far as I am personally concerned, it would suit me, but I am expressing the views of gentlemen on both sides. The Bill which I am promoting is in no sense a party question, and gentlemen on both sides, who take great interest in it, have urged me not to bring it up on Monday. It will also not come up in the same order on Monday as on Wednesday. On Wednesday it will be sure to be reached after private Bills after eight o'clock, but on Monday the House might adjourn at 11 o'clock or 12 o'clock without discussing this Bill at all. Motions have to give way on Wednesday after six o'clock and, in the ordinary course my Bill would come up on Wednesday evening. It was on taking that into account that we made an arrangement which we thought would be suitable and satisfactory to everybody and which we would never have made had we supposed the government would take this Wednesday, and repudiate the whip's agreement.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

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

Mr. JAMES J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) Before that motion is carried, I desire to call the attention of the government, the House and the country to the intolerable condition of things that exists in relation to the telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I had intended to bring this subject up on the third reading of the Bill of the Minister of Justice dealing with telegraphs and telephones, but as it has been decided to leave that Bill over until next year, I am obliged to bring it up in this way and now. I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the position is intolerable ; and I think I have only to mention the bald facts of the case to have every hon. member in this House agree with me that that language is not one whit too strong.

The Anglo-American Company, which has its head office in London, is the only telegraph company doing business in Prince Edward Island, and is the only company that has a cable connecting the island with the mainland. That company closes its offices on Prince Edward Island at eight o'clock in the afternoon, and does not open them again until eight or nine o'clock on the following day. That is a very great hardship not only to the people of Prince Edward Island but to all others who may have to do business with them. It was found to be a very great hardship during the early stages of the South African war when, no matter how important the message might be coming to Sackville, N.B., only a short distance away, if it came after eight o'clock in the afternoon it did not reach the island until after eight o'clock the following morning. Even with so many relatives and friends of young men engaged in that war anxious for news concerning them and with all the people desirous of learning the progress of events, yet, no matter how important these messages might be, they could not reach the island until the following day; they would not be printed in the morning papers and so would not reach the country until twenty-four hours after the news had reached Sackville. This is the age of progress, this is the twentieth century. Yet to-day we have one whole province of this Dominion entirely shut off from telegraphic communications with the outside world for twelve hours out of the twenty-four.

But that is not the whole trouble. We on the island are obliged to pay twice as high for messages as those on the mainland. This is a serious drawback to business men in Prince Edward Island and also to those who wish to do business with Prince Edward Island. I have here a letter from a business firm in Charlottetown, which refers to this point :

> We find that our telegraph bill for November was $106.44, and if our rates were the same as on the mainland, we could get the work done for about one-half the amount, which would be a very material saving. But this does not, by any means measure our loss. You can quite understand that our customers, say at Sydney, would not think of wiring us for supplies as it would cost them twice as much to get information as to prices, &c., from Charlottetown as from Halifax or St. John. This is where the real loss comes in. Business that we should get passes us every day owing to the extra expense in wiring. In buying and selling goods, at least two or three messages must pass between the buyer and seller. First, an inquiry as to price, second an offer, third a counter-offer, and finally a telegram to close the transaction. So it will be easily seen that the excessive telegraph rates become a serious tax on our business, and drive business away from us as well.

But even that is not the whole matter. This cable was laid many years ago, at a time when the making and laying of cables was not as well understood as it is now. I understand that that cable never was very strong, and it is liable to break at any time and leave us without telegraphic communication altogether. As a matter of fact, it did part last fall and was not repaired for about three weeks. If it should break during the late

autumn it could not be repaired until the following summer. But, even while the cable was broken, if any person went to the Anglo-American Company to send a message across the Straits to have it repeated to some point on the mainland, though the sending of it cost the company only two cents, and the answer might not come for several days, yet they charged the old rates that they were charging when they sent the messages across on the cable. Many tourists come to Prince Edward Island, especially from the United States, and they are simply astonished to find that they cannot communicate with their friends for twelve hours out of the twenty-four. And we as a people are humiliated that such a state of things should exist throughout a whole province of this Dominion. As I say, this is a matter that affects all the maritime provinces and all Canada, and I am glad to find that the people of Canada generally do not take a narrow view of the question. Let me read a resolution passed by the Maritime Board of Trade on this matter. I believe that this resolution was sent to the government :

A subject brought to the attention of this Board is 'improved telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.' The facts of the case are, we believe, well understood by the government, and especially, by one member, Sir L. H. Davies. As briefly put before the board at its last meeting, they are substantially these, that :

'Telegrams could only be sent to and from the island between nine a.m. and one p.m. and between two and eight p.m. The Anglo-American Company, though it has only one hundred miles of wire, controls the situation. A telegram to Boston costs $1—50 cents to Sackville, and 50 cents to Boston. Pressure should be brought to bear upon the company, whose head office is in London, to secure a better service. They get a subsidy of $2,000 a year. The island papers cannot get the press dispatches at night. There would not be so much objection to slightly higher rates than those on the mainland if it were possible to get messages and press dispatches through at any time, or at least up to midnight. There are two steamers now every week from Boston to Charlottetown with crowds of tourists who stand amazed that they cannot send a message home between eight p.m. and nine a.m.

We earnestly hope that this will receive that careful attention which its merits most certainly demand.

(Signed) M. G. DeWOLFE,
President.
G. E. CALKIN,
Secretary.

The Maritime Board of Trade brought this matter up last summer again, and here is a memorandum I have received from them :

Copies of resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade, held at Chatham, N.B., on the 21st and 22nd days of August, 1901 :

Resolved, that this board again urge on the federal government the prompt improving of the telegraph connection between the mainland and Prince Edward Island, the necessities of which have already been fully set forth to the government.

I find that the people even as far west as Toronto take an interest in this discussion. The following is from the 'Railway and Shipping World' :

Prince Edward Island Telegraph Service.

In referring a short time since to the complaints about this service, we pointed out that there are two sides to the question, that the Anglo-American Telegraph Company is not entirely to blame for the high rates for messages outside of the island, owing to the fact that these have to be handed over to other companies necessitating the charging of an extra toll, and that the telegraph business of the island is small, owing to its population being almost entirely an agricultural one. But there is no doubt that the service is inadequate and that an improvement is necessary. During a recent discussion in the House of Commons several of the island members complained very forcibly about the service, being supported by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, whose home is in Charlettetown. The Anglo-American Company has its head office for the island in that city, yet it is closed daily at 8 p.m., and not opened until between 8 and 9 a.m., so that no messages can be transmitted during the night. As Sir Louis Davies pointed out, during the South African war, the morning paper published in Charlottetown has not been able to secure any dispatches arriving later than 8 p.m., and in consequence, most of the trains leaving Charlottetown in the morning, the people outside that city always get their news 24 hours late. There is no doubt such a position of affairs is intolerable, and if the Anglo-American management values its Prince Edward Island business at all we would strongly advise it to provide a more up-to-date service by keeping its offices in Charlottetown, and possibly Summerside and Georgetown, open at least until midnight and to endeavour to make arrangements with the lines with which it connects in New Brunswick that through rates may be somewhat reduced. Unless the management does this another service will undoubtedly have to be provided.

Now, that is the way that parties outside of Prince Edward Island view this matter, and you can from it form some opinion of how we look upon it in the province. We have been trying for some years to get a remedy, but the company, whose head office is in London, will do nothing. About two years ago or a little less, Sir Louis Davies wrote to the company in regard to the matter, and in their reply to him they were almost offensive. When he asked for an improved service they answered that if the government or the community would undertake to bear the whole cost of the extra hours of service, and would guarantee the comapny against any diminution of their net receipts, they would consider the matter. Now, in bringing this matter to the attention of the government and of the House, I hope that something will be done quickly to remedy this state of affairs. It is my opinion, however, that no effective remedy will be found until the government takes over the telegraph business itself.

Mr. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. Another county heard from.

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) I firmly believe in that proposition. I believe that the government should have control of the telegraph and telephone systems, as they have of the post office system, these latter in fact would only be an extension of the post office system, for the telegraph and telephone services are the twentieth century post office. But as it is not likely that the government will take them over very soon there is another way that the government could bring pressure to bear upon this company, unless it gives a reasonably satisfactory service, and that is by withholding the subsidy. This service might have been suitable or satisfactory twenty or thirty years ago, but it is not satisfactory to-day. This company, in order to obtain a charter, undertook to keep up a regular telegraphic communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and I believe that no court in the world would decide that a service that was only available for eleven or twelve hours out of the twenty-four, was a regular service. I think it is a sound principle in law that any company having to deal with the public, or any persons having to deal with the public, and receiving a contract of that kind, must keep pace with the progress of the age. This company, if it is not a monopoly, really exercises a monopoly, and it makes large profits out of Prince Edward Island business; therefore, if the government at any time should decide to take the business over they would not have to take over an unprofitable business. I have under my hand a statement issued by the company showing its profits for the last twenty years, from 1880 to 1899, and I find that the net yearly profits were £993, almost $5,000 a year. Yet this company will not even consider a proposition to give a reasonable service to the people out of whom it makes these large profits.

Mr. TAYLOR. What capital had they invested?

Mr. HUGHES (P.E.I.) I do not know. I presume that interest was charged on the capital before they declared a net profit. I think that is the way nearly all the companies in the old country make up their profits, as they are very conservative in giving profits. As I said before, I do not think any adequate remedy will be found until the government take over the telegraph service of Canada. Now, there are six telegraph systems in Canada. If there were only one or two, the service might be very good. Now, in what condition would the post office service be if it was operated by six companies? Here is what Mr. Pope, manager of the Great North Western, says in regard to that matter:

The telegraphs in Eastern Canada are owned by six separate organizations.

1. The government lines operating in Quebec and New Brunswick;
2. The Western Union Telegraph Company in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia;
3. The Anglo American Telegraph Company in Prince Edward Island;
4. The Great North-western Telegraph Company in Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick;
5. The Montreal Telegraph Company, and
6. The Dominion Telegraph Company, operated by the Great North-western Telegraph Company.

The tariff for ten words from Ottawa to stations on government lines varies from 40 cents to 75 cents, to Western Union stations, 30 cents, to Prince Edward Island, 50 cents, to Great North Western stations, 25 cents, and the rates between the various systems run as high as $1.25.

It is proposed that the Great North-western Company operating the largest system, should acquire the lines of the Western Union Company and the Anglo-American Company, and should also operate the government system, and establish a uniform 25 cent rate over the whole territory.

This could be effected not only without actual cost to the country, but in a way that would ensure a large annual saving to the government, and would satisfy all interests concerned. The Great North-western Company now pay a rental in the shape of dividend to the Montreal and Dominion companies aggregating $238,000 per annum.

If the government would exercise the right to purchase the telegraph lines of these two companies which is given to them by chapter 132 of the consolidated statutes, paying the present market price of the companies stock, the purchase could be made for $5,000,000. The Great North-western Company would continue to operate the lines, and would pay the government the interest on the above amount at two and a half per cent, and this charge being the first lien on the whole system, the payment would be assured.

The saving effected on the fixed charges would compensate the company for reducing the rates, and assuming the cost of operating the government lines.

The company would be restricted to a seven per cent dividend on its own capital, any earnings in excess would be used to extend the system, or to lower the rates.

The government, having the necessary facilities, would continue to maintain the cables in the gulf, but would be relieved from all other expenses in connection with their lines, thus saving between $20,000 and $25,000 annually on their present and prospective outlay.

The advantage of such a sweeping reduction would be felt and appreciated everywhere, but more especially in the poorer districts on which, under the present system, the high rates bear cruelly.

The actual ownership by the government of such a large portion of the telegraph system would make the acquisition of all the telegraphs an easier task, if it was ever decided to adopt such a policy.

That would be another way out of the difficulty, if the government, in their wisdom could see fit to pursue it. But, I do not know whether that matter could be taken up immediately or not. As I have spoken of the government ownership of the telegraph system of the country, as this matter has been before the House on previous occasions and the various aspects of it have

been spoken of by various members, and as figures have been submitted bearing on the question, I do not propose to trouble the House with the figures which I have here in regard to the working of the government telegraphs in other countries particularly in Great Britain. However, I will read a very short extract from an article in the 'Arena Magazine' which shows how advantageously the government telegraph system has worked in Great Britain and the wonderful results that have been achieved there :

In 1869 the telegraph service in Great Britain was in the hands of a number of companies who combined to keep up the rates which ranged from 24 cents to 48 cents per message according to whether the distance was under one hundred miles, or under or over two hundred miles. The principal centres enjoyed telegraph facilities, while many villages and some towns were left without. At this time Belgium, Switzerland, the colony of Victoria and some other countries had government telegraphs. In Belgium the proportion of telegrams to letters was 1 to 37, in Switzerland 1 to 69, in Britain 1 to 121. In January, 1870, by a law previously enacted all the telegraphs in the Kingdom were taken over by the government and made a part of the post office. The government acquired 77,000 miles of wire with the equipment at a cost of $32,108,214. The lines had really cost the telegraph companies only $11,000,000, and from depreciation were worth 25 per cent less. So dearly did the government pay in order to give the people increased facilities for telegraphing at reasonable rates.

The first action of the government was to rapidly extend the wires into districts hitherto unprovided with the telegraph and they reduced the rates at once to 24 cents for 20-word messages, irrespective of distance. The result was a vast and immediate increase in the popular use of the telegraph. The government continued to extend the wires and in 1885 reduced the rates to 12 cents for 12 words with 1 cent for each additional word, the address being counted as part of the message. There was a proportionate reduction in press messages, which speedily caused an increase from 6,000 to 20,000 words sent daily to the newspapers over the wires. From 1869 to 1894-95 the number of telegraph offices in the Kingdom increased from 2,488 to 10,000 ; the miles of line from 5,601 to 35,000 ; the miles of wire from 77,000 to 215,000 and the messages from 6,500,000 to 71,589,000. No less than 91 per cent of the messages are received or delivered at the new offices opened, because they are easier of access or more conveniently located.

The ratio of telegrams to letters had in the meantime increased from 1 to 121 to 1 to 30, and this notwithstanding the steady increase in postal facilities, the largely increased number of letters sent and the further important fact that the telephone service had come in, directly competing with the telegraph service. And best of all, the postal service has been a paying one. From 1870 to 1895, aside from interest on the cost, the English telegraph has paid all expenses of extensions, operation, repairs, &c., and given the country a profit of more than $8,500,000. The profit above operating expenses alone has been over $25,000,000.

I think I have said enough to bring to the attention of the government the condition of affairs as it exists in Prince Edward Island in regard to this matter, and I ask the government in all earnestness to take up the question and do something and do it speedily to bring about a better state of affairs. I know I am not capable of pointing out the best method to pursue; they are the best judges of what can be done to bring the Anglo-American Company to some kind of reasonable terms. We have the lever in our hands. The government have a lever which they can apply and it is by withholding the subsidies. That company are making a very respectable profit out of their business. I believe that the government will have the support of the House and of the country in this matter whatever they may do. I would ask the press of the country to support us. A few months ago a monopoly which existed in this country tried to raise the price of paper which the newspapers use. They unitedly asked the government to remedy this grievance, and the government, availing themselves of the power given to them by parliament very properly applied the remedy and the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) said that if the Order in Council which was passed does not meet the exigencies of the case an order will be made to meet the case. I believe it is the duty of the government to take notice of all matters of this kind, to right these wrongs and remedy these grievances. I hope and trust that the government will not allow this session to pass before something is done in this matter. I would appeal to the press of the country to assist in ventilating this grievance. It is not a question that refers to Prince Edward Island alone. It is a matter that concerns the whole Dominion, and it is a principle now well recognized in this House and in the country that no part of the empire can suffer a grievance and the rest of the empire remain indifferent in the matter. No province of this Dominion particularly can be under a grievance of this kind without it affecting the whole Dominion as well as every other province. Every public man, every person in the Dominion must take an interest in it. I, therefore, rest my case as I have stated, hoping and believing that something will be done and done at once to remedy this grievance.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (East Prince, P.E.I.) Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) has presented this case probably as clearly as it can be presented, and I shall therefore have very little to say upon it. The question has been before the House on several previous occasions, and we have had the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries and other members from Prince Edward Island stating the case to the House. I think hon. members on both sides recognize that there are serious grievances in connection with the present telegraph system of Prince Edward Island.

The hon. member for King's pointed out that the hours of closing are absurd. Out of twenty-four hours in the day we have a twelve hour service, the office in Charlottetown closing at eight o'clock, local time, and we are unable to have any communication through the telegraph service with outside places until nine o'clock in the following morning. On Sundays the offices are open for only one hour in the day, between one and two. This is a very serious matter in the carrying on of our commercial interests, and in getting telegraphic news. In the matter of rates, as the hon. gentleman has pointed out, we are obliged to pay double the rates that are paid on the mainland. The rates between Charlottetown, St. John, Halifax and Montreal are double what the same rates are between different places for like distances on the mainland. Besides that we have no night rates such as are given to the rest of the provinces where twenty words can be sent for the same charge as an ordinary ten word message during the day service. Moreover, in the matter of news communication, we are at a very serious disadvantage. I have a statement here from a newspaper proprietor in Prince Edward Island which is to this effect :

For our press despatches we have only 'specials' prepared by our own paid correspondents in St. John or Halifax. For these we pay (besides the cost of preparation) 70 cents per hundred words and St. John or Halifax pays for 'special' despatches, but 25 cents per hundred, or about one-third of what we pay. For their cable and general telegraphic news of the world they have the despatches of the 'Associated Press,' which a few years ago were delivered in St. John at the rate of $10 per week for 2,000 words a day. That was a very low rate—10,000 words for $10, and no cost for preparation. I have been informed that the rate the St. John papers pay now for the Associated Press despatches has been raised to about $15 per week. For that they would get at least and usually much more than 12,000 words. In other words we pay at the rate of $7 per thousand words and they at the rate of $1.25 per thousand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can readily see that the commercial community and the press of Prince Edward Island are labourng under very serious disadvantages in this regard. It is high time that the government and the members of this parliament looked thoroughly into this matter, as it affects not only the personal convenience of the people of Prince Edward Island, but their commercial relations with the whole world. I am sure that the statement made by the member for King's is correct when he says, that if pressure were brought to bear on this company to give us an ordinary rate as charged on the mainland or even a small advance on the ordinary rate, their business would be doubled, and there would be no financial loss to the company on that score. If pressure cannot be brought to bear on this company to give us reasonable telegraphic rates and reasonable hours for telegraphing, then it is up to the government to take hold of the matter themselves and to establish a cable system, or the Marconi system across the straits. As the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) pointed out, this company was chartered in 1853 and up to the last year or two they have been generally understood as claiming a monopoly of the cable system across the straits. On that point we have the opinion of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) in these words : 'Hansard' 1900, page 1720.

This company was established in 1853, and it had a certain monopoly granted to it, but that monopoly does not extend to the laying of a line between Prince Edward Island and the continent of America. It does extend to the laying of a line between Prince Edward Island, England and Europe, but not to the laying of a line between Prince Edward Island and the mainland of America, although the company sedulously seeks to create the impression everywhere that such a monopoly does not exist.

Last year I intended to bring this matter to the attention of parliament but I was requested by Sir Louis Davies to allow it to stand over as he was in correspondence with this company on the subject and wished to develop it further before anything was done. Sir Louis Davies has left the House for a secure position, and he has done nothing for the people of Prince Edward Island in the matter of their telegraph service. However, since this company has no monopoly, and in as much as I feel assured that the members of this House recognize the serious difficulty under which the people of Prince Edward Island and of the maritime provinces labour, I express the hope that the matter will be taken in hand at once by the government, and if pressure cannot be brought upon the Anglo-American company to remedy the evil ; then I trust that the government will at once establish a modern telegraphic system across the straits.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I have to assure my hon. friends that the government will give their best consideration to the important point which has been raised. It is not the first time that I have heard complaints about the Anglo-American company. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken are right in saying that we have some means of reaching them. Several members of the government will be in England in a short time and if circumstances permit, I expect to go there myself. I will try to have a short and interesting interview with these gentlemen of the Anglo-American Company. The government already possesses a pretty large system of telegraphs. I may say that it has not been built under what might be called business-like circumstances, because we have been building telegraph lines where ordinary

telegraph companies would not build them because they would not pay. The telegraph system of the government has so far been built to accommodate trade and navigation. I am just now engaged in giving attention to some considerable extensions of our lines in order to make them pay if possible, and in order at any rate to give more accommodation to the public. If the Anglo-American Company does not want to listen to reason I feel confident that we are able to bring them to book. The government system might very well be extended—it wont cost $1,000,000. Moreover, we have some wireless telegraphy, especially Mr. Marconi's system, and with Mr. Marconi we have already made some arrangements. With all these weapons in hand, I repeat that I feel confident that we can bring the Anglo-American Company to sense and reason. It is not necessary to say more. Under some circumstances action is better than any amount of speeches.

PUBLICATION OF BLUE-BOOKS.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I wish to say a few words about a matter of very great importance to the House and the country. It is in reference to the subject of our blue-books. The value of official documents issued by the government has been very seriously attacked, and some hon. gentlemen have gone so far as to express their sympathy and their sorrow at discovering that gentlemen on this side of the House should place any reliance or should base any argument upon statements to be found in a certain blue-book issued by the present government. Attention was called to the fact that the examples quoted from the Year-book did not exactly bear out all the strictures that were made upon that publication. Later on, a gentleman on the other side of the House called attention to the fact that while confirmation of certain figures cited by him could not be found in the Year-book for 1900—that being in my opinion the Year-book that was in the first place in question and under attack, because I have no doubt it was the Year-book of that year to which the gentleman on this side referred—that hon. gentleman in some subsequent remarks made by him, repelling the criticism made from this side of the House, rested his case upon the fact that he was using the Year-book, not of 1900, but the Year-book of 1899.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the hon. member is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. BELL. If possible, I will endeavour to avoid doing so; but it is a little difficult, and in a sense it is a personal explanation that I am making.

Mr. SPEAKER. At the same time, in making a personal explanation, the hon. gentleman should be very cautious not to bring in a question which has been the subject of a past debate.

Mr. BELL. I am not referring to a past debate. I am speaking in a very general way of statements which have been made. The Year-book of 1889 having been brought into question, I find that there is a discrepancy between the figures used in this House and those given in the copy of the Year-book of 1889, which I have been able to put my hands upon—not very important, perhaps, but sufficiently divergent to justify a certain amount of inquiry, and to afford, I think, legitimate ground for questioning the claim for extreme accuracy, which is based on the use of these figures. Now, I do not propose to go into this matter at any length, further than to say that I cannot find confirmation for the position taken by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, even in the Year-book of 1889.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is certainly referring to a previous debate. He is answering a matter brought up by an hon. member of this House some time ago, and that is certainly out of order.

Mr. BELL. I am very sorry, indeed, Mr. Speaker, if it is impossible for me to refer to this matter without violating the rules of the House, because I can assure you that I have no desire to be out of order. I am endeavouring to furnish satisfaction to a very hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, and I hope the House will pardon me in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not desire to violate the rules of the House; but he must recognize that he is referring to a question which was the subject of a previous debate, and I am calling his attention to the fact that this is irregular.

Mr. BELL. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to abandon my purpose to throw further light on this subject. I will simply say, if permitted, that I think there was no foundation for any of the strictures addressed to myself, that a charge of stupidity which was made against me with extreme good taste by an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, I think I could answer with satisfaction to the House, and that I think it would be impossible for the hon. gentleman to find in my speech any word which could justify his expressions. I did not charge any hon. member of this House with intentionally falsifying figures. I simply called attention in a most courteous manner to the fact that there were discrepancies, and expressed my desire that they should be explained; and I regret very much that I should have been treated in the harsh and unpleasant manner I was, and should have been made the subject of a charge, which, if the rules of the House permitted, I could effectively repel. Under your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will make no further remarks.

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, I am taking this oportunity to bring before the House and the country a very important incident which happened in Great Britain yesterday. The Chancellor of the Exchequer delivered his budget speech in parliament, and in that speech made certain statements of special interest to Canada which ought to be immediately brought to the attention of this House. He introduced for the first time a tax on bread and flour; and, laid down the doctrine that a tax of that kind was not a tax on the consumer; and, after fifty years of free trade in England, the Chancellor of the Exchequer made a confession that the duties on breadstuffs never should have been taken off. These are statements of a most far-reaching character, and for that reason I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the House to them. Let me read just what he said :

> The effect of a duty of three pence per one hundred weight on wheat would mean but a very small fraction of a farthing increase in the price of the loaf, and the competition of the bakers was so keen that any one trying to raise the price of bread on such a ground would probably find such action not to his advantage. The chancellor denied that the registration duties on grain and flour violated the principles of free trade or would increase the cost of food. He thought the duty had been recklessly abandoned and declared the remission did not reduce the price of food. He therefore proposed an import duty of three pence per hundred weight on all grain, with a co-relative duty of five pence per hundred weight on flour and meal. The total yield of this duty was estimated at £2,650,000 bringing the total estimate of the revenue from the new taxation to £5,150,000.

Now, what does that mean ? It means that for the first time in over fifty years, a measure has been introduced into the British parliament proposing a tax on food products; and the disappointing thing to us in Canada is that when the opportunity came to the parliament of Great Britain to reciprocate towards Canada, that opportunity was not taken advantage of. We have given Great Britain a preference in our markets, and the government claim the greatest credit for that act; but when the opportunity came to Great Britain to reciprocate, there was no reciprocity.

An hon. MEMBER. They said they did not want it.

Mr. MACLEAN. But we want something for what we have given; and why was the opportunity not taken advantage of yesterday ? I believe the cause of no action on England's part was the attitude of this government. The opportunity has been presented to this government time after time to open up negotiations leading to reciprocity of trade between the mother country and this country, and every time it has been thrown down. Let me read what has taken place within a very few days. I am now quoting from a prominent English magazine. In the Nineteenth Century for March, there is an article dealing with Mr. Chamberlain as an empire builder. Speaking in Birmingham in January last, Mr. Chamberlain made this statement :

> A new factor has entered into the politics of this country. In future you will have to take account of the opinion of your colonists. You will have to consult them.

Mr. Chamberlain made that statement in connection with the war in South Africa; and the essayist who is discussing the question says :

> These are pregnant words, and call to mind others already uttered by Sir Wilfrid Laurier : 'If you want our help, you must call us to your councils.'

Sir Wilfrid Laurier is quoted as having said to the people of Great Britain in connection with the jubliee celebration : 'If you want our help, you must call us to your councils.' In that very year a proposal was made to call Canada and the other colonies to the councils of the empire, and the right hon. gentleman did not accept it. The invitation was again given by Mr. Chamberlain in that speech in January last, and no response was made to it ; and on top of that the following despatch was sent to this country by Mr. Chamberlain—it was given out in this country on the 11th of March :

> On the 23rd January, the Colonial Secretary cabled to Lord Minto as follows : 'It is proposed by His Majesty's government to take advantage of the presence of the premiers at the coronation to discuss with them the question of political relations between the mother country and the colonies, Imperial defence, commercial relations of the empire and other matters of general interest.'

There was a broad invitation issued to the Prime Minister of this country and to the prime ministers of all the other colonies to discuss Imperial affairs ; and I believe that that invitation was given in view of the statement which was made yesterday, that England had at last come to the point when she must resort to protection; and if the proper answer had been given to that invitation, I believe that the budget speech of yesterday would have shown an inclination on the part of England to give us some kind of reciprocity in return for what we have given to England; but what put them off ? It was this reply of the Canadian government which His Excellency the Governor General on the 3rd of February cabled to the Colonial Secretary :

> Referring to your despatch of the 27th December, my government accepts the invitation extended to the Prime Minister to attend the Coronation.

The he goes on to say :

> Referring to the several questions mentioned in your despatch of the 23rd February, the only one which, in the opinion of my ministers,

gives promise of useful discussion, is that of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire. The political relations now existing between the mother country and the great self-governing colonies, and particularly Canada, is regarded by my ministers as entirely satisfactory, with the exception of a few minor details and they do not anticipate that in the varying conditions of the colonies there can be any scheme of defence applicable to all.

But, Mr. Speaker, is it not evident that it is just in connection with an Imperial scheme of defence, that a tariff can be arranged to the advantage of Canada ? If a tax were put on all foreign food products coming into the empire for the defence of the empire, that would give Canada reciprocal treatment, and it is because the right hon. the Prime Minister said he was not prepared to discuss the question of defence, that this proposal was made in the budget speech yesterday to tax grain coming from outside countries without extending any preference to Canada. This is only another instance of the carelessness of this government, and its lack of foresight in dealing with these great questions that concern the people's interests. They take credit to themselves for our good crops and prosperity. They are not entitled to credit for either, but they deserve discredit for having lost opportunity after opportunity of doing something to extend and promote the trade of this country, and especially to obtain reciprocity from the motherland in return for the preference we have given it. At the jubilee the Prime Minister threw a great opportunity away. When Mr. Chamberlain made the statement in Birmingham that England must call her colonies to her councils, no reply of an encouraging character was made from this side. And when an official invitation was given the Prime Minister to go over and discuss all the questions concerning the colonies and the mother country, he replied that he did not intend to discuss the question of defence.

But, Sir, the defence of a nation should be its first consideration, and if we had a patriotic, far sighted and statesmanlike cabinet, that invitation to which I have referred would have been accepted in its broadest sense. Had it been so accepted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would never have come down and proposed to levy a tax on food products without giving a preference to Canada. This is the first time in fifty years that such a tax has been proposed in England. It has been stated time and again that England never would give us a preference, but if we had at the helm of state, men of foresight, that question of defence would have been coupled with England's commercial policy, and Canada would have had no difficulty in obtaining the preference we all desire. But the right hon. gentleman apparently saw no connection between the defence of the empire and its commercial policy, and lost the golden opportunity. Yesterday we had the confession made in the British House of Commons by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the principle of protection is a sound one, and that protection does not mean an increase in cost to the consumer. True the statesman who said this is a Tory, but in view of the trend of events I question whether that will take from the value of the declaration in the eyes of the people. And this statesman said further that these duties never should have been abandoned, as they were a great many years ago. Here is an opportunity which has been, with criminal carelessness, absolutely thrown away. This is not the first time the interests of our country have suffered through the lack of statesmanship of the right hon. gentleman. As I pointed out in this House on a previous occasion, when there was first a question of the abolition of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Lord Lansdowne declared in an official document that there should be no settlement of that difficulty until an agreement satisfactory to Canada was arrived at concerning the Alaskan Boundary dispute. That was stated in an official dispatch as the declared policy of the British government, but as far as we know the government of Canada never insisted on that position which was taken by the British Foreign Secretary and indorsed by the Prime Minister of England, Lord Salisbury, being strictly adhered to. A great opportunity was then lost which cannot be recovered. But I believe that if the invitation of Mr. Chamberlain, received in January last had been fully accepted, we would have had no proposition in the budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to impose a tax on food products without giving a preference to Canada in return for the preference which we have given the manufacturers of England. Thus three great opportunities have been lost of improving our commercial relations with the mother country, and I have no doubt that we will have a similar course followed by our Prime Minister at the coronation conference in June next. Whatever offer may be made to the colonies by the mother country, no doubt we will find him using some cold blooded double meaning phrase that will effectually kill it. I make this charge to-day, that in these great questions, which call for foresight and statesmanship, the government have shown itself absolutely incapable. To show the House that the view to which I have given expression is held by leading organs of public opinion in England, let me read a few lines from a recent number of the 'Saturday Review.' In the 'Saturday Review' of the 9th of March last, I find the following editorial remarks :

Canada, Australia and New Zealand are busy organizing new contingents for service in South Africa. The persistence of these colonies in identifying themselves with the Imperial cause

is a proof of devotion more remarkable even than their first efforts, and encourages the highest hopes that some scheme of Imperial relations more businesslike than those which now obtain may result from the Colonial Conferences to be held in London this summer. As New Zealand has been the most enthusiastic contributor to the colonial forces in the field, so her Prime Minister, Mr. Seddon, is easily first in his eagerness to promote the cause of Imperial solidarity. His programme is comprehensive, and includes preferential tariffs, Imperial reserves, the strengthening of the Australasian squadron, and triennial meetings between leading Imperial and colonial statesmen. Mr. Seddon's attitude is what we should expect that of other colonial premiers to be, in view of the attitude of the people they represent. Sir Wilfrid Laurier's unwillingness to consider any project of Imperial defence is intelligible only on the ground that he has misapprehended the ideas which have been advanced on the subject. We should not have been surprised if his free trade proclivities—which he has not been able to gratify in Canada as premier—were a difficulty in the way of tariff modifications, but that he should deprecate the discussion of defence is astonishing and may prove unfortunate for himself.

It has already proved unfortunate for the Canadian people. Were the right hon. gentleman equal to the situation, he would have accepted that invitation in its entirety and coupled the question of Imperial defence with that of the Imperial trade policy. The 'Saturday Review' points that he has lost his opportunity. I only hope that he may recover it in June next, but, judging by the experience we have had in the past, there is very little prospect of his so doing. I am not going to delay the House further on this question. I have taken the earliest opportunity of bringing it up after the Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech of yesterday. Let me emphasize the great fact that there can be no discussion either of Imperial defence or of Imperial trade relations without the two going together. They cannot be uncoupled, as the Prime Minister has sought to do in his reply to the invitation sent to the government. When the government in England know that the colonies are prepared to do their share in the way of Imperial defence and are ready to discuss what that share is and how it is to be given, you will find England ready to give a preference to colonial products in her markets recognizing fully the principle of protection, as against the outside world for that great principle the British government has this day accepted, and the recognition of it as an Imperial bond cannot but be an advantage to the farmers of Canada, especially those of our growing North-west. The future of our North-west lies in two things—the home market, which we propose to keep for them, especially as against American competition; and the English market by way of preference over foreign food products. If there is any reason that will bring the American people to a sense of their duty and obligation, if there is anything that will cause them to respect Great Britain and Canada and compel them to settle such questions as those of our fisheries and the Alaskan boundary, it will be a preference in the British market for Canadian products over the products of the western states of the union. The very form of the invitation sent to the premier, the commercial relations of the empire and the defence of the empire being coupled together, meant preference of some kind. And the Australian and New Zealand premiers saw it, and they are going to London to discuss both these questions of Imperial defence and Imperial trade policy. But our premier goes over, according to his own word, not to discuss the question of defence, but to discuss the question of trade relations. He cannot go with any authority or force to discuss the one without taking the other also. But, with these questions presented together, the parliament of Great Britain will at once see that the time has come when a preference must be given to the colonies. When that time comes, Canada will prosper as she has never prospered before, the empire will be bound together as it never has been before, and we shall be in a position, for the first time in our history, to compel our neighbours to the south to treat us as they ought to treat us. These are great questions; these are far-reaching questions; these are up-to-date questions—and they are squarely before the people of this country and the people of the motherland. They are questions that demand consideration; they are questions calling for the highest kind of statesmanship on the part of the government. I am sorry to say I have seen no evidence of statesmanship in the handling of them by this government up to the present time. All I have seen is that every opportunity presented to the government to lead in these matters has been neglected. But the empire must be led by the colonies. We are called colonists, and, used in its proper sense, I do not resent the name. I claim this for the colonies—at least, so far as Canada, Australia and South Africa are concerned—that the clearest vision in regard to Imperial questions has been in the eyes of men who are called colonists. The day will come when all the people of the empire will see that the men who are leading in questions of Imperial policy, the men who are doing the work that is binding the empire together, are the men from the colonies. We have long had these views on this side of the House; unfortunately, we lost our opportunity to press them forward. Hon. gentlemen opposite are in power, but whenever opportunity has come to them, they have allowed it to pass by. As I have said, the only explanation I can give for that is their pro-United States leanings. 'The Senator from Quebec' and 'the Senator from Ontario,' as they have been called in the United States, would not like to do anything to injure their friends there. But, if the gov-

ernment had accepted this invitation in its true significance and had said they were ready to discuss both Imperial defence and Imperial trade preference, I believe that this proposal of three pence per hundred pounds on wheat going into the motherland, would have been modified into a proposal of a duty on foreign food products with a preference to the colonies.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have to express my regret to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) that, since he thought it advisable to bring to the attention of the House so important a question as this, he did not follow the usual practice and give some notice to the government of his intention, so that we might be prepared for a discussion. But, if my hon. friend did not give us notice, perhaps it is that, after all, he was not quite sure of his own facts or of his own mind. For, having listened somewhat carefully to what he has said, I can hardly think that he meant exactly all he said or that he knows exactly in what position he stands. One thing is quite apparent—he wants to attack the government. And he attacks it right and left, for everything it has done and everything it has not done. The hon. gentleman has attacked us for the British preference and has called upon his friends to censure us because, forsooth, we have given a British preference without exacting any compensation. And, before he had gone much further, he blamed us for our pro-American leanings. That we gave the British preference is because of our pro-American leanings I imagine. That is the kind of logic that we have from the hon. gentleman; therefore, I am not surprised that he has entered somewhat unguardedly upon the discussion of a topic upon which, if he will allow me to advise, he should reflect further before he speaks again. The hon. gentleman blames us because we gave a certain answer to the British invitation sent to us, in common with the other colonies, to take part in the conference that is to take place in London next summer. What reason did he blame us for ? What fault has he to find with the attitude we have taken ? And, since the hon. gentleman finds fault with the position we have taken and that was made known to the House six weeks ago and more, how is it he dares not put his view in the form of a motion which can be debated before the House ? It is not enough to have rambling speeches; but, if the opposition have a policy on this question, I would expect them to frame it in a motion that can go to the world and let us know what are their views on this question. We were invited to the conference to discuss three matters. We were invited to discuss the commercial situation, the political situation, and the military situation. Our answer has gone forth to the Imperial authorities that we are ready to discuss the commercial situation. Our answer has gone forth, at the same time, that we see little advantage in discussing the political situation or the military situation.

Now has my hon. friend anything to say to that position ? We stated to the Imperial authorities that, according to our way of thinking, the relations which at present bind Canada to the mother land are satisfactory. Is my hon. friend prepared to take another course upon this question ? Does he want to have the position in any way improved that now exists between Canada and Great Britain, or between Great Britain and the self-governing colonies ? If so, let him suggest in what way our present relations can be improved ; let him say what he has to offer to the people of Great Britain or to the people of Canada in the way of improving the relations that now subsist between the two countries. In our own estimation, and I believe in the estimation of the hon. gentlemen who sit on this side of the House and in the estimation of the Canadian people at large, the relations which today bind Canada to the mother land cannot be improved—at least I do not see how. Possibly there may be some way of improving the presesnt condition, if there is, I am prepared here to discuss it. But my hon. friend must remember that this is not the first time that we have had to deal with this question. In 1897 we were invited in almost identical terms to discuss certain questions between the colonies and the motherland. A conference sat in London and the question of the political relations, the Imperial relations, was discussed ; they were discussed by the representatives of the Imperial government and of the self-governing colonies, that is to say, of Canada, New Zealand, Natal, the Cape Colony, New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, West Australia, South Australia, Tasmania and Newfoundland, and with two exceptions, all were unanimous in the opinion that the relations then subsisting between the colonies and Great Britain were perfectly satisfactory. Nothing has taken place since 1897 which would induce me, at all events, to change my mind, or would suggest any way by which those relations might be improved. The basis upon which the British empire rests, the basis upon which it has grown, has been the local autonomy of all its constituent parts, and I do not see that anything can be done at the present time which would warrant a change in that basis in any way whatever.

Now my hon. friend takes up another question. He says we have made a great mistake in refusing also to consider the military situation, in refusing to discuss a scheme for the general defence of the empire. My hon. friend says the government have made a great mistake, that the commercial question and the military question must go together. If that is the view taken by the hon. gentleman, that commerce and

war must be considered together, it is a view from which I altogether dissent; and I challenge him or any other gentleman in this House, or outside of it, to present a scheme whereby two things so dissimilar as commerce and war can be considered together. No, Sir, I do not admit that view at all; it would be a most suicidal policy for the Canadian people to go into any scheme of that nature. It would be the most suicidal policy that could be devised for Canada to enter into the vortex in which the nations of Europe, England included, are engaged at the present time, and which compels them to maintain great military armaments. Sir, what is the relative position of Great Britain and Canada? Great Britain is one of the foremost nations of the world, in many ways, perhaps, the foremost nation, certainly the head of the greatest empire which exists to-day, the greatest which has existed since the Roman empire. Great Britain, by reason of her situation, has to maintain a large and permanent army. Hon. gentlemen are aware how repugnant to the British people ever was the necessity of maintaining a standing army; hon. gentlemen are aware how the British people have constantly fought against that idea, but they have been forced by events, forced by the position which the empire occupies in the world, to maintain a standing army, and to-day the principle item in the British budget is the expenses for naval and land armaments. Now my hon. friend says that Canada should follow in the same course, that we should take part in a scheme of Imperial military defence. Sir, Canada is in a different position. Canada is a nation with an immense territory, but with a sparse population of five and a third million of souls, scattered over an area 3,000 miles in extent from east to west. The principal items in the budget of Canada are what? Public works, the development of the country, the construction of railways and harbours, the opening up of ways of transportation. This is the work to which we have to devote our energies, and I would look upon it as a crime to divert any part of that necessary expenditure to the supply of guns, cannons and military armaments generally.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the right hon. gentleman say any part of the expenditure?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no hesitation in saying that I share altogether the views which have been expressed by Sir Charles Tupper more than once, that Canada has done more for the defence of the British empire by the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, than she could have done by spending that money in military armaments. Certainly we must improve our own militia, and we have a scheme before us to-day for that purpose; we must look after our own defences. But there is all the difference in the world between undertaking this domestic military expenditure and embarking in such a scheme as is embraced by my hon. friend's vast conceptions. I do not share his views, and so long as my hon. friend wants to link together war and commerce, he will find me unalterably opposed to him. I cannot agree to anything of the kind.

We are going to London simply to discuss the commercial question. That question we are prepared to consider, and it seems to me that our course has been a wise one. Great Britain, as it appears from the budget which was delivered yesterday, has entered upon a new line of taxation, I do not care whether you call it protection or not, but for the purposes of this discussion it is sufficent to say that England has opened up new avenues of taxation, she has gone back to the old duties on corn. It is very true that this new tax which has been imposed upon the English people is not large, I do not complain of that, I rather rejoice at it. But at all events, there is an opening, and since the British government has adopted this new line of taxation, the field is clear now for negotiations in a new direction at London next summer. What have we said in our answer to the invitation that has been given to us? The answer we gave is, that we are ready to discuss with you the trade relations that exist between Canada and Great Britain, and between Canada and all the self-governing colonies. I do not despair that we may be able to lay down next summer in London the basis of a system which will improve the trade relations between Great Britain and her colonies and will establish freer trade between all sections of the British empire.

That is the view which I hold, that is the view which the government hold, and that is the view on which we are prepared to act and so far as he is concerned, I do not know whether it meets the views of my hon. friend or not. If it be that it does not meet his views, I am satisfied that it does meet the views of the great majority of the Canadian people. What the Canadian people are looking for at the present time, is the improvement of the trade relations which exist between the mother country and the colonies. Perhaps I am mistaken in the hope I now express, perhaps it is premature to say it, but there is every reason to believe that we are facing the dawn of a new day, that peace is going to be at last restored to the British Empire, that this cruel war will soon be over, and if that be so, the conditions are more favourable than they ever were before for securing the improvement in our trade relations which we have in view. When we come back from Great Britain next summer it will be time enough for my hon. friend to find fault with the government if the government have not done, as he thinks, their duty. Whatever we may do, I am satisfied we would not please the heart of my hon. friend. I know that the better the arrangements we

can make the more displeased he will be. But, whilst I have great admiration and sympathy and friendship for my hon. friend, he will pardon me when I say to him that it is not so much his approbation I am looking for as the approbation of the Canadian people.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems to object very strongly to the wisdom of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) bringing this question up at the present time. As he could not bring it up at an earlier moment, on account of the information contained in the papers and upon which he based his argument not being available, he is quite excusable in not having brought it up at an earlier date, but, that he does it at an opportune moment will be admitted by every right thinking man, because, it is during this time above all others that the attention not only of Canada but of the world is attracted to the very important divergence that has taken place from the old established custom of the mother country by the introduction of what may be fairly regarded as the protective system. In view of that he could not choose a better time than the present in which to let the mother country understand the strong desire of the Canadian colony, when a departure has been made from an old established principle, that her interests may be taken into account and that such provision may be made as will enure to the benefit of the colonies, if it is possible to make an arrangement of that kind. I think we are justified in believing that had proper representations been made by the right hon. Prime Minister at the time of the last conference, that Canada desired above all other things some form of inter-Imperial preferential trade between her and the mother country and the other colonies of the empire, England would have kept that representation in view, and in this departure, in all probability, she would have made provision for the introduction of a system of inter-Imperial preferential trade. But, the right hon. Prime Minister says: I am not going to connect war and commerce. They have no connection, and I distinctly refuse to act upon that principle. Why, the history of the British empire shows clearly that Great Britain has acted upon that prinicple. War and commerce are so indissolubly associated that they have never been separated. War is always the precursor of commerce, and after the resort to force, to the arbitrament of arms we have established our commercial relations with the country with which the empire was in conflict. There never will be a time in the history of England or of Canada more opportune than the present for the establishment of some new and mutually advantageous commercial relations. The time is not likely to come in the history of our country in our own life time, or perhaps in the life time of those who come after us, and I say that there is no time in the history of the country when it is more important to depart from the old lines and to adopt new lines to meet new conditions than when the force of war when the arbitrament of war has given the Imperial government control of the country with which she was in conflict. That is the time above all others when commercial relations ought to be improved and established upon a basis that would be mutually advantageous to the colonies and the motherland as well. I do not think the right hon. gentleman's contention that there is no connection between war and commerce is one that will be held by the people of this country. Well, there is one thing that the right hon. gentleman has told the English people, and it is that he will not inform them how it might be possible to make an improvement in the line of commerce and defence. We have something in common with the mother country in connection with the question of defence, as we have something in common in connection with the question of commerce. We have mutual interests all seeking a common defence. The defence of one part of the British Empire is the defence of all. If England lost her power on the high seas Canada would have no status amongst the nations of the world, and it therefore becomes a matter of importance and interest to us as it is to England to have some common system of defence. But, how can this question fit in with our inter-imperial preferential trade in this way: A motion was made a few years ago laying down the lines as to how it could be accomplished. It was a motion proposing that the mother country and the colonies should collect a customs duty upon imports from all foreign countries, setting a small percentage apart for the purpose of common defence. I have no doubt it would be answered, if the right hon. gentleman were to answer it by saying that we will never concede the right to give away money without the right of saying how that money shall be expended. We need not do that. Having raised the money, having obtained a customs revenue for this purpose, would it not be proper to retain the expenditure in our own hands for the purpose of establishing the nucleus of a navy, and in this way assisting the British empire? I do not see that it would necessarily follow that because we raise money we must give it away to the Imperial government to be expended as they like. If the colonies collected such a revenue, and if the mother country imposed a tax on foreign importations what would be the result? It would accomplish what we desire to obtain, a measure of inter-Imperial preferential trade that would give us the advantage of putting our goods down on the English market over any outside competitor in the world. Take the proposition which was announced yesterday in the British House

of Commons. A duty of 5 cents a hundred weight is placed on wheat. That is 3 cents a bushel. Suppose that had been put on the foreign product and not upon wheat coming from the colonies; that would have given us 3 cents a bushel more for our wheat in England than the American would receive, and they are our greatest competitors. See what an incentive it would be to immigration and to the settlement of our great North-west, where we can raise millions of bushels of wheat to supply the British army and the British people. See what an advantage a preference of 2 cents a bushel on wheat would be to our North-west farmers. We believe that if the Prime Minister had been alive to the situation, and had pressed that phase of it as strongly as he might when he was in England before, it would now be before the Imperial parliament, and they would in all probability have given us that advantage over the Americans. It has been written:

> There is a time in the affairs of men (and nations)
> Which taken at the tide, leads on to fortune.

We believe that one of these golden opportunities passed when the Prime Minister was in England. We believe that he missed a golden opportunity to strengthen the trade relations between the mother country and the colonies. We believe that he lost the opportunity of accomplishing great good for Canada. But another opportunity will come a few months hence. The Prime Minister of Canada is invited to England to consider the commercial relations between the mother country and the colonies, as well as the defences of the empire. He has refused to discuss the question of Imperial defence, but in my judgment the two questions are so indissolubly united that you cannot separate them without doing injustice to one or the other. The Prime Minister is doing less than the Canadian people expects of him when he refused to discuss both questions, because the discussion of our commercial relation without the discussion of Imperial defence can only be half hearted. We shall have another opportunity to discuss this matter at greater length and I shall not dwell further upon it now. I could not avoid saying something on the subject, seeing that it was introduced at the earliest possible moment to the notice of this parliament, and seeing also that the Prime Minister has proceeded in the past on the line that we have given to England a preference for which we ask nothing in return. The Minister of Agriculture made the same statement in England last year. This government is always ready to give away what belongs to Canada and to ask nothing in return for it. What a contrast with the policy of the Australian colonies who are alive to this question, and who want a mutual preference. But, Sir, cold water is thrown on this intercolonial conference by the Canadian Prime Minister in advance. If the premier colony is not prepared to go to the length of discussing Imperial defence, that conference must lose a good deal of its importance seeing that the other colonies will not be sustained or supported by Canada. It is because we think our Prime Minister is not alive to the interests of Canada at this opportune moment, that we desire to draw his attention to the importance of the question, and to impress its importance on him when he comes to discuss these matters in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say a very few words in reference to what has been said by the right hon. Prime Minister. I was not aware that this subject was to be discussed to-day, and therefore I can say very little on the main question which has been brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean). I would however like to remind the Prime Minister, that when he expressed his complete and perfect satisfaction with the relations which exist between Canada and the motherland, he seems to have somewhat altered his mind from the opinions which he entertained in days gone by. Reference has been made during the present session to the aspirations of the right hon. gentleman in 1892, for the complete independence of this country, and within a more recent date, if the right hon. gentleman has been correctly reported in England, he has said to the Imperial government: If you want our assistance call us to your councils. I have never heard the right hon. gentleman contradict the correctness of that statement attributed to him. It has been published in the public press of this country and in the public press of the mother country many times, and it has never been contradicted. But, when a courteous invitation to come to the council of the empire is extended to the right hon. gentleman by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the response which is given to that invitation is not itself of a very courteous nature, so far as we can understand it. I do not, however, propose to discuss that at any length just now. The right hon. gentleman quotes with approval a certain statement by Sir Charles Tupper in the past, and the right hon. gentleman refers to the great burdens which are imposed upon the people of the motherland.

I for one shall always maintain that so far as Canada is concerned, Canada must herself deal with the subject of contribution to Imperial defence. The parliament of Canada is the proper tribunal to deal with that, but I do not think it necessarily follows that the government of Canada should refuse as they have done, to even discuss that subject. I say that this country must deal with that subject and must control that subject, but I do not agree

with the right hon. gentleman that it is altogether out of the question to discuss it when we are invited in a courteous way to do so. We must also recollect in connection with the guns and ammunition and warlike stores and the enormous liabilities which are paid for by the British people, that these are to some extent at least for the benefit of Canada as well as the other portions of the empire. We should not altogether put that particular phase of the question out of sight. I suppose there is not one amongst us, holding even the most extreme views on this question, who would not understand that if any Canadian subject was ill-treated in any part of the world under such circumstances as would call for the intervention of Great Britain, that Canadian subject would be supported by every British gun and every British ship to the full extent of the resources of the British empire.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, Sir, if that be the case, it perhaps affords us food for reflection in discussing a subject of this kind. It does not, it seems to me, sound very well from the mouth of the Prime Minister of this country, that while he speaks of that question of liability which is laid upon the people of the British Isles, he should so absolutely shrink as he seems to from even a discussion of the subject of the defences of this country as part of the British empire. The growth of constitutional government in Canada has been gradual. It has progressed in every decade for the last sixty years, and the only step backward that has been taken in connection with our responsible government has been taken under the government of the right hon. gentleman, in connection with the subject of copyright. As I understand it, this government has receded from the attitude taken by Sir John Thompson, and which, if he had lived, he would have maintained to the full. I shall always maintain that Canada should advance, so far as the right to govern herself is concerned, and I regret that after sixty years of progress in that direction, the only retrograde step has been taken by the present government.

But, what I particularly call the attention of the House to is this : We on this side have been asking the government for the past two or three years to endeavour to secure for Canada a preference in the British markets. All parties in this House and in this country have adhered to the opinion that that preference would be of great advantage to Canada. But, Sir, the only answer that we have ever got from hon. gentlemen on the other side is, that it was so supremely ridiculous that the mother country should think of imposing a tax on food stuffs, that the very absurdity of the proposition justified the Canadian government is taking no steps whatever for the purpose of securing such a preference for our food products.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my right hon. friend can point to any other reason which was ever given by himself or by his colleagues to excuse the apathy of the government on this subject, I would like to hear that reason now. I have paid pretty careful attention to the debates of this House, and I have heard nothing else. I have heard it from my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have heard it over and over again from the Minister of Finance ; I have heard it ad nauseam from the right hon. gentleman himself and from numerous of his followers ; and now, Sir, what the country would like to know is, when it has appeared imminent that some measure of this kind was to be brought down by the Imperial government, has this government awakened from its sleep and made any representation on the subject ? I am very much surprised that my right hon. friend the leader of the government should have taken his seat to-day without informing the House and the country whether the government has or has not taken action with regard to this most important subject. He has occupied the time of the House in making certain criticisms on the speech of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), but he has not afforded one single word of information to the House and the country as to whether this government has made the slightest representation to the mother country with a view of having the colonies exempted from this tax which is being placed on bread stuffs going into the United Kingdom. I regard that as a remarkable omission on the part of my right hon. friend. It is true, he is in a very peculiar position in respect to this subject, because he told the people of the mother country that he did not want any preference and he has got the medal of the Cobden Club on that score. If my right hon. friend should ask the mother country for exemption from this tax for Canada, it is perfectly clear that he would have to send that medal back to the Cobden Club, because from first to last the ground on which that medal was given to him was that he had told the people of the mother country that he did not want any preference—that he was a free trader. Well, some members of his cabinet have made it abundantly clear to the country that they are not free traders. Is my right hon. friend so much of a free trader that he desires to retain this Cobden medal and desires that Canada shall not have any preference in the markets of the mother country ? There is a well-defined line between what this country would like to have in this connection and what the right hon. gentleman has said in the past that this country did desire. As plain as words could make it he has told the mother country that he gave the preference without

any desire for a corresponding preference from the mother country. He has also told us, and his followers from time to time have repeated it, that although a preference to this country might be desirable, the right hon. gentleman was perfectly justified in taking that position at the time he did, because it was utterly and absolutely hopless to suppose that any tax of this kind would be imposed on food stuffs going into the United Kingdom. Now, when it became apparent that this tax was likely to be imposed, has my hon. friend had the courage to go back on the declaration which he made at that time, and to say to the mother country, we in Canada do desire a preference in the United Kingdom; and, as we have given you a preference, which, whether it has done you good or not, is well intended, will you give us a preference by exempting Canada at least from the operation of this duty on bread stuffs? I venture to say that this country would be very much more interested in some declaration of that kind from the right hon. gentleman, who is the Prime Minister of this country, than a great deal of the declarations and statements he made in the House to-day. Although the right hon. gentleman has not seen fit to enlighten the House at the present time with regard to the attitude of the government on that question, I trust that he will take an early opportunity to do so. Are the government still of opinion that they do not want this preference in the markets of the mother country? Does the right hon. gentleman adhere to that solemn declaration which he made to the mother country at that time, or does he adhere now to the view which we on this side of the House expressed last year by a resolution which was voted down by the right hon. gentleman and his followers, that it is a good time, and the proper time, and the proper thing to do, to ask the mother country that the products of Canada at least shall be exempted from the tax which is being placed on food stuffs, and that the farmers and agriculturists of this country shall receive from the mother country a preference by being exempted from that tax. I trust that the right hon. gentleman will at a very early date enlighten the House as to what the government has done or proposed to do on this subject, and what the present attitude of the government is on a subject of such great importance to this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman made an allusion to myself, which justifies me in offering a word or two in reply. It is unfortunate for hon. gentlemen opposite that they have never been able to found an argument on this question of preferential trade without entirely misstating the facts of the case.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friends say oh, oh. A reference to what has occurred in the past will be sufficient to justify my observation. A few years ago the hon. gentlemen created the delusion in their own minds, and tried to place it in the minds of others, that Her Majesty's ministers, on the occasion of the Jubilee, when the right hon. the Prime Minister of Canada visited London, indicated their willingness to give Canada a tariff preference in the British market. That statement was made over and over again, and ran through all the discussions of this question from the opposition side for a series of years, and yet every hon. gentleman knows that it was a statement absolutely unfounded in fact, that it never had any foundation. If it ever had any colour at all, it was utterly destroyed and taken out of the discussion by the letter which was addressed by the Duke of Devonshire to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock). The Duke of Devonshire was the gentleman who was said to have made that statement to the Prime Minister, and in his letter, which is now a matter of record, His Grace said that it was preposterous, that he had never made such a proposal, that he could not have made it, that he never dreamed of making it. We have been told again and again that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who delivered his budget speech yesterday, was quite prepared to give a preference for Canadian flour and wheat, and that the only reason he did not do so was that we had not asked him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Who said that?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from East York said it all through his speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Practically that is what he said all through—that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach was prepared to do that. The hon. gentleman does not deny it. He knows that I am making a correct statement.

Mr. MACLEAN. I did not put it that way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He did not put it that way, but he knows that that was the substance of what he said.

Mr. MACLEAN. No, I made no such statement as that. The statement I made was that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had yesterday introduced a measure putting a duty on corn, that it was the first time that had been done in fifty years, that it was a protectionist proposition, and that that being the case, it was the opportunity of the government to protest against that tax being put upon Canada after we had given a preference to the mother country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman said most distinctly that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have been prepared to give Canada a preference on wheat and flour but for the fact that the

Canadian government had not demanded it. That was the whole argument of my hon. friend's speech, and if it did not mean that there was no reason in his argument at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, what I did say was that when the right hon. gentleman received the invitation which he did some two months ago, if he had replied that he was prepared to discuss a scheme of defence and our commercial relations together, I had no doubt that the budget speech introduced in the British House of Commons yesterday would have given a preference to Canadian bread stuffs.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The difference is not material. But the substance of the hon. gentleman's remarks was that because of the action of this government, the budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not put a preferential duty on wheat for the benefit of Canada. There is no man in the English government or English public life who would receive such a statement seriously. Every one who has any conception of the position taken by the ministers of state in England knows that up to this year, not one has ever declared his willingness to put a preferential duty on wheat or anything else.

Mr. SPROULE. Did you ever ask him ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would have been useless to have done so. I am speaking of what I know, because I have had the opportunity of discussing the question with a number of public men in the mother country. And when the hon. gentleman represents that English statesmen were prepared to grant us this preference, he makes a statement which is absolutely not justified by anything that has occurred in the mother country. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition made reference to some speeches of mine. He said that over and over again he had heard me say it was absolutely ridiculous to suppose that a preferential duty or any duty on wheat would ever be imposed by England. I want to tell my hon. friend that he is mistaken. He may search through every speech I ever made in this House, and he will not find in it any such statement. On the first occasion when I was privileged to discuss the matter in the House of Commons, I said that, as matters then stood in England, it was unreasonable to expect that any duty would be put on wheat.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought that when I was quoting the resolution of the Maritime Boards of Trade in this House last year, the hon. gentleman interrupted me by saying that any such idea was perfect nonsense. I think that 'Hansard' will show that I am right.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not happen to remember the Maritime Board of Trade resolutions. I said that to have expected the British government in 1897, when we brought down our preferential tariff, to put a duty on wheat was at that time unreasonable and preposterous. Here we are five years later, and during all the intervening years nothing of the kind was done, but to-day you have a small duty on wheat and flour, only brought down because of the tremendous cost of one of the greatest wars in history.

Mr. MACLEAN. Which shows that the tariff goes with war.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The money to pay for war has to be raised by tariffs. That happens to be the only bond of connection between the two. On that very occasion, when I had to discuss this question in parliament, not only did I not say that the thing was ridiculous and impossible, but I carefully guarded myself by saying again and again that the conditions were so changing in England that I could not, nor would abler men, undertake to say that at no future date should a condition arise, under which it would be possible. But I said we had not reached the stage yet when England was prepared to give us preference. And she is to-day only putting a duty on bread stuffs because of the war tax. Were it not for the war tax, we would have no duty on corn or flour in the British budget to-day. Therefore it is unreasonable to compare events in the time of peace with those which occur in the stress of one of the greatest wars of modern times. Not only did I not make the statement charged against me, but I took great pains to indicate that the time might come when Great Britain would be prepared to adopt a preferential policy. Hon. gentlemen will remember that I did make that point, differing in that respect from one or two on this side, who took the view that it would never be done at all. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, always argued on what might happen in times of peace, not on what may be brought about by stress of war. It is perfectly evident that up to the present there has been no reason to believe that the Imperial government would grant the preference talked of. We agree that such a preference would be desirable from a Canadian point of view. I have said that twenty times in the House of Commons.

An hon. MEMBER. We never heard it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman has never heard me, he has lost some valuable information. It would be desirable from a Canadian point of view, but whether or not it would be from the point of view of the English consumer is what he has a better right to decide than this parliament. If there is one view which I have presented again and again, and which I now present, it is this : The point on which we differ from hon. gentlemen op-

posite on the question of preferential trade is this. They have from the beginning insisted on our demanding of John Bull a preference and giving him nothing until he would grant it; whereas, the position we took was that we would give John Bull the preference, believing that it was good for ourselves and that ultimately it would lead him to take a more favourable view.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend will find that, again and again I have given expression to that opinion, and if this movement for preferential trade has made any progress in Imperial affairs, if there is a party in any part of the empire which is advocating preferential trade, it is largely because Canada has led the way. And if at any time we should be able to bring about that preference for the benefit of Canada and the other colonies, it will come, not as a result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, who demanded that we should make huckstering terms with John Bull, but as the result of the policy adopted by this government in 1897, which undoubtedly has been a very great factor in the development of Imperial ideas in commercial affairs. Hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to sneer again and again at that preference. We say that it was a good thing for Canada, and for the mother country. These hon. gentlemen say that it has ruined our factories by admitting a lot of English goods, and then in the next breath say that it never did any good to anybody and has not increased our trade with Great Britain. But if we follow the history of the movement during the last five years, we have every reason to believe that the step taken by Canada has been the chief factor in the creation of an Imperial interest in our commercial and other affairs. I have no difficulty in proving that. Go to the mother country, go to the magazine writers, the daily press, the leading public men, go to the man on the street—aye, and to the utterances of the sovereign from the throne—and you will find all recognize the fact that this preferential trade movement in Canada has been a matter of great concern to the empire at large. And when we can point to that fact, we can afford to listen unmoved to hon. gentlemen opposite who would like to have us believe that it is a matter of no concern at all. On the question of defence, the reply of the government did not state that we would not discuss any such question. It stated that we would, as in duty bound discuss any matter brought before the conference, either by the Imperial government or any of the colonies, and that was the proper view to take. But if my hon. friends opposite think that we are not going far enough in our willingness to enter upon Imperial military expenditure, if they are of opinion that in addition to the moneys we are now spending on the military forces of Canada—and in expending money on the militia of Canada, I claim that we are spending for the defence of the empire—if hon. gentlemen think that in addition, we should enter into a broader scheme of Imperial defence and pay out larger sums that we are now doing for the defence of the empire, they would do well to frame a motion of that character, and assign specially the preparation of that motion to my hon. friend, the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), because I am given to understand that when my hon. friend speaks in the province of Quebec, he is not as cordial in his desire for Imperial military expenditure as some of his friends seem to be in this House. Probably that very fact would suggest that before undertaking to commit ourselves on any of the great questions, we should take into consideration not what may commend itself to one section of the people or the other, but what is likely to commend itself to the good judgment of the people of Canada as a whole. That, Sir, is the view which the government have taken. We believe that on this question as on others we have given expression to the sober, sensible, thoughtful judgment of the Canadian people. And time will show that we are right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but I would like to be permitted to say a word. One thing which I referred to—only one of many—was where the hon. gentleman was dealing with the statement of Sir Charles Tupper that Great Britain would impose duties on foreign food stuff while admitting those of Canada free. He said:

> That is an old cry of Sir Charles Tupper, but no one knows better than he does that it is arrant humbug.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And so it was.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I also read, in the same speech which I made, the resolution of the Board of Trade advocating preferential trade within the empire, and when the hon. gentleman was interrupting me, I said:

> Why could not the hon. gentleman in the same way characterize this resolution which I have read as arrant humbug.
>
> The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So it is.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I wish to say that Sir Charles Tupper, whom the hon. gentleman quotes had been telling the people of Canada that, as a practical question of the present day, not as a thing of the future—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Sir Charles Tupper had been telling the people of Canada that he, the Conservative leader, if placed in power would be able to secure a preferential duty in favour of Canada. That

was the statement which I said was arrant humbug. And, whether it be said by Sir Charles Tupper or anybody else, it was arrant humbug then and it is arrant humbug to-day. In every speech that I have made on the subject—I have not made many, so the hon. gentleman can easily look them up—I have invariably said that, while a preferential duty could not reasonably be expected at the time, I distinctly declared that by the step we were taking, we were creating an Imperial sentiment which would probably bring about that result. And that is what is happening to-day.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). When the right hon. First Minister was speaking, I felt that it would be my duty to rise and defend the premier of the province of Ontario, the province from which I come. That gentleman has devoted a great deal of time and study to the very question now before the House, but seems to differ, unfortunately, from the right hon. gentleman who leads this House. But before I venture to say a word in defence of the premier of Ontario, let me take the opportunity of saying a word in defence of the right hon. gentleman who now leads the House against the attack made upon him by his follower and colleague the Minister of Finance. (Hon. Mr. Fielding). The Minister of Finance in stentorian tones anathematized anybody who would be so foolish as to demand a preferential duty from the old land. I am not aware that anybody ever did 'demand' a preferential duty from Great Britain. But the gentlemen on this side have contended again and again that, if the hon. gentlemen opposite would conduct the business according to business methods ;—if, instead of doing as they did with the United States when they wished to make a bargian with them, give everything they had to give and then depend upon the gratitude for a return ;—if they have devoted themselves to the matter in the ordinary methods of business, very possibly the result which the hon. gentlemen opposite affect to desire, and which the hon. gentlemen on this side do most sincerely desire, would have been attained long ere this. The Minister of Finance went on to say that it was a most unreasonable thing for anybody to expect preferential trade away back in 1897. Surely the hon. gentleman is not a student of the modern classics or he would have known that, one of the most beautiful orations ever delivered in this or in any other land was that delivered by the premier in London, on the subject of preferential trade, in 1896. We on this side may differ from the right hon. gentleman as to methods which we think best, or wisest, or most patriotic to promote the development of this country. But we bow to no gentleman on the other side in our admiration for the eloquence and ability with which the right hon. gentleman can present his views, such as they may be at any time. In 1896, as I have said, the right hon. premier with even more than his wonted eloquence pointed out the glorious opportunity before Canada, the illimitable possibilities that opened up before us, if the people of Canada would be wise enough to reject the protectionist government which could not attain the boon of preferential trade and put in power a government led by himself and made up of gentlemen whose views of these matters were in accordance with the doctrines of free trade. For he promised to go to the old land and bring back preferential trade which would make this country blossom as the rose. Surely the Minister of Finance has failed to read that speech, or he has forgotten ; otherwise he would not have spoken of the folly and presumption of those who, so long ago as 1897, ventured to propose such a preposterous thing as preferential trade. But, when the right hon. gentleman and his followers came into power they gave us this tariff which gives a preference in our markets to the old country. For what reason they gave it, nobody on this earth can possibly tell to this day, for these hon. gentlemen themselves within the last fifteen minutes have differed as to the reason why it was given. The right hon. premier has told us and told the people of the old country—and thereby won the encomiums of the people there and, possibly won his Cobden medal as much on account of that statement as of any other—that we gave that preference as a matter of gratitude to the mother country. She had done so much for us, and we had done so little for her, that, without seeking or desiring anything, we gave this preference as evidence of our gratitude. And not only we did not expect anything but, we did not desire anything in return. Further, he pointed out most earnestly that any move in the direction of protection would be an injury to the motherland, and so would injure us, the greatest colony. So, the right hon. gentleman did not seek or ask or wish —and perforce, would not accept—a preference from the mother country. Within the last five or ten minutes, the Minister of Finance, who would be supposed to have some faint glimmering ideas as to the reason why this most extraordinary tariff was brought into existence, has told us that there were two reasons for it. One was that it would pay us and the other was that Great Britain would be more likely to give us a preference if we gave her one. Think for a moment ;—the right hon. premier tells the benighted Englishmen who were out of sound of the debates in this House and ignorant as to why this tariff was given. We have given you this as a matter of gratitude and nothing else. I can understand how the welkin rang with that shout of loud acclaim that rose to the heavens from the grateful Englishmen who listened to the right hon. gentleman. But what if they had learned, these poor benighted Englishmen,

that, in deed and in truth this was one more of our usual selfish colonial modes, that we gave the preference as the Minister of Finance has told us, first because it would pay us, and second that we hoped to get a preference in return ? Now, for my part, I am inclined to stand by the premier. I am inclined to think he understood what he was talking about. For the Minister of Finance, who, after four or five years operation of this tariff would venture to say, on the floor of this House, that any intelligent government passed such a tariff on the ground that it would pay us, does not understand the meaning or operation of that tariff.

And when he went on to say that he gave to Great Britain because, in the second place, he thought we would get something in return, he forgets that we have been told during this very session, and other sessions, and have been told throughout the land, that we gave this tariff to Great Britain not expecting anything under the sun in return, but that we gave this tariff to Great Britain because we owed her a debt which we were going to pay in that way ; for the premier has told us, and we have been told by many speakers on that side of the House, that we gave her that tariff because we owed her a debt of gratitude which we intended to pay in that way. And just see how we have paid it. We have said to Great Britain : We owe you a debt, we the people of Canada owe you a debt, but unfortunately we are hard up, money is scarce, we have spent all we had on the first two contingents and we have run short ; we cannot afford to give you anything ourselves, and you could not expect a poor country like this, whose brave boys at the front have to live on emergency rations, to pay anything more. And so, as you cannot expect us to give you much in the way of cash, we will pay you by making the woollen manufacturers, the cotton manufacturers, the shirt manufacturers and some other industries in this country square the account with the Yorkshire manufacturers and workmen, so that while we, the people of Canada, cannot afford to pay our debts in cash, we have a few people in Canada from whom we will allow the English manufacturers to collect the money by coming into this market with their goods at the expense of our own manufacturers ; and then we can hold up our hands to heaven and say : Thank Heaven, that debt is paid. I am not prepared to say that the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues have not considerable ground for the line he takes that we cannot afford to pay the old country in cash for the benefits we receive from her. There were other and happier days when we could afford to pay our debts in cash. There was a time when this country was sufficiently opulent that when crimes were committed the government could afford to take all reasonable steps to follow and punish the misdoers. Under the late government that was done again and again, and so determined was the late government to see that justice was done, and so overflowing was the treasury, that even when a Conservative member was accused of wrong doing the most eminent lawyer of the country and he a Reformer, was employed to see that justice was done, and finding him guilty, he was expelled from this House. But even since the hon. gentleman and his friends have come into power, when election frauds were charged in distant Manitoba, money was supplied in abundance and even advanced to private individuals in order that justice might be done and the wrong-doers punished. But since that day we have had much graver offences than those, we have had election scandal after election scandal, until to-day Canada, which once was the most honoured country in the world, I am afraid has some black spots on its escutcheon now ; yet we are so impoverished in this country that ever since the marvellous efforts that were made in 1896, whether rascalities were perpetrated in Brockville, West Huron, Montreal or elsewhere, we have not been able to see that justice was done and the fair fame of Canada vindicated. Now when we find in this way that our money has run short, perhaps we are not to blame if the hon. gentleman should suggest that we take the only means we have in our power of paying our natonal debt.

But before six o'clock is reached, let me say a word in defence of the Hon. Mr. Ross, the premier of Ontario. The right hon. premier of this Dominion laid down the proposition that war and commerce should not go together, and that this letter having been sent over from the old country to the Governor General of Canada, inviting the premier and his colleagues to a conference, they were quite justified in refusing to discuss the question of defence, or in refusing to discuss any question except the commercial one, on the ground that the commercial question and the defence question should not go together. Now, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House in commenting on the terms of this letter in reply, as it is not before us. But it has been laid on the Table of the House, and therefore it is in the possession of the House, and within the knowledge probably of most hon. members. I venture to say there is no member of this House who has read the invitation and the reply, who will not unhesitatingly acquit the right hon. the premier of either writing that reply or of any knowledge of the particular terms of that reply. The language, the spirit, the courtesy of that reply are such as the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) alone could dictate. Neither the right hon. premier or any other of his ministers could have dictated such a response as was sent. It is not necessary for me to recapitulate all the terms of the letter ; but hon. gentlemen will remember

well that whereas the Prime Minister and his colleagues were invited to discuss other questions, and were asked to make any suggestions in connection with them that they could, they very promptly slapped their prospective hosts in the face, and they very courteously refused to discuss anything but the problem of dollars and cents in which there might be some pecuniary profit. It would have been quite within the province of the right hon. gentleman to have said at the conference, Canada is not prepared to do anything more in the way of defence than she has done; he could very properly have taken that course; but I do submit that nobody will believe that the premier ever dictated or was aware of a reply so discourteous to his hosts, who had invited the ministers to a banquet, and suggested to them certain topics to discuss. But the premier and his colleagues refuse to discuss any but one question. Perhaps some hon. gentleman may say: But look at the last sentence, look, as it were, at the sting in the tail; for after pointing out that no fruitful result could flow from discussing any question but that of dollars and cents, they practically say to their hosts: If, however, you are bound to discuss the question of defence, we suppose we will have to listen to what you will have to say. That is the gracious reply His Excellency, on behalf of the government, has sent to the Colonial Secretary in response to the invitation to the right hon. premier and his colleagues.

But the premier of Ontario has discussed this very question. He went through England discussing it at various boards of trade and before other public bodies in the old land. Again and again this question of Imperial defence came up, and the Hon. Mr. Ross, formerly a member of this House, for many years a minister of the province of Ontario, and now for some time back premier of Ontario, pointed out that war and commerce were so closely allied that in his judgment the proper discussion of the defence problem was along commercial lines; that inasmuch as an enormous expenditure is necessary for the purpose of the defence of the empire, and inasmuch as we in the colonies were deriving all the benefits without contributing a dollar, he suggested that a duty of say 5 cents a bushel be placed on all grain brought into the colonies or into Great Britain, or that perhaps the duty might be 5 per cent all round on all products brought into the empire from whatever source, and that the revenue thus derived should be applied as a defence fund, thus making outsiders maintain the army and navy of the empire. Surely, Sir, that is a business proposition. I will go as far as any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House—I say this in answer to the taunt that was thrown out at the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as being opposed to taking part in a scheme for military defence—I say I will go as far as any hon. gentleman in this House in objecting to any military arrangement that would in any way, no matter how slight, deprive the Canadian people of the control of their own treasury and of their own men. But it is one thing to say we object to handing over to the Imperial authorities the control of Canadian money and Canadian lives, and it is another thing to say that we are not willing to discuss a question whereby, by simply imposing a tax—which would be the very Imperial preferential tariff that the right hon. gentleman claims he desires to attain, that he hopes to get in London, which was the very thing that Mr. Ross hoped to obtain in this simple way—by putting a tax of 5 per cent on all products coming into the empire, we might thus contribute to a common fund for the defence of the empire. Now I venture to say that when a gentleman occupying the position of the premier of Ontario points out this simple, unobjectionable way, and if it were possible even less objectionable since the budget speech of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, and when the right hon. gentleman says in this House that it is impossible to consider war and commerce together, he takes a position in direct antagonism to the position the premier of Ontario has assumed on that question.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not in the House when this debate commenced in order that I might have had the full advantage of all that has been said. I desire, however, to express briefly an opinion or two in regard to what has already been said in reference to two or three questions to which attention has been directed. It appears that about two months ago the attention of the country, of the government and of the commercial bodies, such as boards of trades, was directed to the fact that it was the intention of the British government to impose a duty upon corn, or to reimpose, in a degree, the corn laws. The matter was discussed at that time by the various commercial organizations of this country and I know in one, and in perhaps more, cases that the government of this country were approached and that they were pressed to make known the views of the country on this matter and to ask the British government that if these corn laws were reimposed the colonies of Great Britain should be exempt from the operation of them. Whether the government took the advice which was given to them, or whether they have communicated to the British government on their own behalf, or on behalf of the country, or on behalf of the commercial organizations to

which I have referred, I cannot say. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if they have not done this, they have fallen very far short in their duty. I regret that the right hon. leader of the government (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not in his place at the present time because if they have not asked the British government to exempt the colonies from the operation of the duties which have been reimposed, I would like to inquire from the government, and to know to-night before this discussion closes, whether it is their intention, now, to press upon the British government to exempt us from the operation of these corn laws. I would urge them, if they have not done so, to take steps to have the British government exempt us in the way in which I have mentioned. It would appear from the debate, so far as it has gone, and it would appear from the attitude of the government for many years past that they have been very sceptical in regard to the question of whether the British government would at any time within measurable distance reimpose the corn laws or adopt a protective tariff. The hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) has said that five years ago no one could have expected that these corn laws would have been reimposed, that this duty would have been put in force and that it is because of the war. Certainly we have to look forward to all kinds of contingencies such as war which is one contingency which brings about great results. In view of all kinds of contingencies it does not seem that the government have been very wise in not placing themselves on record and trying to have this country relieved from the operation of this tariff in case, under any circumstances, it should come in force.

The premier gave utterance to a sentiment this afternoon at which I was very much surprised. He took the ground, as I understood it, that defence and commerce are two separate and entirely different things. I wish to disagree with him in respect to this matter. I cannot put myself in the standpoint of the Prime Minister when he makes such a statement, because, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that great navies are chiefly for the purpose of defending the commerce of the nations which own these great navies, that were it not for the commerce of the countries there would not be so much money spent in naval defence. I think that the ground is not well taken when the premier puts forth such a statement as that. The navy of Great Britain is increasing constantly. For what purpose is it increasing ? The navy of Germany is increasing and for what purpose ? The navy of the United States is increasing. Is it not to defend the continually increasing foreign trade of the United States, of Germany and of Great Britain ? These are civilized nations ; they are not seeking for territorial extension at the present time so much as to develop their trade and commerce and the navies upon which they spend so much money are for the purpose of enabling them, in case of complications, to defend that commerce. Therefore, I say that trade and defence go hand in hand, and while it is a very nice sentiment for the Prime Minister to talk about developing this country along other lines, and not to direct our attention to the question of military and naval expenditure so much, yet, we must be guided by what other nations have to do and we must come to the conclusion that we cannot be exempt from these obligations and responsibilities which other nations have to assume. The Prime Minister also referred to the fact that we had done an Imperial work in building the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have heard that argument advanced on former occasions and by other gentlemen. The Canadian Pacific Railway has paid this country fourfold over all it cost us, but we have other great enterprises in this country besides the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have other railways, we have other public works, we have canals, we have bridges, we have wharfs, and I think, Sir, that these would only be secondary to the Canadian Pacific Railway in these discussions in using such things as arguments, if, in fact, any of these things, and including the Canadian Pacific Railway, can be considered in any sense to have been built from an Imperial standpoint. I say that it is no argument and no excuse why we should not assume our fair share of responsibility in relation to the defence of the country that we should point to such matters as these. The right hon. gentleman also said that we did not want to turn the finances and revenues of the country in the direction of defence, that it would be better to spend the money on public works. I will admit, that, perhaps, it might be better, but we have to accept the inevitable. We cannot get away from these facts.

Now, I have said in this House on many occasions that I did not believe there was any other destiny for this country except that of British connection. I wish to reiterate that statement, and I wish to say that I hope the time is coming when we will all agree on that matter. I believe there is no medium course for us, that there is no course for us such as independence. I believe that if there was a sentiment, which I question very much, there is no such sentiment on the part of our people looking towards independence as would make it a practicable question, because, assuming that we were granted independence, in a very few years we would be absorbed by the United States, I admit after a struggle, but the struggle would be inevitable because the conclusion would be foregone.

Mr. FRASER. No, no.

Mr. KEMP. Well, 5,000,000 against 80,000,000—of course, there might not be many

of the 5,000,000 left when it was all over, but that would be the result and there is no use trying to get away from that fact. I do not want anything to do with independence and I do not want anything to do with the United States more than to continue to live beside them on terms of peace and harmony for ever, developing our country with its great resources in the best way we can. But, supposing that we had the aspiration to become an independent country and that we did become an independent country what would be our position in regard to this question of defence which has been raised in this debate this afternoon? Would we not have to have some show of a navy? Would we not have to have one or more vessels? Would we not have to have some means of defence? Is it not a fair thing for us to look around and see what our duty is in regard to this question, and having discussed the question and having considered it, be willing to face the matter, not by throwing our responsibility over in the discussion of the question, but by being prepared to take whatever steps are necessary in the direction in which our duty lies?

To talk about our being exempt from the responsibilities which belongs to every nation, and to talk as the Prime Minister has about ignoring the question of defence, is all very fine for a five o'clock tea party, but it is not the kind of talk that the parliaments of civilized nations indulge in with reference to that question. A large percentage of the total revenue of all the nations of the world is devoted to their defence; 50 per cent in England, and only between 3 and 4 per cent of the total expenditure of Canada is expended on means of defence. I cannot give the exact figures for the United States, Germany and France, but of course a very large percentage of their total expenditure is on their army and navy. When we consider that only about from 3 to 4 per cent of our expenditure goes for defence, compared with 50 per cent of the revenue of Great Britain, that in itself ought be sufficient to warrant us in at least discussing the question. I believe we are educating our people the wrong way. We cannot reap where we have not sown, we cannot get something for nothing, but when we shirk our responsibility in this matter, that is what we are actually trying to do. When we endeavour to keep the discussion of such a matter out of this House, we are simply stifling our national life and shirking the responsibility which nationhood casts upon us. This question must come into our politics; it will be forced upon us, and to endeavour to procrastinate with regard to it, is simply to drift. Mr. Isaac N. Ford, whose writings are always held in respect, and whom we look upon as an authority, has a cable despatch dated 'London, April 15, 1 a.m.,' which shows the trend of public opinion in Great Britain; which shows the changing of public opinion there, and which says:

> Mr. Kruger, besides staggering humanity, has driven the last nail in the coffin of free trade. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has required considerable pressure and he has yielded reluctantly. Sir Robert Giffen, who was once the hope of the stern, unbending Cobdenites, has been coaching him in the columns of the 'Times,' and at last the cue is taken. The taxation of corn is resumed. Although the abolition of the corn laws was the supreme end of Mr. Cobden's agitation, which converted England into the pioneer free trade nation, the hands on the dial plate, as devout Cobdenites will say, are now turned back. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach sought to minimize the importance of the new taxation by describing it as a revival of the registration duty on wheat and flour, which Mr. Lowe ought never to have repealed, and which had nothing to do with a protective system, but Sir William Harcourt did not allow the House to be deceived by sophistries, and characterized the taxation of food as incompatible with a free trade system.
>
> The budget speech was a clear evidence that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach had yielded to pressure from Mr. Chamberlain. The Secretary for the Colonies evidently was determined to have the duties on food stuffs before the assembling of the Imperial conference, when the colonial premiers come to the coronation, so that there could be some basis for the preferential treatment of Canada and the other colonies.

This language must represent British public opinion to some extent. It shows that it is in the mind of the British people that there is to be a trade preference within the British empire. It is evident that the time has come when not only from a sentimental standpoint, but from a commercial standpoint as well, it is in our interest to encourage preferential reciprocity. In the critical stage of the South African war, I did not believe as others did, that the downfall of the British empire had commenced. I believe that these are days of consolidation and federation. I believe that British opinion is more favourable to the consideration of preferential tariffs to-day than at any time in the past. I believe that this great colony should in this crisis move in the direction of preferential trade with the mother country and the other colonies. As Mr. Ford says, this view has been electrified and intensified by the outcome of the war in South Africa.

Let me turn for a moment to the question of Imperial defence. I want to be guarded in what I say on that matter. I do not want any one to understand me as contending that because Great Britain expends such tremendous sums for defence, that we in Canada should spend as large a sum per capita, or even that we should spend as large a sum relatively in respect to the tonnage of our sea commerce as Great Britain does in respect to hers. I do, however, say that the time has come when we must consider this question, and I contend now as I have contended before in this House, that we should at least be willing to discuss the question with the motherland. Let me refer to the attitude of the

Canadian government as evidenced in their reply to the invitation which was received from the British government. I repeat that the Canadian government were not warranted in making such a reply. I assume that before the Colonial Secretary cabled the invitation to the Canadian Prime Minister through the Governor General, that matter was well thought out by the British cabinet. I also assume that the British government were reluctant in suggesting any matter of the kind to the colonies, knowing as they must know the sensitiveness of the self-governing colonies with regard to anything affecting their perfect autonomy and independence. It is not British to ask for help, and I believe that it was not the intention of Great Britain to ask for help or to suggest anything that could by any possibility be construed as being offensive to the colonies. The invitation of the British government raised three questions, namely : The question of our political relations; the question of defence, and the question of trade. As was pointed out by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup), the Canadian government replied that there was only one of these questions which they would condescend to discuss. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Northrup) referred to the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) as being the gentleman who had framed that reply to the British government, I saw from the smile that came over the face of the Prime Minister, that he wished to take credit to himself for that reply. But the Minister of Finance afterwards came along and added the rider to which he referred, and which he could use when necessary. I wish to refer again to this letter and to read the few lines to which reference has been made. It says :

> Referring to the several questions mentioned in your despatch of January 23, the only one which in the opinion of my ministers gives promise of useful discussion is that of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire.

Then, after reference to some other matters, the letter ends with the clause to which the Finance Minister refers :

> Nevertheless my ministers realize the desirability of taking advantage of every opportunity for the discussion by the public men of the mother country and the colonies of questions of Imperial interest.

and so forth. Now, I think the government have made a mistake in this reply, just as they have made a mistake in reference to the preferential tariff, and in reference to asking the British government what was their intention in imposing these duties on our produce. Even if the government felt that this was a sensitive matter, and that they were not sure what the feeling of the people of this country was, would it not have been a courageous thing and a fair thing for them to have expressed their willingness to discuss any question of Imperial interest ? It seems to me that if their reply gives room for the British people to take offence, because, after all, it is only a talk between the mother and the daughter—a confidential talk to a certain extent. If this government were carrying on negotiations of a delicate nature with a foreign government, I could understand why they should word their letter in the way they did in this case. There are three questions brought out in this discussion ; one in reference to the preferential tariff, one in reference to imperial defence, and one in reference to our young men going to South Africa to serve the empire. These are all questions of imperial importance ; and in using the word imperial as I have done, I want to say that imperialism is a word which, it seems to me, is not well defined. It may mean one thing to me and another thing to some one else ; therefore, I wish to use it in a guarded sense. I think it would be a good thing if in these discussions we came to an understanding of what we meant by imperialism. When I speak of taking some step to defend ourselves, of course I have in my mind the question of coast defences, the question of a navy. I do not wish to be understood by that, however, as laying down a principle under which we would contribute a large amount of money to be administered otherwise than by this parliament of Canada. I believe that every dollar of naval or military expense that this country incurs should be controlled solely by this parliament, and I believe that at no time in the future should we participate in military operations in any part of the empire or in any part of the world except by the consent of this parliament.

Now, I come to the question of the contingents, which has already been discussed ; and in reference to these, as in reference to the other two questions, I think the government have been wrong. I believe that on these Imperial questions they are not taking a broad enough view of the situation, and later on we will be obliged to discuss them on broader lines, because they will be thrust into our politics, and we shall not be able to get rid of them, however much some may desire to do so. As I understand, the government of Canada paid for clothing and equipping and transporting the two or three first contingents who went to South Africa.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And supplemented their pay.

Mr. KEMP. And supplemented their pay. However, for some reason or other the government have gone back on the principle they acted upon at the outset of the hostilities. Why they have done this is a mystery to me. It must be apparent that if they were right in the first instance, they were wrong in the second ; if they were right in equipping, clothing and transporting the men

of the first two or three contingents, they were wrong afterwards in not doing the same with regard to the subsequent contingents. We cannot say that in the paltry expenditure they incurred for this service, they did their whole duty to the empire. The contingent which is in course of organization at the present time, as I understand, are offering themselves for service in South Africa, and the ordinary citizen cannot possibly take any credit to himself, because the men who are offering themselves are doing all the sacrificing. The government as I understand, is not willing even to clothe them or give them a water bottle or a rifle. The young men are enthusiastic. We were told the other day by the Minister of Militia that three were offering where only one was needed. This is an evidence of the condition of public opinion in this country. It is quite evident that if five thousand were needed, they would be forthcoming. This being an evidence of the condition of public opinion in this country, I say that the government have taken a wrong stand in this matter also. I think it is an injustice to our young men that they should be put in that position. If the British government wanted men, they could get them from the semi-civilized tribes of India or Africa on the same conditions. Have we or have we not any interest in this matter ? Do we not feel that it is a good thing for this empire to be held together ? And is there not merely a sentimental reason for this, but a commercial one also? If it had not been for the great efforts and sacrifices which Great Britain has made, and the lesser sacrifices which the colonies have made, all this could not have been accomplished, but the whole structure would have fallen to pieces. Not only would Great Britain have been deprived of her possessions in South Africa, but that would have been the beginning of the end. Therefore I say that the government made a mistake in this matter, and I deplore the way in which men who have volunteered to go forward have been treated. I contend that if Great Britain had desired to obtain troops upon the conditions which these Canadian soldiers have gone forward, she could have got them in other parts of the globe, and we in Canada should only have sent forward as many men as it was possible for us to clothe, equip and transport at the expense of Canada. When we have an over-flowing treasury, and such surpluses as the Minister of Finance boasts of, and when we are spending so little on defence, we cannot say that we have done our whole duty when we have spent a couple of million or so on the first contingents. From a monetary point of view we cannot be excused. The sentiments and principles of these young men have been established, because they have continued to volunteer after others returned from the war, and after they knew of the privations, the sufferings and the dangers which were before them.

The government have, in respect to the despatch of these contingents, simply occupied the position of outfitters. They have on behalf of the British government, the British taxpayer, purchased the clothing, arms, and equipment, which any commercial organization could have done. We have one citizen of this country, with sufficient national sentiment and money, who organized, equipped and sent out to South Africa a contingent at his own expense. It is a pity that we have not had others with sufficient wealth to do likewise and thus to have relieved this government from a responsibility which they have evidently been loath to assume. I do not wish to take up the time of the House any further. It is a good thing for this country that we have young men such as those of whom we have read within the last few days—men such as Private Evans and Captain Carruthers. If we did not have such material in this country, we could never expect to build it up as we hope to do. These men are the kind who have helped materially to build up other great nations, and I am sorry I have to say of this government that I believe it has pursued with regard to them a picayune policy. To my mind the government have made three mistakes. Their first was the reply which they gave concerning the question of Imperial defence. The second, is their attitude in reference to the contingents, and the third is the position in which they find themselves, owing to the re-imposition of the corn laws in Great Britain. Now that the right hon. Prime Minister is in his place, this House would be very much interested if he would tell us whether he has up to the present, at the instance of the commercial organizations which petitioned him in respect to this question, approached the British government and asked it to exempt Canada from the affect of the tax imposed on bread stuffs. These commercial bodies foresaw two months ago what was likely to happen, and petitioned the right hon. gentleman to do something. But if no steps were taken during the past two months, I would like to have the right hon. gentleman say that steps will immediately be taken to ask the British government to give us a preference. I believe, from the reports in the papers this evening, that if such representations were made, Canada would be exempt from the application of the tax which has been imposed upon her wheat and other cereals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I do not know that I should have thought of saying anything in reply to my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Kemp), had it not been for the repetition, in the latter course of his remarks, of the attacks upon the position of the gov-

ernment with respect to the sending of the contingents to fight for the empire in South Africa. My hon. friend enjoys the distinction of being more loyal to the King and more Catholic than the Pope, and in that respect he seems to have a considerable amount of support in the good city in which he resides. He finds fault with us for not hraving done what he thinks we should have done. He finds fault because we have not paid what we were not asked to pay.

Mr. KEMP. Oh.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And what it was not even suggested we should pay. The House knows well that when the question of sending a contingent first came before us, the government promptly responded to the call and did everything to the letter which it was suggested the government should do. But our hon. friends even then were so anxious to find fault with the government that they contended that, in addition to supplementing the pay of our forces in South Africa, we ought to pay the rest of the money, although the British government were willing to pay it and never made any suggestion to us that we should do so. And they find fault with us because, in the case of this last contingent, we have not assumed a position different from that which it was suggested we should assume.

The British government, desirous of securing a number of colonial troops, made a suggestion to a number of colonial governments, and that suggestion was loyally responded to by every government to which it was made, and by none more promptly and loyally than the government of Canada. In respect of the contingent being formed to-day, we are doing everything it has been suggested we should do, and if anything further be necessary, we are ready and willing to do whatever else may be suggested. Surely that is an attitude in which the country will be disposed to support the government. And it is an attitude, in respect of which we can claim the support of the House and the country. But I venture to say that my hon. friend, in the remarks which he has addressed to this House, cannot claim the support of the House and the country. I venture to say that he cannot get the members on his own side to endorse the position he takes. I venture to say that he cannot get his leader in this House to endorse the statements he has made and put them in the shape of a resolution. We are here, Sir, for the purpose of doing business, and not for the purpose of airing theories which we know are not going to be adopted. We are not here for the purpose of making suggestions which cannot be carried into practical effect. That is not what the government is here for, whether that be what my hon. friend is here for or not. We are here for the purpose of dealing with practical business, and we have dealt with these contingents in a practical business way, and we submit our conduct to this House and the country, confident that it will meet with their approval. Let my hon. friend get his leader to submit his policy to his friends in the House and the country, if he desires to have even respectable attention given to the suggestions he makes. This government and the Liberal party generally have no cause to feel ashamed of their position with regard to sending troops to assist in fighting the battles of the empire. Hon. gentlemen opposite when in opposition are very loyal, so far as their lips are concerned, but it is a matter of history that when they had an opportunity of doing what we have done, they did not do it. They did not supplement the pay, they did not pay the expense, they did not send the men, although the suggestion was made that they should do so, when Britain was in war in the Soudan, and other British colonies were busy sending assistance to the mother country. Where was Canada then? Canada was then governed by the party of which the hon. gentleman is so enthusiastic a member. But Canada was not then in the van of the fighting line. It lagged behind until the Liberal government took office. Since then it has not lagged behind but has gone forward and assumed a position in the councils of the empire which it never enjoyed before, and which it never would have assumed if we were left to follow the theortical and unpractical counsels which the hon. gentleman suggests. The hon. gentleman has had some experience himself in endeavouring to formulate an imperial policy, but his experience has not been satisfactory, to the extent at least of making any impression on the minds of the statesmen who govern the empire. What is the occasion of this debate? Why has it been brought on? So far as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) is concerned, I think we can all answer the question. The hon. member for East York could not resist the temptation—he never can—of being first to bulletin an important piece of news from his place in this House. His instinct as a newspaper man leads him to highly prize that privilege, and I think we all regard it as one of the things that may be expected of him and all rather enjoy it. But, so far as this debate has developed into an attack upon the policy of the government, I desire to point out that it is of a piece with the policy that has been followed by the hon. gentlemen on the other side with respect to the action of the government in connection with the affairs of the empire from the day we took office. It is a deliberate and persistent attempt to misrepresent the position of the government to the House and to the people. When we were in opposition the hon. gentlemen did the same thing. They were exceedingly loyal, and they declared that if we came into office the affairs of the British empire would not be safe, so far as our influence upon them was concerned.

But the moment we proceeded to give a practical evidence of our affection for the empire and our loyalty to it, what did they do ? No sooner was that resolution laid on the Table than they proceeded to show that they were opposed to that policy and to any policy that gave practical expression of Canada's loyalty to the empire. A little later on when the right hon. Prime Minister went to England what happened ? They were afraid of the effect of the success of the visit of the right hon. gentleman to the mother country, of the reception he met with there and the favourable impression he created upon the minds of the people. Fearing that these things would reflect upon their political fortunes, they proceeded to misrepresent what he had said, and to say repeatedly, yet without a shadow of foundation, that he had refused an offer that had been made of preferential treatment of Canadian products in the British market, or that he had declined in advance an offer that was about to be made. It took a considerable length of time to explode that misstatement. And now, we have the same thing going on. We find these hon. gentlemen trying to create the impression in the House and in the country that there is something in the position of this government that is not favourable to preferential trade, in fact, that we have declared ourselves hostile to it. I know of no case of any person who has any authority to speak on behalf of the Liberal party having declared himself hostile to preferential trade or having attempted to minimize its beneficial effects if it were possible to secure it. What was said repeatedly was that it was not likely that such a thing would come about in the very near future. As my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said it is simply a question of when the opportune time was. Was the time opportune in 1897 when my hon. friend the Finance Minister laid his budget on the Table and brought down this British preference proposal ? If the time was opportune in 1897, was it not opportune in 1896, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power ? There was no striking change in the affairs of the empire between 1896 and 1897. If the members of this government could have got preferential treatment in 1897 why did not the Conservative government get it in 1896 ? Simply to call attention to the fact is all that is necessary to show that the thing is not arguable, that it is a statement that does not commend itself to the most easily deluded person. Now, these hon. gentlemen find that circumstances have arisen which make it possible that in the future, perhaps in the near future, the question of preferential treatment may be a subject of serious discussion. Nobody knows better than these hon. gentlemen do that the action of this government for the last five years has commended itself to the government of Great Britain and to the people of Great Britain. Nobody knows better than they do that Canada at the present time is strong in the mother country ; and if, under the circumstances in which the empire is placed, it be possible to do anything to meet the wishes of Canada, it will be done. That is what we all feel and we feel it and know it to be the result of the course of action followed by this government for the last five years—a course of action that was diametrically opposed not only to what hon. gentlemen opposite propose now, but to what they carried out when they were in power, their policy of keeping Great Britain at arms length, of giving nothing unless they got an equivalent. Now that they see the time approaching when a discussion is likely to take place upon this question, they desire to make it appear to the people that this government approach the discussion of that subject in the coming conference in a hostile spirit. There is no foundation for such statement. On the contrary, every member of this government looks forward to the conference with the strongest hope and desire that something may be done to improve our trade relations, not only with Great Britain but with the other colonies of the British empire. And if Great Britain finds itself on account of its revenue necessities in a position to consider an idea which Lord Salisbury would not entertain two years ago, we say that we have been favoured by fortune and shall be most happy to take advantage of the opportunity thus presented. There is nothing whatever in the document to which the hon. gentleman referred which justified the misrepresentations made this afternoon. It is a document which, I venture to say, is calculated to do that which it ought to do. It is calculated to convey to the British government what is in the minds of the advisers of the Crown in this country—that we regard the commercial question as the practical question, the question from which results may be expected, but that as to the other questions, while we are prepared to discuss them, we do not at the present time feel that there is likely to be any tangible or practicable result. If the gentleman's own views were written down, I venture to say they would be expressed by that memorandum. The hon. gentleman himself knows, I am sure, just as well as we do, that the commercial question is the one from which practical results may follow, but that the other questions while they may be discussed are not likely to yield any practical results at the present time. And if we have expressed, as I venture to say we have, the mind of nine-tenths of the members of this House on both sides, and of nine-tenths of the members of the Canadian community, I do not see why the hon. gentleman should take the trouble to waste the time of the House in finding fault. I did not wish to take up time this evening, but I desired to call attention to the position

that the government has taken with regard to the contingent, upon which the hon. gentleman made an attack, and I take it that it is quite clear that the position that the government has taken is one that will commend itself both to the House and to the country.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). The House has now listened to three members of the Cabinet address themselves to the task they have in hand, and that it is a task is quite evident from the fact that the question of real importance that has been raised, and that will be regarded as real importance throughout this country, has not been answered by any of them. The whole question at issue is whether or not this government proposes to address itself to the task, if it is a task, of obtaining from the British government favourable treatment for Canada in this question of grain importation into the motherland. I can easily understand why these hon. gentlemen are ashamed to deal with this question. I can easily understand why they feel diffident in approaching it. The fact is they find themselves in a pit and they are unable to extricate themselves. What is the history of the question of British preference? In the autumn of 1896 when the elections were being proceeded with, the present premier went into the province of Ontario. Sir Charles Tupper had introduced the question of British preference, and the premier who was then the leader of the opposition found that he had to do, as he has always done, and I suppose always will do—he had to trim his sails to catch the wind.

Finding that that was a popular cry in the province of Ontario, in his celebrated London speech which has been referred to this afternoon, the hon. gentleman went strong, and endeavoured to go Sir Charles Tupper one better on the question of a preference for our food stuffs within the British market. Then he found himself face to face with his pre-election utterances. Later on he found himself in Great Britain, and true to his free trade principles, he at once placed himself in communication with gentlemen who had the same political aptitudes as himself. My recollection is that there was a meeting held in the city of Liverpool, that a banquet was tendered to the right hon. gentleman, and that on that occasion his first utterance was along the line that Canada did not want any preference in the British market at all. Now the right hon. gentleman was in one of two positions: Either he was not politically honest when he preached that doctrine of preferential free trade, or he was in a position where he might accomplish it but did not wish to accomplish it. Be that as it may, the right hon. gentleman's statements were acclaimed, and I think on more than one occasion, in addressing meetings in different parts of Great Britain, banquets which were tendered him, he went on this self same cry again, that no preference was desired and no preference sought by the Canadian people. So strong were his statements in this regard that he was at once heralded by the celebrated Cobden Club as an apostle of free trade from protectionist Canada. If reports be true, although I have never seen that precious article, the right hon. gentleman had the honour of having pinned on his breast the Cobden medal which, on more than one occasion, he has been advised that he holds to-day under false pretenses, heading as he does a protectionist government in Canada, and that a quick return should be made of that medal, which must be now a much despised article because it has never been paraded in this country.

Now, what is the position of these hon. gentlemen to-day? The Conservative party have held the right hon. gentleman and his government to task from the very moment they stood on the threshold of office, in that they have not tried to impress upon the home authorities the desirability of carrying this policy into effect. As the Minister of Finance stated this afternoon, five years ago it was an absurdity to ask for that, and he said to-night that we would not have been greeted with the news that we have heard to-day of this imposition on flour and grain, were it not that this impost was rendered necessary by the exigencies of the war. Well, that is rather a prophetic declaration for that hon. gentleman. But he must remember that he and his colleagues have always fairly laughed the matter out of court in this respect, and have contended that so long have these duties been abandoned in Great Britain that it was impossible that she should ever have recourse to them again. The hon. gentlemen have proceeded on these lines, and their press has gone on these lines; but when they are confronted with the information that has come to-day from Great Britain, they are startled, it is almost too quick a turn for them to take; and they are in this dilemma, that they cannot to-night inform the House whether they intend to ask the home government to make that concession. Now how is this news being greeted in Great Britain? I find in the Montreal 'Star' of to-day a despatch from New York containing the correspondence of the New York 'Evening Post' to this effect:

> Almost before the Chancellor of the Exchequer had resumed his seat in the House of Commons, yesterday afternoon, the streets were ringing with the news-boys' cries of 'tax on bread!' Thus beginning an agitation with a possible serious sequel.
>
> Taxes on wheat and flour, practically, is a return to the duties which were enacted after the repeal of the old protective corn law. Influential supporters of the ministry intend to press for the complete exemption of Canadian and Australasian grain, as a response to the colonial preferential tariffs and some recognition of colonial help in the war.

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, almost alone among the ministers, stands between them and success.

Now this afternoon I listened to the Minister of Finance's exposition of their policy. While with one breath he said that the whole preference to Great Britain was sentiment, in the next place he said it was really a sordid proposition on the part of the government, that they went to Great Britain with this proposition, not out of sentiment, but with the hope and expectation that some day later on a preference might be given to Canada. To-day these gentlemen are brought face to face with the fact that they have been slow in the past, and they find themselves in a dilemma. Let us go a little further and read another quotation which I have here, showing how this matter is being viewed by persons from other colonies. In the Montreal 'Star' of to-day a number of gentlemen are interviewed on the situation, and one gentleman gives this opinion :

Mr. Caldwell, of the firm of Steen, Macky, Logan and Caldwell, of Auckland, New Zealand, who is at present in Montreal, expressed the opinion that the business men of his country would be disappointed at the new budget. In discussing the matter to-day, he said that, while New Zealand had not given Great Britain a preference in her tariff, the people were perfectly willing to do so, provided it was placed on a reciprocal basis. He did not understand how Canadian manufacturers could prosper under the present tariff.

Now there is the opinion of a gentleman from New Zealand who, I presume, is a gentleman of prominence, as his opinion has been sought by a journal of the importance of the Montreal 'Star.' This fact is evident, that the members of the government have been caught suddenly by this proposition of the British government, and they are now endeavouring to back up and wait for public opinion. They are endeavouring to force the opposition, if possible, to take the ground that we are in favour of a defence fund for army and navy purposes, in order to precipitate a discussion along those lines so that they might strengthen themselves in the House and in the country. Well, it is no new game for these hon. gentlemen to stand and wait for public opinion and popular approval. We have seen that in connection with the question of sending the contingents. Why, if there ever was a question agitated before the people of Canada on which the government stood, and halted, and waited for popular opinion before they moved, it was on the question of the first contingent. Why, Sir, it was the scandal of the country, and day in and day out the ministry were at daggers drawn on that very question. The 'Patrie' newspaper, controlled by the Minister of Public Works, who, as the country knows, is the master of this administration, declared day after day that there would be no contingent ; and afterwards when these contingents were sent there were apologies all along the line from these hon. gentlemen. If I recollect rightly it was the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) who apologized on different platforms in the province of Quebec at the last elections, for the presence of those men in South Africa who had gone from Canada. The whole plea of the government was that these men had not been sent by the Canadian government, but that this government had in their wisdom simply allowed these men to go from Canada to South Africa. These hon. gentlemen are in this position to-day, that they have failed to keep abreast of the times, people are holding them to account on this question of preferential trade, and for missing an opportunity that would probably have been theirs had they grasped for it. To-day they are endeavourig to draw a herring across the path, they are endeavouring to force this side of the House into taking some stand that can be used in the province of Quebec. The Prime Minister made a speech to-day that he cannot deny will be used both in Ontario and in Quebec. The right hon. gentleman struck the keynote when he said that he was opposed and opposed fairly and squarely to this question of giving assistance to the empire in strengthening her armaments, whether they be naval or whether they be forces in the field. I think that was plainly understood. When the right hon. gentleman came up to the fence he saw the dilemma with which he was confronted and I assume that he thought it would be better to take a position of anti-imperialism, as it is termed in the province of Quebec, and then to approach the people in the other provinces by simply presenting the question in the shape of a commercial matter. But, I can tell the right hon. gentleman that there has grown up in Great Britain a strong feeling in favour of a preference being given to our food supplies in that country and I believe it has been hastened, not by the question of this so-called preference which has been given under our tariff, but that the feeling has been strengthened in Great Britain by reason of that fact that our valiant sons volunteered their lives in defence of the empire in South Africa.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I would not have taken any part in this discussion excepting for the allusion that was made by the last speaker (Mr. Bennett) to an article which appears to-day in the Montreal 'Star.' It appears to me that if there was anything wanting to make the Liberal party substantial in this country and in the motherland it is the article that appears to-day in the Montreal 'Star.' What is the effect of that statement ? We have, to-day in England, by reason of the enormous war expenditure which has accumulated there, the necessity of what is called in England a protective tariff. It is not a protective tariff ; it is a tariff for revenue. The English people are

not a people who believe in protection. The whole history of the past shows that they are not a people who believe in protection. They are a people who believe in a tariff for revenue so far as the necessities of the country are concerned and free trade is their factum. What does the Montreal 'Star' say? Properly read this is the language which is used:

Almost before the Chancellor of the Exchequer had resumed his seat in the House of Commons, yesterday afternoon, the streets were ringing with the newsboys' cries of 'tax on bread!' Thus beginning an agitation with a possible serious sequel.

Taxes on wheat and flour, practically is a return to the duties which were enacted after the repeal of the old protective corn law. Influential supporters of the ministry intend to press for the complete exemption of Canadian and Australasian grain as a response to——

What?

—as a response to the colonial preferential tariffs.

What does that mean, Sir? Does it mean that the English government repudiate the preferntial tariff which the Canadian government enacted some years ago? What does it prove? That the English people and the influential supporters of the Conservative administration in Great Britain appreciate that tariff. They appreciate it so highly as to insist that the government shall give a preferential tariff on Canadian wheat. For what? In response to the preferential tariff that was enacted in Canada by the Liberal government of Canada.

Mr. BROCK. You said you would not take it.

Mr. GERMAN. There never was a public man in Canada who said that he would not take it. There never was a public man in Canada who said that he did not want it. There never was a public man in Canada who said that Canada did not want a preferential tariff in favour of this country. It has been stated time after time that the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), while in Great Britain, said that we did not want a preferential tariff. That is absolutely untrue as you will see if you read the record. There is not a gentleman in this House, or in the country, who can show a single line in any speech that the premier of Canada made which will bear out the suggestion that he stated that Canada did not want a preferential tariff. That is what the Liberals want; that is what the Conservatives never did want and never tried to get. As was well stated by the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) the conditions were not changed between 1896 and 1897. The Conservatives could have got a preferential tariff in Great Britain as well in 1896 as the Liberals could have got it in 1897. The Conservatives were in power for eighteen years, they never got a preferential tariff and they never tried to get a preferential tariff. The Liberals made an effort to get the preferential tariff and the best evidence of that effort is this very article which the hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat, has read as published in the Montreal 'Star.' It appears to me that the Liberal party have done more in that direction than the Conservative party have ever done. We have heard considerable during this session of parliament and during previous sessions from the Conservatives that the Liberals have done something enormously wrong by giving a preference on British goods. I would like to see one Conservative stand up in this House and move a resolution that the preferential tariff be done away with. Let the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), who has sprung this discussion on this House against the will of his friends, against the desire of the Conservatives, the same as he sprung himself on the city of Toronto——

Mr. MACLEAN. He will win yet.

Mr. GERMAN. He has sprung this discussion on the House that his own friends did not want. Let him stand up in this House and take the position, that he appears to desire, of moving a resolution condemning the preferential tariff and then we will believe that he is honest in his suggestions. Let the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who did move an amendment to the motion to go into committee of supply which is a sort of a veiled ignoring of the government's action in this direction, but which, however, did not come out flatfooted against the proposition, move a resolution condemning this policy. Let any hon. gentleman who sits on the opposite benches move a resolution condemning this policy and then we will believe that they have confidence in the assertions they make in this House, but, until they do that, neither we on this side of the House, nor the people of the country will believe that they have any confidence in their own assertions, but we will believe, as we do believe, that they are simply talking to the galleries. It is mere buncombe and they desire to make political capital without being responsible for what they say. The government are responsible for what they say. The government are responsible for what they do, as stated by the hon. Minister of the Interior. They are going into this matter as a business proposition. They have shown themselves to be a business government. They have conducted the affairs of the country on business lines.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GERMAN. Hon. gentlemen opposite say 'hear, hear,' in that peculiar tone of voice in which they generally express themselves when they have no other argument to make. But, Sir, they know as well as we know on this side of the House that the people of Canada to-day have confi-

dence in the Liberal government as expressed in the last election, and they will have confidence in this government when they go before them at the next general election. We have confidence in the premier of Canada and the other representatives who will go to England to attend the Coronation and to take part in the conference which will be held there of colonial ministers when there will be matters discussed involving large interests in this country and we have no fear but that the interests of Canada will be looked after carefully, fairly and properly and that if ever any preferential treaty or tariff is made as between Great Britain and her colonies it will be brought about by the careful, business-like proposition of the Liberal government of Canada.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Toronto Centre). Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen on your right must be in a very difficult position this evening, because they find themselves facing an issue which a cabinet of business men would never have to face, if they really were the cabinet of business men that was promised to this country. The least business-like amongst them, the right hon. premier went to England some years ago and notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Welland (Mr. German), who endeavours to befog the question with noise, the leader of the government did make the statement positively, that he asked nothing in return except good will for the preference which he was then giving to Great Britain. I give that right hon. gentleman the credit of knowing business men, and I will assume that he has surrounded himself with business men. The leader of these business men, the Finance Minister, was heard to-night in reply to a gentleman on this side of the House, and I am perfectly prepared to leave the arguments used from the opposition benches and the arguments used by the government and their supporters to the business men of Canada, to say which side has had the best of the debate. The hon. gentleman from Welland (Mr. German) very loudly and very noisely sneered across the House at the member for East York (Mr. Maclean). Well, the member for East York may feel perfectly satisfied in being sneered at by the member for Welland. The member for East York has never been in purgatory for eight years for his sins. The member for East York was never prevented from entering this House for eight long years as was the member for Welland, who, I suppose, is one of the business men behind the Prime Minister. If business men are good business men one of their characteristics is foresight. They can read the signs of the times. They can, before a crisis comes to hand, feel it in the air. The right hon. gentleman has considerable practice in trimming his sails to adverse winds, and in voting for a thing while endeavouring to argue against it. That right hon. gentleman was in England, and how was it he did not see that protection was in the air. It has been there for years past, gradually developing, gradually strengthening until to-day England has imposed a tax on the food of the people; a tax which the premier of Canada and the premier of Ontario declared was too ridiculous a thing to be thought of. In my humble capacity as a new member of this House, I made the positive statement of my belief that protection was coming in England. I could feel from the English press and from the expression of English people, that they were carefully preparing for it, and that if it did come it would be accepted by the masses of the people. Let it be remembered that the duty on corn is not adverse to every interest in England. We knew well that a duty on corn, a duty on cattle, a duty on various products of the American continent, will serve the interests of a very large party in England; will benefit the whole agricultural community, the labourers as well as the farmers. I therefore say that this cabinet of business men in Canada have been strangely wanting in foresight, or, have been strangely wanting in courage. It is a characteristic of a successful business man that he should have courage. I contend that this government have proved themselves from first to last to be incapable of conceiving a new idea. Every idea they have had in connection with the government of this country, has been either borrowed or stolen. They tell us they are not protectionists. Is that true? Occupying the position that you do, Mr. Speaker, and occupying it so very acceptably to both sides of the House, and occupying it so impartially; I can well understand that when you are using that impartial judgment it must create great difficulty in your mind to know whether you can depend on any statement coming from that side of the House. You know, Sir, that while these gentlemen to your right are stating they are not protectionists, they are at the same time protecting, but in an insufficient way, the industries of this country. You know, Sir, that if they did not lack the characteristic of courage they would be full-fledged protectionists. The Minister of the Interior, after a good deal of coaching, made a speech to-night. I was very anxious to reply to him, but really when he got through with his speech it was apparent that he had not his heart in his subject, as he usually has. He left very little to reply to, except that he stated that we on this side of the House should come down to practical business, and that we should move a resolution to do away with the present preference. Our quarrel is not so much with the present preference as it is with the injury which that preference is doing to this country. Our quarrel with that preference which we have given to England in this market, is not that it is an imperial preference doing good to the em-

pire, but is, that it is merely a one-sided preference giving the manufacturer in Yorkshire a preference over the manufacturer in Canada, and placing the Yorkshire manufacturer in a position to injure some and many of the great industries of this country. Therefore we are finding no fault with the preference as far as it goes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BROCK. But we contend that it injures some industries of this country, and to that extent it should be removed. And if this cabinet of business men were doing their duty, they would at once acknowledge that they are wrong and remedy the injury which this preference has done. I believe that every one of these gentlemen opposite has admitted that the preference is an injury to some of the industries of Canada. Why cannot they apply the remedy ? They have among them a gentleman who has courage; they have the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), whom this country respects for his courage. I believe that the Minister of Public Works has done the very best he could to bring the other members of the cabinet to his own mind. Some say he is the master of the administration. I am sorry he is not ; I regret it very much because if he were we would have a better state of things in this country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He will be soon.

Mr. BROCK. The Minister of the Interior told us that the Liberal government had come to the help of Great Britain, but that the Conservative government did not help Britain during the war in the Soudan. Does he mean to make any comparison between the situation at the time of the Soudan war and the crisis in South Africa, which meant almost the destruction of the British empire ? There is no comparison between the two cases. But, during the Soudan war the right hon. leader of the government was in opposition. Now, that we are in opposition he asks us why we do not do something. Let me ask him why he did not do something when he was in opposition ? There is not a line in any of his speeches to condemn the then government for not giving assistance to the motherland during the Soudan war. When he was in opposition why did he not move a resolution such as he and the Minister of the Interior talk about ? In all the records of this parliament, there is nothing to show that Sir Wilfrid Laurier when leader of the opposition ever ventured to condemn the Conservative government for not sending troops to the Soudan. That was the statement made by the Minister of the Interior. So that the Liberal opposition, according to their own statement, were derelict in their duty, if the statement they make now is correct. The hon. member for East York has been taunted with being a newspaper man—a terrible disgrace, you know—and as having made a scoop—I think that is the newspaper term. He certainly has, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there is an agitation in the dovecotes on the other side of the House. They are face to face with a difficult question, and with their actions of the past five years. But they have themselves to blame for it, and we on this side of the House are endeavouring to show them their way out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BROCK. The Prime Minister is backed up by these gentlemen who can always be got to howl for him, whether he is right or wrong. But let the Prime Minister take a manly and straightforward course ; let him put himself into communication to-night with the Prime Minister of England ; let him ask the British government to exempt Canada from these duties which are to be imposed against the rest of the world ; and let him withdraw the statement he made, that this country wants nothing in return for the preference it has given to the mother country. Let him say that he was mistaken in making that statement, and that this country wants and demands something in return. By taking this course he will place himself more in sympathy with the people of this country than he did on the last occasion that he visited England. The right hon. gentleman wound up his speech by saying that the people of this country were at his back, and that what he wanted was their approbation. If he wanted to retain that approbation, the course I have indicated, the manly, direct, straightforward course, is the course he should pursue. We on this side of the House have announced a definite policy, and we have asked that hon. gentlemen on the other side should have a definite policy. Have the gentlemen sitting behind the Treasury Benches heard anything of a definite policy ? They have not. More ministers have spoken on this question than spoke on the budget ; but has any minister announced a definite policy on this question ? I leave it to hon. gentlemen on the other side to say whether they have or not. We are not ashamed of this discussion. It will go abroad to the country, and it will create a remarkable sensation. It will remind the people that the right hon. Prime Minister went through the province of Ontario stating that he was going to surround himself with business men who would conduct the affairs of the country on business principles ; but they will not be convinced that it is a business principle to give something for nothing. As the right hon. Prime Minister is on the eve of going to England a second time, we will endeavour to see that he does not make the same mistake that he did before, but rather that he will remedy that mistake ; for I feel that the opposition in this House on this question are repre-

senting an absolute majority of the people of Canada.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, after the manner in which this question has been discussed by his colleagues on the other side of the House, should presume to say that he desired that there should be some definite question placed before the House to-night to be decided by a vote. Hon. gentlemen understand that the question before the House is whether the Speaker should leave the Chair or not, for us to take up the work of the Committee of Supply; and our hon. friends on the other side of the House, on that very simple resolution, have discussed almost every question that has come up in the party politics of Canada in the last four or five years. They have discussed the question of the contingents and the attitude of the Liberal party and that of their party on that question; they have discussed the question of the preferential tariff which was framed by the present government; they have discussed almost every other question which has come within the lines of party politics. My hon. friend from Hastings reduced the whole discussion down to a question of politeness, as to whether the answer of the government to the invitation of the Imperial government was couched in sufficiently polite terms—in other words whether this government should not have said that they would cheerfully discuss all the questions laid before them by Mr. Chamberlain in his invitation. Unfortunately for us, if there should be a vote on this question, we shall be called upon to vote at random. If our hon. friends would consent to confine the discussion to any one of these questions, it would be far more satisfactory; and the repeated invitation they have had to formulate their views in a resolution, so that we might bind them to some declaration of policy, has a great deal of force in it. I do not think it rests in the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite to charge this government with a lack of policy on these questions, when they are so notoriously divergent upon them. Perhaps before this debate is through we shall hear from the hon. member from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) as to his views on the contingents—whether the contingents which are now being sent to South Africa under the auspices of the Dominion government, and the contingents which went before, should be paid for by this government, and as to whether the government of Canada should enter into negotiations with the government of Great Britain for the purpose of establishing a large scheme of imperial defence. Many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House take a stand that this government should be bound to join with the mother country in a large and broad scheme of imperial defence. I would like to see hon. gentlemen opposite united on these questions before they charge the government of the day with being disunited upon them. The party opposite has always claimed to be pre-eminently the party of imperialism and of extreme loyalty to the mother country; and yet I have listened in vain to-day for one word of sympathy with the people of the mother country for the enormous burdens which they have laid upon themselves in maintaining the dignity and prestige of the empire in South Africa; and in view of the fact that the Chancellor of the Exchequer has to meet a deficit of fifty or sixty million pounds sterling in the current year, I think that hon. gentlemen opposite might have looked at that phase of the question. It is all very well to speak of the small duty which is proposed to be levied on wheat and corn as a protective policy; but any one who knows anything of a protective, as compared with a revenue policy, must admit that this is a portion of a revenue policy pure and simple. The position of the mother country is that notwithstanding this small duty and the increase of the income tax and of the stamp tax, there will still be a deficit of about thirty million pounds which must be raised by a revenue bill. Any one who looks fairly at the facts of the case cannot believe that this is the entering wedge of a protective policy in regard to foodstuffs. So far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, while I believe every man in Canada, whether Liberal or Conservative, would be willing and glad to see some preference given to our products in the mother country, and would welcome it as a response to the fraternal feeling displayed by Canada in her preferential tariff, yet I feel that we should not go to the mother country, either in times of peace or in times of stress, to huckster and bargain with her on questions of this kind.

I was somewhat surprised that any gentleman, particularly the hon. member who has just spoken, should have ventured to assert that the Prime Minister said in another country that Canadians did not want any preference in the British market. It is true that when brought to task by my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German,), he varied the assertion somewhat by declaring that what the Prime Minister said was that he would not then ask any preference for the Dominion, as a consequence of the preference we were giving. Before resuming his seat, however, he again repeated his original story, which he utterly failed to prove. One would suppose that the hon. gentleman would have been prepared with a quotation and the day and the date, to substantiate the statement he made, but nothing of the kind. Now there is considerable distinction in stating that Canadians did not want a preference and declaring that we were not basing the preference we offered on a reciprocal preference by the mother country; and to have demanded such reciprocal pre-

ference would have been perfectly useless at the time, because a duty on breadstuffs was a thing no one then contemplated. It would have been considered as something outrageous for any public man to have insisted on the British government placing a duty on the foodstuffs of the British people. But since, in the stress of war, it has become necessary for the British government to raise more revenue by means of a tariff on breadstuffs, which previously was undreamed of, there might be some reason for expecting that the preference given the British in our market, which aroused so much enthusiasm in the mother country, which did so much to draw us together, might possibly be reciprocated. Upon the general subject of our relations to the mother country much no doubt will be said before the close of the present session, and I may be pardoned if I express my own views on that question, in which, I think, my colleagues about me largely share. The commercial relations between the colonies and the mother country and the Imperial defence are two entirely separate questions. The question of Imperial defence is one upon which the people of this country are by no means a unit, one upon which the Conservative party is not a unit, and it is possibly one upon which no inconsiderable number of people in the Dominion have formed no positive conclusion. We all know the strong opinion held by Sir Charles Tupper on this point. We all know the intensity of the language he used when denouncing the very idea of the Dominion being bound in any way to meet any of the charges in the British Exchequer with regard to imperial defence. And he has many followers in the Conservative party. The principles as laid down by him I think were very sound. In defending our own territory, in providing an adequate force for the defence of Canada, and in carrying on our internal legislation in such a way as to make Canada strong and prosperous and cultivate a strong feeling of solidarity of the empire in Canada—all these things are sufficient guarantee that we will be ready when the circumstances require us to bear our share in the defence of the empire. The government has been charged with slackness of duty, and odiums attempted to be thrown on it for not having voted larger sums in support of the South African contingents. I do not think that the financial aid of Canada is by any means so important to the mother country as is taken for granted by some hon. gentlemen opposite. What the statesmen and the British people do appreciate and admire is the spirit of loyalty and enthusiasm with which we responded to the call of the empire in South Africa. The noble enthusiasm which our sons manifested in laying upon the altars of their country their lives, prospects and honour stirred the pulse of the English people. That which they admired was not any contribution in money or financial resources, but the contribution of sentiment, zeal and loyalty which we sent in the person of our sons who went to fight the battles of the empire in South Africa. Not only we, but the people of the mother country, are proud of the young men who thus proved their courage, ability and devotion to their country, and who have not only gained a high place in the esteem of their own countrymen, but have done a great deal to excite admiration for Canada in the minds of British statesmen and people. And when the colonial and British statesmen meet at London to plan closer commercial relations between the colonies and the mother country, if they come to a wise solution of this question, that will solve all the others. I agree with the right hon. the First Minister that there is a vast difference between being united for the purposes of war and united for the purposes of commerce, and that we ought to keep these two questions separate and distinct. It seems to me that in the time of stress and trial through which the mother country is passing, and when she has to impose a duty on breadstuffs, it is only a narrow spirit which would prompt us to clamour immediately to be relieved from all the weight and burden of that duty. We can safely leave this matter to the Imperial instincts of the British government and people, confident that the part which Canada has played will inspire them with a desire to settle this question in our interests as well as theirs. I hope, in the meantime, that our hon. friends opposite will come to a conclusion as to the stand they propose to take, and that when they succeed in finding themselves in a position to formulate a policy, they will do so that we may know exactly where they are, which it is impossible to say at present.

Mr. S. E. GOURLEY (Colchester). I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that mere party politics should be imported into a discussion of this character. If that spirit, were only eliminated from discussions of questions such as the one under consideration, immense good would no doubt result from our joint counsels. One would think, that a question such as this, if no other, could be approached, without importing into it, any form of party politics ; but while I have listened with pleasure to many speeches on both sides, I must say that I have listened with regret to the speech of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and that of the hon. gentleman from Welland, who has just sat down. They were speeches of the parish politics order, and of a more than usually narrow character. I regret indeed that this motion did not take another form, and that due notice was not given, so that we might have come to the discussion of the great questions involved thoroughly prepared to deal with them in a broad and equitable spirit. I regret, however, more than anything else, that the right hon. the First Minister, when he first

received the invitation from the King of England to discuss the many questions of imperial importance referred to in the invitation, did not come to parliament and ask us to discuss the matter as the great council of the nation, as patriots, in order to ascertain how the interests of Canada might best be served. I regret that the right hon. gentleman did not get above the level of party politics. I would have expected him to say : Gentlemen, this is not a party question; I will forbid any of my people discussing it as a party question, and I will ask you, on your side, to discuss it, in its national and imperial aspect, with a view to working out the highest destiny of Canada. No more important question could be discussed in this parliament than the question we have before us at this moment. I believe we are at the parting of the ways. We have had misguided discussions in the parliament of Canada. There has never been any question, however great, that was not hedged about by miserable party considerations. When the Canadian Pacific Railway was undertaken, one would have thought that both parties, would have approached it with the common desire to build up Canada. The building of the Intercolonial Railway was a great national issue ; but it was approached as a party question. Anybody should have known that if we could not build the Intercolonial Railway and operate it successfully ; if we could not build the Canadian Pacific Railway and run it successfully ; 'the shreds and patches of Canada' should have been thrown to the winds or put up at auction ; for if we could not build a national railway, we could never hope to make a nation of these provinces. But, notwithstanding all errors and mistakes, to-day we are on the threshold of national and imperial greatness. I declare it as my own opinion, that, if the people of Canada had been filled with the national ambitions and aggressive spirit that have characterized the people of the United States, if we had proceeded to spread the fame and glorify the resources of Canada as they did those of the United States, we should to-day possess a population and political power equal to theirs. They thrust themselves into the eye of the world, they boosted and glorified themselves on every platform, until they dominated the public opinion of the world, and even frightened Canada into subserviency. A few years ago there were people in this country weak enough and mean enough to talk about annexation. To-day, I am glad to say, quite the opposite feeling prevails. In my part of the country at any rate, any man who would dare to utter such a sentiment would be tied up to the nearest post and horsewhipped. But, fortunately in every crisis in our history some men have been found broad and liberal enough to forget party, and to look with a single eye to the interest of Canada as a whole. At this moment I want the government of Canada, I want the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier), above all I want the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), to take a broad imperial view of the questions before us, and to labour during the next year for the welfare of Canada. As I have already mentioned, we are at the parting of the ways. To-day, if this parliament, should unanimously approach the English parliament and government, with a resolution, telling them that every man in this country is loyal, that every man in this country is prepared to sacrifice every dollar of the property of Canada in defence of the empire, that every man, woman and child is prepared to back the empire in its trials in any part of the world—if we approached the empire in that spirit and said : As we are loyal, as we are devoted to the empire, as we are prepared to back this empire with all the resources of the country, help us to build up a great Canadian nationality and we will stand by you for good or for evil, in war or in peace. That proclamation would inflame the affections of the people of England for us and arouse their national pride. That is the doctrine we should propound ; and, if the Prime Minister had come forward and proposed a resolution of that character and had said : We want a tariff upon our wheat, and upon all our agricultural products, how strong would our position have been ? Every man will see, that if, to-morrow, we could face the world, with the intelligence, that, the English government, had given us a preference on wheat and other agricultural products, from that moment we would fill the eye of the world, from that moment Canada would be the goal of energetic and ambitious people. We would fill the eye of the world in this twentieth century as the United States filled it for fifty years to the close of the last century. Our supreme need is population. What do we want in Canada ? We want ten or fifteen millions of people to come into this country quickly. We do not desire to wait for forty or fifty or a hundred years, but we want them to come at once. Let the world know that we have a preference in the British market of even 3½ cents a bushel on wheat, then, with the profits on wheat as narrow as they are, Canada would have a dominant and masterful position in the great agricultural markets of the world. And, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be the effect of the step that the British government have just taken. I have no doubt they have taken this position advisedly, because they have found it necessary to thrust this boon upon us. They found we could not take a hint, so they have had to come at us with a sledge to attract our attention. Three or four years ago, they invited the statesmen of Canada to go into council with them. They said : We are a wealthy nation, we have many enemies in every part of the world, we have

splendid young nations growing up in every quarter of the globe, but they are not growing rapidly enough—come and give us the benefit of your counsel and see if we cannot mutually assist each other. That, I have no doubt, is what Mr. Chamberlain meant by the invitation sent to the government of Canada on the occasion of the late Queen's Diamond Jubilee. How was he met ? The premier virtually flouted his advances. In effect, he said : We are unknown and poor in Canada, and we desire to remain unknown and poor, and we will accept no favours from your country. On the present occasion, the British government have gone further than before. Not only have they invited Canada to take part in their councils, but they have said : You are apparently dense and unappreciative in Canada ; so we will give you a protective tariff before we invite you into council ; we have so arranged it that very little diplomacy will give you a preferential tariff that will make your country prosperous 'beyond the dreams of avarice.' And still they are met in this unseemly manner. I must say I have been impressed with the politeness and courtly manner of the Prime Minister. I have felt pleased when he has gone abroad, for I felt that though he did not represent correctly the true political policy of Canada, he did represent its culture and refinement, and would do us good abroad. I may say that I have never been able to be bitter in politics or to say unkind things. Perhaps that is a weakness in a man addressing this House. But I am compelled to say that I almost feel bitter against the Prime Minister for not seizing this unparalleled opportunity for not accepting the benefits that were offered irrespective of party advantage, and asking the House to adopt such a resolution as I have referred to. I have often observed the pleasant smiles heretofore upon the face of the Prime Minister in this House. He could afford to be pleasant, for he has a majority at his back, and they are docile to a degree. He has only to look back at them, and they respond with loud plaudits and ready votes. But something has pained deeply the heart of the Prime Minister today. I never saw any one exhibit in his face such sorrow as that which has marked his fine countenance to-day. And I know that his heart was sore far beyond the power of his face to conceal. He knows the awful position he is in. When this proposal was sprung upon him, his keen political sense told him, that he was like the fox, that had been cunning often in his time, but the hounds at last had him by the haunch.

But, Sir, I need not further extend my sympathy to the First Minister. I leave him for further solace to his Quebec followers. But I have an unbounded sympathy for the Minister of Finance, because he comes from my province, and I can sincerely say that I have never been able to think an unkind thought of any man in this House who comes from that province. I am sorry for the Minister of Finance. In the old days he was at the head of the local government in Nova Scotia, and I believe conscientiously embraced the awful heresy of free trade. I believe that he honestly advocated it. He used to go around the shores of Nova Scotia, those wild and beautiful shores ; they are always noisy, but his voice was still louder than the winds or the waves, in advocacy of this delusion. Now, Sir, he spoke of free trade, he gloried in the promulgation of the doctrine, and I believe he was honest in his fantasy, but it was a most delusive fantasy for an intelligent man to indulge in. Now, in what an unkind position has fate put him ? It appears as if nature is making war upon him. In Nova Scotia he was free to embrace any trade vagary, for his government had nothing to do with trade policies. He could talk any nonsense he liked about trade policies ; but here unfortunately he is chained, he is bound hand and foot by a masterful colleague. Have you noticed, Mr. Speaker, the bland, captivating smile on the face of the Minister of Public Works this afternoon ? The gods have come his way ; they have put upon him a crown. People call him the master of the administration. Why, he never was the master of the administration until to-day, and the crown has been placed upon his brows by England. That tax of threepence a hundredweight, gives protection in this country a safe guarantee for the next half century. We know that the Minister of Public Works has had a great deal of trouble in holding the rest of his colleagues down to protection. But now the British government have come to his aid, and all the other weaklings in the government must submit. Now the poor Minister of Finance is in a pitiable position, having to hold up his hands to the Minister of Public Works and have them bound ; and having to promise that never hereafter will he preach the heretical doctrine of free trade.

For free trade was always a heresy, it was the most absurd doctrine that ever was promulgated, and no people but the English people could ever have been deceived and misled by that doctrine. Cobden's doctrine was based upon this absurd fallacy, that every man, woman and child in every other nation but England was a fool, an absolute fool, and would remain a fool until the end of time. The doctrine of Cobden was upon this absurdity : We are going to take all the raw products of the world and manufacture them, and make all the money ; and we are going to keep all the rest of the world in the position of slaves and servants, doing our menial work for a mere subsistence, and no outsider will ever see through the game we are playing upon them. If that doctrine had been

propounded in Canada some one would have got up and said: You are mistaken, Mr. Cobden, there are other people in this world as bright as you; we will establish manufactures, and sell our goods all over the earth, and your doctrine will go. It was an utterly unarguable fallacy, this doctrine of free trade, and it could have overcome no other nation on earth excepting the English. I am of the same breed, I am an imperialist, and I want this distinctly understood, that I admire the traditions of England up to sixty years ago. They were a band of demi-gods, they conquered the earth for the highest purposes of civilization, and religion, of benefiting mankind; but for the last sixty years, after that infamous doctrine, that weak and silly doctrine of Cobdenism came to the front, the whole country became weak and pusillanimous, and the English people who have believed in it are degenerates to the last man. But, Sir, the new doctrine, of imperialism, has spread over Canada and will yet make statesmen of hon. gentlemen opposite, no matter how narrow they may be to-day. That new doctrine will lift them up and exalt them, that doctrine will revivify the English people, and in a generation or two they will rule and dominate this earth again; and every square mile of its territory will, eventually, I hope, be brought under the British flag. Hon. gentlemen may be uncredulous, but that is the destiny of the British flag. and if you read your bibles diligently, you will there find ample confirmation of the doctrine. All nations will come under it. I have no doubt that if you could get the Germans under the British flag for even one year they would never desire to go back under the German flag. All that is needed is for the different portions of the British empire to unite under the glorious British constitution in closest union for defence and offence if necessary, and for trade and commerce, then they will convert the whole world, and then we will have peace. Then the Prime Minister will not have to preach that heresy that commerce and war do not go together, because there will then be no necessity for war, for the whole earth will be under one flag, and all men will speak one language.

I was interested, in watching the demeanour, of hon. gentlemen opposite, on hearing the news, that was flashed across the water to-day, that the British government had put a tax on bread stuffs. I naturally thought the First Minister would come in here with a veil over his face. I thought the Minister of Finance would come in clothed in sackcloth and ashes. I thought that, being men of generous feeling, they would send a message over to the opposition and say: Gentlemen, we want to make you a full apology for all the heresies that we have been talking for the last few years; we want to show to the people that we have some politeness, if we have not the good sense of the opposition. But what was my surprise, when these gentlemen got up and stated that this is not protection, this is no change at all, it is only a result of the war, it is only a war measure and will soon pass away. I think the hon. member for Welland also uttered that sentiment. The British government will return to a policy of free trade, he says, this will only last for a time. Nothing apparently could convince him. Sir, I am bound to tell you that so far as I understand this matter, the war has nothing to do with it, except as offering a convenient opportunity for the British government to retrace its steps, to abandon an erroneous course. For ten or twenty years the British government have been endeavouring to retrace their steps. Now we know what a prophet of public opinion Sir Charles Tupper is and has been. He went across this country telling us that public opinion in England was changing, that it was coming rapidly to the point at which it would retrace this false course, and impose protective duties. These gentlemen in the government went over to the other side and pretended to gauge public opinion there, they thought they had done so, and came back and told us that Britain would never do anything of the kind. It shows how incapable, gentlemen opposite, were to judge public opinion, and how far they were lacking, the keen insight that Sir Charles Tupper possessed of the trend of public opinion. I hope you will all do justice to that eminent Canadian, that father of Canada. He and Sir John A. Macdonald together made Canada. I hope you will get up to-day, and say to that father of confederation, that you have wronged him, wronged him seriously, by pretending to dispute, the accuracy of the prophecy which he made, that the English people were rapidly returning to the cause of protection.

I want the hon. gentlemen now to take occasion by the hand. The English government have extended in a most polite and courteous way an invitation to these hon. gentlemen to go over and talk, not about the defence of the empire alone, but to sit down and consider how they can strengthen this empire. That is what we desire. I want Canada, from this moment, to take the position of being a portion of this empire, I desire this House of Commons to be a part of the imperial government. I want the British government to acknowledge that the House of Commons of Canada, in relation to all matters not affecting the mere domestic policy of the British Isles, is an integral part of the imperial government, and to call us in consultation whenever occasion requires. This idea of sending a half a dozen men over to England to represent us in the House of Commons or the House of Lords is a very immature suggestion. I want the powers of this House increased, not dimin-

ished. We sit here as a House of Commons in Canada, as a co-ordinate branch of the government of this empire, and the government in London have no right to arrogate to themselves the sole control of imperial affairs.

I fancy that the invitation which has been extended to us is in recognition of the principle that we, to-day, must be consulted in reference to all imperial questions, and what I understand by that invitation would be, that the Prime Minister should sit down with the imperial government and discuss that matter. What I believe the imperial government would want the right hon. gentleman to say would be this : We, in Canada, are engaged with our great commercial interests, we have enormous territories to develop, but if you want us at any time, if you want the men of Canada to stand by you at any time, we can call out 100,000 or 200,000 troops and have them ready to take the field in two weeks. I can say that Canadians do not want more than a fortnight's drill to make them as good soldiers as you want on the field of battle. We need no standing army in this country, all we want, is to have money enough expended, to give the young men of this country an opportunty of drilling upon a field, for 20 or 30 days, every year, and I venture to say that on the field of battle they will distinguish themselves more than any soldiers of the line. The right hon. leader of the government, mixed up this question with another, and it was an unfair argument in the discussion of so vital a matter. Was it not an unfair argument, to attempt to mislead the people of Canada, into believing, that the government of England, wanted us to have a standing army, and that in exchange they would give us this preference in their tariff ? That is not the intention of the English government, I am persuaded. All the English government want to know is that we are truly and sincerely interested in the welfare of the empire, and that we are prepared to fight for it in time of need. Now, in regard to my French friends——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. I have come here without a particle of feeling or prejudice. I am endeavouring to learn their beautiful language, and I propose some day to go down and hear the extraordinary speeches that are said to be made in the province from which these gentlemen come. I am a man with feeling but without race prejudices, and I propose to go down and discuss these questions before them. But, I want to say this to my French compatriots : A few leaders, who profess to speak for the French people, have misled us, by saying that the French population of Canada, would not be willing to fight for the empire. If there is any advice that I might be permitted to give my French compatriots it is, that they should take the opposite view. That is the only thing that affects the English opinion of Canada today. You must reflect that Canada occupies this curious position : For years there have been people in England who have openly advocated the idea that the colonies were not loyal, that they were anxious to break away from England. Thousands and millions of people have believed that doctrine and believe it to-day. Then, there was another, old belief, that when Canada was ripe, and when we had got all we could out of England, we wanted to become independent. These things militate against our position in England, and so much so, that the English people have treated us rather cavalierly. Then, the doctrine was propounded, that the French people, were not loyal to the British flag. The sending of the contingents, has helped in a great measure to refute the idea that we were not loyal to England and that we wanted independence. Because of the unfortunate circumstances surrounding the sending of these contingents—and I sympathise with every word that has been said—they were sent under circumstances that might possibly destroy their influence. They were sent under protest. Suppose a bill of exchange is returned under protest, it is very injurious to the credit of the persons concerned. It gave the feeling in England that there was something wrong with the loyalty of Canada. It was something that should have been spontaneous and generous and open. I want to say in reference to my French compatriots that they have an opportunity of doing a most unparalleled act. I believe that the French, in their own interest, should believe in imperialism, because they have more to gain from imperialism on this continent than even the English speaking people have. If it is not imperialism, it must be independence, or annexation, because we never can remain a little insignificant country. We must go in with England and embrace all the conditions attendant upon the existence of the empire with her traditions and her policy, or we must become independent, or be swept into the neighbouring states. Would the French people desire to be swept into the United States ? They would be absorbed and their traditions and institutions would be brushed aside in twenty-four hours. What would happen in the event of independence taking place ? The two races would be comparatively equal, and there would be a battle of the races. That would efface the prosperity of Canada, and this would go on until the United States would be bound to interfere to preserve the peace of the continent. But there is a magnificent prospect and a magnificent hope for the French people in imperialism. I believe that should they approach the imperial government and say : You have given us better laws and institu-

tions than old France itself would have done, we will go with you to the ends of the earth and fight in defence of the empire. The French would then be the dominant race on this continent in spite of the energies of the Anglo-Saxon people. That is the position the French people should assume, and they should be the first to declare in this House that: We are imperialists and the strongest of imperialists. I want the French people to declare to this country that the statement which has often been repeated that they will fight for Canada but that they will not fight for the empire is a heresy. Suppose England is attacked in India and beaten, it will mean that not only Canada but the whole empire is shattered, and you will have no opportunity of fighting for Canada. The man who talks about fighting for Canada only talks about allowing our empire to be attacked and to be smashed. My doctrine is that I shall fight for the empire in the most distant parts of the world as readily as in my own town, were she attacked, and it should be for the French people to say that they will fight for the empire as readily in the most remote portions of the empire, as they would fight for their own province if it were attacked. If the right hon. the Prime Minister had moved in this House, a resolution declaring that the French and the English people, would stand side by side with the empire in its extremity in time of war and in time of peace, I am persuaded that the parliament and people of England would give us a preferential tariff in twenty-four hours. I charge, therefore, that the Prime Minister has not fulfilled that high duty, which should have been fulfilled by the first commoner of this country in attempting to subordinate national advantages to mere party advantages. I want to say one word in reference to what the right hon. gentleman said about bringing Canada into the vortex of war. I think that was a most unfortunate speech for the right hon. gentleman to make. If the empire is attacked in any part of the world, Canada is necessarily brought into the vortex of war, and when the right hon. gentleman used that language he attempted to separate Canada from the rest of the empire. I think it is unfortunate, I hope he did not mean it, but when he did make it, it struck me as an extraordinary statement for the leader of the government to make. Then he spoke of war and commerce. War must always go with commerce. Spain once ruled the commerce of the world. Why? Because she swept the seas of every enemy. Later Holland swept the seas of the Spanish marine and she ruled the commerce of the world until England attacked Holland, swept her ships from the sea, and herself became mistress of the seas.

But a few years ago, and Africa was a savage continent, England wanted commerce to pervade that country in order that it should be civilized. Did she send her merchants there to be shot down? No. She sent her soldiers, and she beat the Kaffirs and the Hottentots, and she controlled the savage tribes, and she made little settlements of peace, and built forts and then invited her merchants to trade under the protection of her guns. She did that until she civilized the country, and to-day in consequence of the numerous wars that have been waged for sixty years, Africa is now pretty well open for the commerce of the world. I stand here to-day to say that I do not want war—but I do not want mean, cowardly, treacherous settlements, called peace. I do not want war, but I would prefer war, and high national sentiment, to prevail in this country, than peace with meanness and cowardice. No nation that has not been martial has ever survived. No nation has ever lived a century after she has lost her martial spirit. Rome sat upon her seven hills and ruled the world. While the mothers and fathers of Rome taught their sons to fight the enemy, Rome ruled the world. But when the mothers ceased to teach their sons to battle in the distant parts of the empire, then the barbarian said: This is not Rome; this is not the glorious martial Rome that we knew, and they raided her and she disappeared. Let the martial spirit of a people relax and the nation is gone. The reason that the British empire came nearly going to pieces within the last few years, and sinking to be a third or fourth rate power, was because of the belief that the martial spirit of England had disappeared. Little fellows got up in Exeter Hall—every one of them should be beaten with stripes and if the English people had not lost their martial spirit they would have done it; they got up and said that they cared not if a portion of the British territory was lost in South Africa. Cobden, or Gladstone, or some person like that would figure out that it would cost $25,000,000 to defend our territory, but there was no commerce and no money making in it; and he would say: Let them take our territory; we will save the money. England had got down to that low level by this miserable Cobdenism. No nation can be great that figures up on one side what it will cost to preserve the national honour, and on the other what it will save to allow itself to be kicked around the world. A nation to be respected, the world over must be such a nation as was ancient Rome. If a Roman citizen in the farthest desert of Africa were attacked, his Roman citizenship protected him; and the legions of Rome moved as fast as horses and legs could carry them to the extreme parts of the earth to punish the insult to Roman citizenship. Then, to be a citizen of Rome was a glorious thing. But later on you could kick a citizen of Rome as you could kick a negro in the southern states and nothing happened. Then Rome fell. English citizenship came to be nearly in the same position a few years ago. But, Sir, fortunately there were these giant

young nations of Australia and New Zealand and Canada growing up who would not stand an insult to the honour of England. The youth that are growing up in these young nations have no notion of being kicked, and not resenting the insult. I want my neighbours to the south to know that I live on this continent not by the sufferance of any Monroe doctrine, or by the sufferance of any Congress. I live here because I am prepared to fight for my existence if necessary. I went to Buffalo the other day, and a gentleman from one of the newspapers came to interview me. I said to him: I am on your soil and I refuse to speak aught of your country, but I have had my say in the parliament of my own country, where it was my duty to speak, and I said what I did say because I believe I would be negligent in my duty if I did not say it. He replied: If the Canadians had been like that for the last sixty years we would have more respect for you in Canada, but you permitted us to think that you were subservient, that you were only ready to jump into our lap, and we treated you with something of contempt. I want this House of Commons to declare that we have rights on this continent, because we are British subjects, and that no nation can curtail these rights. This parliament should deal with that Monroe doctrine. It is a menace to every respectable man in this country. I was delighted to read the article of Mr. Justice Mills a few days ago. It proves that we have some men in Canada who have spirit. He declared that the Monroe doctrine is absurd and he repudiates it as an insult and a menace to us in Canada. I hope that some one in this parliament will start the Canadian doctrine. The Canadian doctrine would have more in it than the Monroe doctrine has. That Canadian doctrine is that the supervision of every foot of this continent belongs by right to Canada. And if any kind of Monroe doctrine prevails that doctrine is the one most tenable: That all other nations who live on this continent are subservient to Canada. I believe, of course, that both doctrines are wrong, but if Monroeism is to be held as a pistol to our heads let us turn this doctrine on the other people. I am persuaded that preferential trade within the empire will come; I am persuaded that it would come now if this Canadian government were not hostile to it. I am persuaded that we will have a preferential duty on our wheat, and if we have a preference of 6 cents per bushel, then the population in the western states would shift in a night. We would find ourselves possessed of 10,000,000 or 15,000,000 of population that is now against us, and we would then be a great nation indeed. Recollect that the world to-day makes as much progress in six months as it did in 600 years a few centuries ago. The people of the west are not tied down as we are in the east. They can take down their shacks and shift 100 miles without any trouble. If we get a preference on our agricultural products in the British market, the star of yesterday would set in the south, and political power would rest in the north. From that moment it would be seen that the political power of this continent would be in Canada; that we were to be the Russia of America, and that national glory would be centered in Ottawa and not in Washington.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. The achievement of this great purpose is opened to the government of Canada at the present moment. I adjure these gentlemen opposite to throw away petty politics such as the member for Welland and the Minister of the Interior dealt with. I adjure them that they cease to introduce such petty things into the politics of this nation. I say to the right hon. the Prime Minister: Go to the Imperial government and say to them: We will stick by you; give us this preference and we will build up a Canadian nation in a few years, that will defy all your enemies on this continent or on any other.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). If I could bring myself from the heights of the rhetoric to which we have just listened, down to the ordinary level of the earth, I would like to discuss this question from a somewhat business and practical standpoint. There would of course be no discussion in this House to-day were it not that a duty has been imposed on certain foodstuffs by the government of Great Britain. Let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) if he really believes what he has said. He has proven to his own satisfaction that Britain has been a nation of fools for sixty years back, but at the same time he insists that the British flag is going to wave over the whole world, and that in consequence the world is to be governed by this nation of fools. That is most extraordinary reasoning. If the people of Great Britain have been fools for sixty years, they have accumulated more money and impressed themselves more on the world than all the wise people who have lived since history came to be written. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) thinks they are fools because they adopted a certain trade policy, and he tells us that the British people have lost their martial spirit. Well, Sir, the British people have fought in Russia; they have fought in India; they have fought in Africa; and during the last sixty years they have shown the same martial spirit as did their ancestors of old. But the member for Colchester calls them a nation of idiots because they adopted free trade. What a strange idea he has of what a nation should be? They are down to the low, ordinary, every-

day life of commerce; and if they kept the sword in one hand to pierce any man who did not trade with them, whether savage or Christian, with goods in the other, they would be all right. A distinguished member of parliament once said that that was Britain's business—to engage in war continually to force the uncivilized and unclothed savages of Africa to buy her products. The truth is, Great Britain is taxing an article which it cannot raise itself. Let hon. gentlemen consider that what wheat is raised in Great Britain will only feed the people of Great Britain for seven weeks in the year; so that for Great Britain to raise a war tax on flour is just the same as it would be for us to raise a tax on tea. It is the quickest way to get a revenue, and every dollar of the tax will go into the revenue. Then how can any hon. gentleman opposite shout that there is a prospect of Great Britain becoming protectionist, which she never will? Where would Canada stand if she taxed everything we sent there? Some gentlemen shout that Great Britain ought to be protectionist when, if they thought for a moment, they would know that it would mean the destruction of Canada if Great Britain acted as Canada does. Even if we had a preference within the empire, which hon. gentlemen opposite talk about, I for one do not see that it would be an unmixed blessing, because if we go to make a contract with Great Britain she will insist that we take from her the articles which she produces. In that case, what would become of the people of Canada who want protection? But I can understand that larger relations may exist which would require such conditions to be borne by us for the furtherance of the empire. But there is one thing more which I want to call the attention of the House to. Is this discussion for the purpose of giving information to the Prime Minister before his departure for the old country? If so, I submit that the wise heads of the other side of the House, if they love the empire as they profess to do, should dictate to the Prime Minister by writing down their thoughts. Is this discussion to be for his instruction? Then he ought to be instructed before hand. I was pleased with what the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) said. He said two unkind things in a very kindly way. He said this discussion should not have taken place, and that notice should have been given of it. I agree with him. But he said one of the most unkind things when he lectured the French, and told them what imperialism they should follow. He did not consult with the second leader or he would not have said what he did. The hon. gentleman forgot that the very gentleman who got up this discussion had said in his paper that what the second leader of the opposition had said would have to be withdrawn, or he would be read out of the party. How well these hon. gentlemen agree. The truth of the matter is that we cannot be up in the clouds in discussing this matter. We have to deal with conditions as they exist. We must consider Great Britain, not as of carrying a flaming torchlight procession, abandoning the trammels of free trade, and becoming a mighty nation, killing the naked savages and extending her sway all over the world. This I submit is vain vaporing. What we want to consider here is what is best for Canada's progress? I thoroughly agree with what the Prime Minister has said. The taunt of the world against Great Britain has been that she has been aggressive in war for the purpose of gaining territory. I do not admit it; but I say that she has always succeeded in planting all that is best in civilization when she has ceased war and engaged in commerce. The hon. member for Colchester was very unfortunate in his references. He said, look at Spain, where is Spain now? She never knew how to colonize. She always went to a country and throttled its inhabitants.

Mr. GOURLEY. She allowed herself to get beaten.

Mr. FRASER. She was beaten before she was beaten, if I might use an Irishism. If the hon. gentleman had read history he would know that when Sir John Moore was in Spain he found that the men who were sent to assist him gave him no assistance, and could not give him any. This was the great nation the hon. gentleman wanted to hold up as an example for Great Britain—a nation that could not hold her colonies.

Mr. GOURLEY. I referred to the fact that she was beaten at the time of the Armada.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman must not forget that she colonized a great deal after that. She lost a number of ships at that time certainly; but that did not break her. If the hon. gentleman's argument was any good, she ought to be all-powerful today. Why, she had twice as many ships as the British fleet and was a better army in every way. Yet, still our little boats—many of them pirate vessels—that came out of every inlet in England, defeated this nation, great as it was, and wealthy and powerful in colonies. I am as ready as any one here to stand up for the empire, but while I think that we should consider the glory of Britain as our own and never see her with her back to the wall without coming to her help, I am not going to say that each individual should not be at liberty to make up his mind as he chooses on this great question of the relations between Canada and the mother country. We will never make Canada what it ought to be if we begin in this

nineteenth century to fetter men's minds and prevent them working out their destiny in the way they consider best. What is imperialism ? I claim that it is a misnomer. We are a colony of Great Britain, with all the rights of the British nation and a free people. Imperialism might have suited ancient Rome, but it is out of place in this nineteenth century. What we want is that every man in the empire shall do his work as a law-abiding citizen, and be ready to combine with his fellow-citizens in helping the mother country whenever she requires the assistance of the strong arms of her children in the colonies. But I do not believe in a man shouting continually about his mother and his loyalty and his flag and his readiness to die. I do not believe in a man who is continually flaunting his loyalty any more than in a woman who is continually vaunting her virtue. The bravest and best men are ready to die for their country, if required, but are not given to saying much about it. Take this young man, who the other day brought glory not only on Canada but on humanity—the quiet school master. Day after day, he went among his boys, he was not a fighting man, but an unpretentious youth, who never made a wild speech, who never wakened up the echoes with that wretched spread eagleism which we have imported from the nation to the south of us, but who went about his duties quietly. Yet when the test came, he met the supreme issue like a man. If we shout less and go about quietly and sensibly doing our duty, we will make better citizens and show better results.

As to this country joining Great Britain in anything relating to war, although I am fairly loyal, I for one do not want anything of the kind. And let me tell the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that a greater missionary field lies before him on the other side, and that he will find there more difficulty in converting to his views men who hold high positions than he thinks. He tells us that he is learning the language of his recalcitrant brethren who refuse to join him, and I am sure that when his lofty and convincing eloquence is expressed in the musical language of his confreres from the province of Quebec, they will be unable to resist his persuasive influence, and, beginning with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), we will find them giving way in succession before his convincing tones, and we may hope to have a united, though not necessarily an Imperial Canada.

I do not propose giving any advice to the right hon. the First Minister. In the first place, I do not think I could give him very much advice ; and in the second place he has had so much freely given to him that I would not like to increase the dose. I was glad to see my right hon. friend apparently oblivious of much of the advice so freely showered on him by hon. gentlemen opposite. There is one thing which the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley) said which I can endorse, and that is that there is too great a tendency to treat this matter as a purely party question. But I would suggest to him that the spirit and the manner in which it has been brought up today furnish ample subject for his criticism. If we were really moved by patriotic interests, we would get together and give our best views about all this. But the whole intention evidently is to try and hold the Prime Minister and the government responsible in certain quarters and endeavour to snatch a small victory by saying that it was the course taken by this government which induced the British government to put a duty on wheat. But I venture to make the prediction that this duty is only transitory. The nations of the world are moving, though not perhaps as quickly as we would like, in the direction of a freer interchange of trade. Even the people to the south of us have shown that they sometimes can rise above the wretched, effete system of protection, and deal with their fiscal policy in a more rational spirit. I am not, however, going to brush away protection as jauntily as my hon. friend from Colchester brushes away free trade, by calling those who differ from me fools. That would bar me out from associating with some hon. gentlemen on the other side, whose good feeling and good qualities I appreciate very much. But I believe that as our means of transportation are quickened by land and sea, the true principles governing trade will make themselves more and more felt. It is as absolutely impossible for one nation to shut out another as it is to stem the course of the St. Lawrence with a broom. We cannot go on living on past ideas. I remember thirty years ago when in Nova Scotia we knew very little about Canada. It was very hard to get up there. But when our means of communication were improved and we came to know more about it, we not only knew the people of the upper provinces better but did all we could to increase our business with them. I hope my hon. friend will continue his studies in the French language, and perhaps he will succeed in converting those who are in darkness on his own side, and get them to join with him in his noble missionary work of bringing the whole world into the fold of Britain's power.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). I wish, Mr. Speaker, to allude more particularly to a statement of the hon. the leader of the opposition, who, I am sorry is not in his seat just now. I refer to his statement regarding what my hon. colleague the Finance Minister has said with reference to the question of preferential trade. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition charged my hon. colleague with having expressed the opinion that at no time would the British government place

any duties upon grain. My hon. colleague told the leader of the opposition that he was mistaken, and in reply, the leader of the opposition referred to an interruption by the Finance Minister to some remarks of his, in which my hon. friend gave the House to understand that the Finance Minister said it was arrant nonsense to talk of any such thing. My hon. colleague explained that he used the expression in connection with the statement of the former leader of the opposition, Sir Charles Tupper, that if he were restored to power, he would obtain from the English government a preference. It was with reference to that statement that my hon. colleague, the Finance Minister, used the words cited. I have extracts here from the budget speeches of my hon. colleague in 1897, 1899, 1900 and 1901, in all of which he said that he did not see that there were any indications then that Great Britain would place duties upon bread stuffs, but that he was not prepared at all to say that at some future time that might not be done, and perhaps earlier than expected. Let me quote what my hon. colleague really said in the budget speech of 1901. Speaking upon this subject of preferential trade and the probability of Britain giving a preference in her markets to our products, he said :

Now I have said all this concerning the past. We do not deny that if we get that preference in the English market, it would probably be of some advantage to the Dominion of Canada ; but we say that is a question for the imperial authorities rather than for us. If we could get that preference, we are as willing to assist in availing ourselves of any advantage which might come to Canada through it as any of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The only difference between us is as to the possibility of getting it and as to the means of getting it. I do not believe, Sir, that it can be obtained to-day. I do not believe, notwithstanding all that one reads in the telegrams from the other side, that we are likely to have a change of front immediately on the part of the Imperial government on the trade question. Yet I would not speak of the future. We live in times of great movements and great changes. I will not say that at no future time in the history of the empire, and the early future possibly, shall this preference be given. Again and again I have stated in this House that that is a question which we must be content to leave to the future. We have believed that the true policy of preferential trade was, not to make demands on the imperial government which we well knew they could not afford to yield to us. The true policy was to give to Great Britain this preference freely and openly, leaving the imperial government and parliament to adopt that trade policy which in their judgment was best adapted to the interests of the English people. But, if this preference, which my hon. friends opposite desire to obtain, is ever to come, I beg them to accept my opinion, my assurance, which I give them in all sincerity, that they will never obtain it by the methods they have employed—that they will never obtain it by demands on the home government which are obnoxious to the great mass of the English people. We have much to hope from cultivating the good-will of the English people. I venture to say, as I have said before, that if the time ever comes when we are to receive that preference, we shall not receive it as the result of any huckstering or bargaining between England and the colonies, but as a result of the development of that Imperial sentiment which may over-ride questions of political economy, and in the creation and development of that imperial sentiment a large and important factor has been the British preferential tariff of the Canadian government.

That shows the hon. gentleman's position. And as I have said, I have extracts from his speeches in 1897, 1899 and 1900, and all are in precisely the same line. Therefore, when the leader of the opposition states that my hon. colleague's view was that never could we expect the British government to take the step that they have now taken, he misstated the position of the hon. gentleman. But the position the Finance Minister took was that we had given the preference to Great Britain and so created a friendly feeling, and that that feeling, if anything could, would bring about this preference. But to-day hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be elated because we were not able to foresee the exact date when all this was to take place; and, because we could not foresee it, they claim for themselves the possession of all wisdom and say that we on this side did not know what we were talking about. But the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp), I am sure, was by no means certain that this duty would be put on this year. If he did know it, the knowledge came to him very recently, for only last year he told us that, while this might come in the future, yet he gave it to be understood that it would be in the remote future. Last year in making his speech, he described the feeling in Great Britain with regard to giving a preference to Canada. He was a delegate from the Toronto Board of Trade that went to Great Britain with a preferential resolution. That resolution was discussed but it was not adopted. But a resolution was adopted that they should wait upon the Prime Minister of Great Britain and ask for the appointment of a royal commission to inquire into this question. We know what royal commissions mean. They mean investigations extending over a length of time and even then are merely a preliminary step, leading to a report which must be taken into consideration. So, whatever the member for East York (Mr. Maclean) may have thought or may have evolved from his inner consciousness, the hon. member for East Toronto did not know that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to make the announcement he made yesterday. But, when they tried to arrange this interview with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the answer they received from him was that the time was not opportune and he would not receive them. And what was the explanation given by the hon. member for East Toronto, why the Prime Minister of

Great Britain would not receive them? This is what the hon. gentleman said:

> The reply which the Chamber of Commerce received from the Prime Minister was, as stated in this House, that the time for receiving this deputation was not opportune. It was not opportune because at that time the South African campaign was at its height: the war in China was also at its height; there was a very important session of the Imperial parliament in progress, which took up the time and attention of the Prime Minister and his colleagues; and the country was on the eve of an election. I can quite easily understand, therefore, and I think hon. members will agree with me, that under these conditions it was inopportune for the Prime Minister to receive such a deputation, especially in view of the fact that the discussion on this question being one which enters largely into the politics of Great Britain, his reception of the deputation might be interpreted to mean that the Imperial government were about to adopt a protective policy, and this might cause their defeat in the elections which were about to take place.

If ever there was a statement made in this House that would show that the feeling in England was not ripe for such a change, this is that statement. Lord Salisbury would not even receive a deputation requesting the appointment of a royal commission. Why? The hon. gentleman says there was the war in South Africa. But everything does not stand still in England because of a war in South Africa. The hon. gentleman says that the Prime Minister had many important things to do. But there is never a time when the Prime Minister of England and his colleagues have not important things to do. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) gives us the secret. This was on the eve of a general election. And, what was the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Kemp's) own personal idea of the thought in Lord Salisbury's mind. It was that if he received the deputation, even though they asked for nothing more than a royal commission, it might be interpreted by the country as indicating that they were about to adopt a protective policy, and that would secure their defeat. What must have been the sentiment in England, according to the estimation of the hon. gentleman, when he tells us that the Prime Minister would not even receive this deputation? The Prime Minister virtually said to them: Do not come near me; if I were seen in the company of men who had such requests to make, I should not be able to remain in power. Yet the hon. gentleman comes to this House to-day with the most complete assurance, as if it was the simplest thing in the world and that any one might have known that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, would take this action. Now, let me point out to hon. gentlemen opposite one thing. And I enter upon this in no partisan spirit. I am one who believes that it would be a good thing to have preferential trade, if we can get it; and I have never taken the ground that it could not be got, but have spoken in the same strain as the Finance Minister did.

I have always taken the ground that if it ever was to come about, one of the great inducing reasons for it would be the voluntary act of this parliament when they gave a preference to the British people. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), if I understood the extract he read from the Montreal 'Star,' read it as showing that members of the British House were calling upon Sir Michael Hicks-Beach to give us that preference now, because we had given them a preference in our tariff, proving conclusively the fact that our action was having its influence. Now, we did not huckster with the people of England, and we are strong in the affections of that people at the present time, and our action has influenced them in their individual commercial dealings with this country to a vast extent. I believe it is influencing them politically, and all the more so because it was given unasked, without any attempt, as the Minister of Finance said, at bargaining or huckstering. They talk about the Prime Minister saying that he did not go over there to ask them to impose a protective duty upon bread stuffs. Things are in a different position now, and under the influence of our preferential tariff English feeling has been moulded in a measure. While they have not been asked by this government to put on a grain duty, they have done it in their own interests and for their own reasons. Those duties being on, it may be that later they will desire to lower them in order to ease the burden which must fall upon their people. I will not attempt to say how the burden will be eased. I have heard this question of protection and free trade discussed enough in this House to know that you cannot lay down any straight line as to who pays the duty in every case and under all circumstances. But I say there will be some burden upon the English people from the fact that they do not produce as much breadstuffs as they require. But if the government wished to ease their burden, if they thought it was in the interest of the people, it would be an easier matter for them to do it now that they have imposed a slight protection for their own purposes, and without being asked to do it by the colonies; they could ease the burden on their own people by enacting a law that so far as the colonies were concerned the tax should not be operative. There are other questions no doubt that will weigh with them. They will have to consider the effect upon the rest of the world. They will have to consider how giving a preference to their colonies will affect the feelings and actions of other nations. But the duty having now been imposed, it changes the position of the question which the Prime Minister will have to discuss, and he will find himself in a somewhat different position to what he was

when he went there before, when England had imposed no duties whatever upon breadstuffs.

But the idea of hon. gentlemen opposite undertaking to lecture this government for neglecting the interest of the country! The idea of these gentlemen rising, as they have done this afternoon, and professing that they are the guardians of the interests of this country, that if they were in power now they would immediately cable this very night to the old country and secure a preference! Sir, I do not wish to refer to a past debate, but the newspapers inform me that in the Canadian parliament there was a resolution proposed by the leader of the opposition not long ago, and endorsed by his followers. That resolution declared emphatically that if they were in power they would so arrange their tariff that not one dollar's worth of British goods should come into this country in any shape or form, while at the same time they declared for a preferential tariff. Do hon. gentlemen deny it? I say that their resolution, as interpreted by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) and other gentlemen, meant to shut out all goods that could be produced in this country. Every one knows that was the position they took, and I ask the leader of the opposition to give to the Prime Minister when he goes over a list of articles that he can offer to the British public in return for their admission of our products free.

Mr. BELL. Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Was not that coupled with a proposal for preferential trade?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. If I may be pardoned for referring to a past debate——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it is perfectly in order for an hon. member to make reference to a past debate in the form of an illustration, but he is not allowed to discuss the matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The resolution was printed in the newspapers, and hon. gentlemen will see it there:

> This House regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products, manufactures, and industries, as will at all times secure the Canadian market for Canadians. And, while thus firmly maintaining the necessity of such protection to Canadian interests, this House affirms its belief in a policy of reciprocal trade preference within the empire.

That is, while imposing this policy of adequate protection which, as interpreted by hon. gentlemen opposite, was to keep Canada for the Canadians and to shut out everything from other countries that could be produced in Canada, they were willing to accept preferential trade. They are on record. Suppose the Prime Minister goes over to England, and he is asked to state the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite. He would be told by English statesmen, Now we have imposed a duty of three pence per hundred weight on grain and five pence per hundred weight on flour, and you ask us to allow the colonial article in free. Then the Prime Minister would say: The opposition instructed me that they were anxious that you should let our grain in free. They will say to him: Did they give you any instructions as to what you would allow us in return for that? Well, nothing further than that they adopted a resolution that they believed in raising the Canadian tariff so high as to secure the Canadian market to Canadians in every line, and that they would maintain that tariff as against Britain, though they want to have preferential trade relations with you. The Englishmen will say to the Prime Minister: Will you please tell us what articles we produce that you cannot produce in Canada? The Prime Minister will say: If I must tell you honestly, I do not know that there is a single article you produce that cannot be produced in Canada under the adequate protection which the opposition have declared is essential, that is, a protection that will exclude every dollar's worth of your goods from the Canadian market. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to state where there is an article produced in the United Kingdom that cannot be produced in Canada under an adequate protection. Their resolution is on record, and that is their position.

For these hon. gentlemen to rise and instruct the Prime Minister that he is to go over there and support something that he does not consider in the public interest is certainly going very far. We are in the position that the Prime Minister is going over there without his hands tied by the resolution of hon. gentlemen opposite for there was not a member on this side of the House who supported that resolution which these hon. gentlemen have made, claiming that it is a preference they want, by which they would tie his hands so that he could not ask the British government to give a cent of preference to Canada in any shape or form. It would be worse than an insult to Great Britain to say: We want a preference in your market, and then to take the position, as their resolution is interpreted by their speeches and by the frequent 'hear, hears' of hon. gentlemen opposite, of saying: While we want a preference we have pledged ourselves that we will have such adequate protection as would exclude all goods from the Canadian market that you produce. It is an insult to the British government to make any such proposition and I think if hon. members opposite were to go over there charged with the duty of negotiating, this is the position they would

find themselves in. I rejoice for the well being of Canada that the Prime Minister does not go over there shackled by any such resolution. He voted against it, as did other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and he goes over there to confer with the imperial authorities and the other colonial authorities, to talk over matters and to see if by some means there can be arrangements made by which, through concessions on the part of one and concessions on the part of the other, trade with the empire can be promoted. To the credit of the Liberal party, the position which they took a few years ago has been a large factor, I have no doubt, in bringing about a state of feeling in Great Britain that is favourable to Canada at the present time, and I hope that there will be an arrangement effected that will redound to the benefit of all parts of the empire and to this Canada of ours. Certain I am of one thing and it is that there is a possibility, if not a probability, that under the position occupied by the party opposite there would not be a shadow of a possibility of obtaining any preference, because, according to the terms of that resolution of the hon. leader of the opposition, these hon. gentlemen have pledged themselves that they will have such adequate protection that Canada shall be kept for the Canadians and that no foreign products shall be allowed to come in. I say then that it is rather strange to hear hon. gentlemen opposite rising and lecturing this side of the House and the government as if we had neglected our duty, as if these hon. gentlemen were not in a position of having no hope of obtaining one iota of a preference from the British government though professing an expectation of being able to secure it.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I observe that the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) says that the decision which this House placed on record quite recently——

The PRIME MINISTER. Order, order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) has spoken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

An hon. MEMBER. Not on this question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the only question before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The only question before the House is that I do leave the Chair, and the hon. gentleman has spoken on that.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark), Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take part in this debate as I was not in the House when the motion was brought up, or, not the motion, because I believe it is only a statement of a grievance on going into committee of supply made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), but from the tone of the debate I have been able to follow the question which has been brought forward. From what I can learn the hon. member for East York made the statement in the House that the government have neglected their opportunities in not having made an effort to secure preferential trade with the mother country. It struck hon. gentlemen opposite as if a thunderbolt had fallen from a clear sky when they read in the papers this morning that their cherished doctrine of free trade which they believed would not be altered in Great Britain for fifty or sixty years to come had been changed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the introduction of his budget by the imposition of duties on corn and flour going into Great Britain. We warned hon. gentlemen opposite again and again that public opinion in England was changing. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when he went to Great Britain made the statement that we wanted no preference in the markets of the mother country, that we made the gift of the preferential entry of their goods into our country without expecting any return for it. Any man who has followed public opinion in Great Britain, not perhaps as it is indicated by the public utterances of men, but who has been familiar with public sentiment, knows that the Colonial Secretary was in favour of a preferential arrangement between the different colonies and the mother country. No more fatal blow was struck at the prospect of obtaining that advantage for this country than was directed by the Prime Minister when he was in England. These hon. gentlemen state now that they were always in favour of getting a preference. Yes, the right hon. gentleman has said that in the House before and we know that in one of his platform speeches in the west at a public meeting he said that he would obtain a preference, or at least try to obtain one within a week or two if he got in and that he would go over to Great Britain to try and obtain it. Did he carry out his promise? No. His first utterances when he landed in England were not such as to promote the obtaining of that preference but were the very opposite in their effect. He struck such a blow that Mr. Chamberlain and others who were prepared to help the cause of protection to the colonies dare not do it. The premier of the largest colony in the British empire was evidently determined to appear as a believer in the free trade principles which were advocated by Gladstone and Cobden. He was determined to show that he was a free trader up to the hilt, as my hon. friend says, and he received a medal from the Cobden Club in England. Whether they deceived him or he deceived them I cannot tell. Were not his first utterances and actions on landing in England bound to lead the people of Eng-

land to believe that he was a free trader at heart and that only the present necessities of his country led him to oppose a tariff ? That is what he told his hearers from one end of the country to the other. But, hon. gentlemen opposite have changed their policy in this respect, as they have changed their speeches on this very important question that we are discussing today. They have abandoned the principles which they thought could not be eradicated for a hundred years to come, and the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) gets up and makes a statement that the hon. Minister of Finance from 1896 in his utterances to the House down to the present day led us to believe that we might expect it. No man in this House, not even a supporter of the hon. gentleman, ever would draw that inference from any statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance, or any other person sitting on the treasury benches, or any one else on the other side of the House. The inference drawn from all of their speeches was the impossibility of obtaining anything of the kind. This government knew the feeling of the British government on this subject. That feeling was communicated to them in the cabled invitation to meet the colonial ministers at London to discuss, first the policy of the empire, next the defences of the empire, next the commercial relations between the different colonies and the motherland. What does that mean ? Every one knew that it meant that they were willing to discuss preferential trade as between the colonies and the motherland. Why did not this government take advantage of that ? Why did they not take advantage of the paragraph in the telegraphic despatch which says, that not only would these subjects be discussed, but any others which would be made known, so that they might be communicated to the premiers of the different colonies? There was not a word then, and there is not a word now, from the Prime Minister as to what his policy is to be. Surely on a matter of that vast importance to our country, the people of Canada ought to be informed what the policy of the government is. We on this side have stated again and again that we can get preferential trade. It is in the air. The complaint against the budget of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is not that it levies a tax upon food stuffs but that it makes no exception in favour of the colonies. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) is always in doubt as to the principles of protection and free trade, and he told us that arguments could be made on both sides. A few years ago there was no argument on our side in the opinion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson). But protection is in the air now. Every civilized country has adopted it. The true principle is to build up towns and manufactures and get in population, so that the material produced in the country may have market for consumption in the country. Last year I quoted the words of the Russian Finance Minister De Witte, the greatest Finance Minister in the world, that protection is the policy of every country, and will be for years to come, until we arrive at the millenium when the inhabitant of China is placed upon the same level with the Anglo-Saxon and other races, and when the product of one man's work shall be equal to the product of another man's work. That is a Christian doctrine, which I fear will not obtain a foothold for a very long time to come indeed. But until that political, religious and moral millenium arrives, which may be in 1,000 years hence, protection must be the policy of this country, as it will be the policy of the American continent. Our people will insist that Canadian manufactures shall be protected to the extent to which it is possible to protect them—not to the extent that the Minister of Customs thinks. There are thousands of articles which may be manufactured in England and which may be manufactured as cheaply here, but on account of the smaller demand will not be manufactured here. But I am getting out of the line of my argument.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. While you are on that line, I wish you would mention a few of the articles that will be produced in England and that cannot be produced here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I can furnish you with a list of two or three thousand. Take drugs, for instance. Nearly the whole pharmacopoeia can be manufactured in the country, but would it pay to manufacture them ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is the question. The question is whether articles which enter into the general consumption of the country can be manufactured as well in this country as in a foreign country. It is the duty of the government to protect these as manufacturing industries. But, let me ask : What industries are the government willing to sacrifice in the arrangement which the Minister of Customs proposes to make with the imperial authorities ? Is it the woollen industry ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We do not propose to sacrifice any.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman says that he was willing to make such an arrangement with the imperial authorities as would increase our imports from that country in return for a preference in their market.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That was the statement of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In carrying out that arrangement, what Canadian manufactures is he going to sacrifice ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. It is not necessary to sacrifice any.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then you cannot come to any such arrangement as that at all. We on this side have charged the government that they neglected to embrace the opportunity which was at their disposal to get preferential trade. The Prime Minister and every one of his supporters said that it could not be obtained. Well, it is possible to obtain it now. The right hon. gentleman is going to discuss our commercial relations when he gets to the old country. But he has stopped discussion on all political questions, and on all questions of imperial defence which are so intimately connected with our commercial relations that he will not be able to accomplish anything. He has given a death blow to everything in the shape of the furtherance of imperial ends, by that answer of his to the imperial authorities. We want the despatches. We want the despatch which the Colonial Secretary sent to Lord Minto, and we want the answer of this government to that despatch. These are not down. I draw your attention to these words :

With a view to the proposed conference, hope your premier will be able to remain for a short time, say three weeks, after the ceremony, as the guest of His Majesty's government. Please telegraph reply. Despatch follows.

We would like to get that despatch.

The PRIME MINISTER. I may say to my hon. friend that there is no despatch. Though it was stated that a despatch was coming, it has never come.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I was judging by the telegram, which seems to me to be a very short one. The despatch must have been countermanded, because when the Colonial Secretary received the reply of the right hon. gentleman, that ended all communications with the government on that subject. I do not wonder that he sent no more despatches.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The reply was so satisfactory to the British government that they did not need to say anything more.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was so satisfactory that they had no further communication on the subject. There is no chance for a despatch now. All chance for negotiation is very likely at an end. When the British government received the reply of the right hon. gentleman to the despatch, that ended all hope of any intercolonial arrangements, either as defence or the political relations of the colonies to the empire, or even as to their commercial relations.

The PRIME MINISTER. What are the dates ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The telegram of the Colonial Secretary is the 23rd of January, and the reply of the government here is the 3rd of February. We have no despatch, there is an end to the communications altogether, and the right hon. gentleman will simply be a pageant at the Coronation show, and no political results will follow from what ought to be the best and brightest opportunity that was ever offered to a people to accomplish their wishes and wants.

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

Statistical Year-book, $4,000.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. minister was to give us some details as to how the distribution of this book was made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The Year-book is distributed to mechanics' institutes, to the press, and to the public libraries in the country. A number are also sent to libraries and different offices in England : also to boards of trade and similar public institutions, and of late years a certain number have been distributed to members of the House. The distribution of the book has been materially increased of late.

Mr. CLANCY. I think that is precisely the information which the hon. gentleman gave us on a former occasion. What he was asked to do, and what he promised to do, was to give the committee the number distributed in each case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I asked for that information from the statistician, but I am afraid I have not got the paper here.

Mr. INGRAM. One class of institution which I think ought to be supplied with these books are the collegiate institutes, which have a special commercial course, in which the students deal largely with the trade and navigation returns of Canada and other countries. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman's department supply the book to the different collegiate institutes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know how many collegiate institutes there are. I believe they are pretty widely distributed throughout the province of Ontario, and if we distributed the book to these we would have to send it to the corresponding educational establishments in the other provinces. Will the hon. gentleman give me an idea of the number of them, and if we have a sufficient number

of the books on hand, I shall be glad to distribute them to these institutions.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot speak for the other provinces, but in the province of Ontario I do not think there would be more than one to each riding.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the number were not more than one to every riding of the Dominion we would have a supply sufficient for them, and I would be very glad to see that this was done.

Mr. SPROULE. How many did you issue last year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. 5,000 were ordered last year.

Mr. SPROULE. How many were distributed to members ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no fixed number. The members who asked for them received, in some cases, as many as ten, but generally four or five.

Mr. CLANCY. Was there no rule as to the number ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There was no special rule, but four or five were usually given each member who wanted them. Many did not ask for them.

Mr. CLANCY. Then those who were a little modest came out rather short. It is well to know that we can have a dozen if we want them.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why was not a certain number distributed to each member ? I did not ask for any, how many did I get ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I presume you got none.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Every member should get a certain number, as in the case of other blue-books.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is not sent out in the way the blue-books are. It is not published by an order of this House, but by the Department of Agriculture. The other blue-books are published and distributed by the order of the House, but this is published on an entirely different system as it always has been.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This vote is an order to publish this book, and every member should have one or two sent him, and the hon. minister who refuses to send these out is derelict in his duty.

Mr. SPROULE. I got three or four copies, which were all that was available. I would like to have had some more because a number of the school teachers like to get them.

Mr. BROCK. I am protesting continually when I receive by mail the enormous amount of literature published by order of this House. This costs the country a great many hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is very difficulty to ask a minister to cut down his expenses, when public documents are sent so lavishly about. I get from the Department of Agriculture every year an enormous number of reports, which I am supposed to distribute amongst my agricultural constituents, but except a few dealers in bananas, I do not know of any agriculturalists in my constituency. Each member has stacks of this kind of stuff sent him which he is not able to utilize. My office is filled up with these publications. I have no time to read them nor do I know of any idle people who have. Hundreds of thousands of dollars must be thus unnecessarily expended in almost every department, and a great deal of the matter is published in French. I would like gentlemen on the other side to assist the members of the government in saving half a million dollars in this item. Of course under the same heading comes the enormous expenditure on 'Hansard.' If you would discontinue the publication of 'Hansard,' you would have shorter speeches and fewer of them, and you could get through an amount of business in two months which now takes four months. A committee should be appointed to take the whole matter into consideration with a view of cutting down the expenditure.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. For the information of my hon. friend I may say that the Joint Committee on Printing of both Houses has appointed a sub-committee to look into those matters. We are getting statistics, and the sub-committee is to report to the Joint Committee, which in its turn will report to the House. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman thought proper to take objection to the publications printed in French.

Mr. BROCK. That is not what I intended.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I received three or four copies of the Year-book and was very glad indeed to get them. It is a very useful publication for school teachers and much sought after by them. With regard to the printing of the House, I am glad to endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock). I could not cart away all the publications I received and which I do not read. We are furnished with two reports of each department. These are big books, and I find my library growing so that I scarcely have a place to put the stuff. When I cannot use it or give it away, it becomes waste material. Therefore, I think the suggestion of the hon. member is in the right direction, and that by reducing the cost of turning out and distributing these publications we shall be able to affect a considerable saving.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Statistical Year-book has been regarded for many years as one of the most useful publications turned out by the government. I maintain that

it should be in every school of any importance in Canada. I took that position in this House ten years ago and have maintained it every year since. If twice as many copies of this book were sent out and fewer of the trash of question and answer and long-winded stuff of the Agricultural Committee, matter that is being sent out by the ton, but not half of it distributed—and nobody would read it if he got it—the country would be better served, and there would be less drain upon the treasury.

Mr. HENDERSON. I can hardly allow that statement to go without answer. I believe that the distribution of the evidence taken in the Agricultural Committee is of very great value indeed, particularly when distributed in the form of bulletins as has been done for a few years past. These small pamphlets are read when the larger volume printed at the end of the year would not be so carefully perused. I believe that many members representing agricultural constituencies find a means of distributing these small volumes without taking up a great deal of time. I know I have found no difficulty in getting rid of any that have been sent to me, and I am sure that I could dispose of double the quantity.

Mr. BROCK. You may have mine.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand my hon. friend from Centre Toronto (Mr. Brock) to say that I may have his. I should thank him very kindly if he will forward them to my address at Acton. I can make good use of them, and I presume he will not require any further reminder. My plan for distributing them is this: For example, I get, let us say sixty copies of the evidence of Professor Robertson before the Agricultural Committee. I do these up in parcels containing eight or ten copies each and address them to postmasters at rural points where I am satisfied they will take considerable interest in handing them out to persons who call for their mail. It is not necessary to address each one separately. I have followed that up by asking the farmers if they have received these bulletins, and have found that they did, proving that the documents went into the hands of people who would make good use of them. I am satisfied that a great deal of information given in the way of question and answer is more readily grasped by the agriculturists than if it were contained in a more closely written volume. I would not like to see a closer limit put upon these publications, for I regard them as very useful and helpful to those to whom they are sent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the attacks made upon him in the House and in the press of the country with regard to the accuracy of publications issued by his department. The minister is responsible for those publications and cannot shelter himself behind officers of his department. I notice that he takes considerable credit to himself in the latter portion of his report for the large distribution of this work—I refer to the Statistical Year-book—throughout the country. If this book is not more accurate than some of the newspapers supporting the government—even personal organs of ministers, if all tales be true—have said, the fewer copies of it that are distributed the better. If my hon. friend from South Ontario (Mr. Ross) wants the teachers to know how our country is progressing, he had better not send them the Statistical Year-book, if statements made by members of the Treasury Benches are to be believed. A Minister of the Crown has gone so far as to say that a gentleman who refers to the Statistical Year-book for facts relating to this country is led into a trap. Does the Minister of Agriculture ask us to vote his salary, when he has not a word to say in support of a publication from his department that is thus characterized by one of his own colleagues, and by the press supporting the government of which he is a member? I expected the minister, when this item came up, to say something about these charges and to defend this publication of his even against the attacks of his colleagues. But we hear no word from him, and are left to guess as best we may whether the attacks are well founded or not. Members of this House have a right to look to a publication sent out by the Minister of Agriculture as a document worthy to be believed; but, if we are to believe the allegations to which I have referred, this is an absolutely unreliable publication and any hon. gentleman who refers to it and bases an argument upon it is regarded by members of the government as being led into a trap. In other words, the hon. gentleman's colleagues tell him that this book issued by this department is a trap of misinformation to the people of this country. Yet, though he has heard these charges for the last two or three weeks, the minister has not a word to say in the defence of his department or of this publication. Knowing the hon. minister as I do, I would have expected him to be as loyal to his officials as he would expect his officials to be loyal to him. This book does not purport, so far as a considerable part of the information concerned in it is concerned, to be anything more than an estimate. Yet, we do not expect Ministers of the Crown will be in a position to rise in this House and say that gentlemen who refer to this book published by the Minister of Agriculture are being led into a trap. I do not suppose that those who have made this charge understand how they reflect upon the Minister of Agriculture, and, apparently, the Minister of Agriculture himself does not understand the seriousness of the charge made against him and against his department. Otherwise when he was asking for $4,000 to publish this work dur-

ing the ensuing year he would have something to say about the matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must confess frankly that I have never undertaken, as minister, to examine every detail of the information contained in this book, and to verify it. I believe that is the duty of the officers who are entrusted with the work of compiling this book, and the hon. gentleman must know that no Minister of the Crown can be expected to go through the drudgery that such work would entail. I regret to say that discoveries have been made of inaccuracies in this book, and of figures which do not agree with each other. I have only to say to the leader of the opposition and to the committee, that I trust such inaccuracies will not take place any more. The Year-book is a compilation from the blue-books which are issued from the various departments, it is compiled by officers of the department, and it is their duty to see that it is accurate, that the transcription of figures is correctly done, and that nothing appears in it at variance with the facts. That such things should appear in it is certainly a reflection upon the department and upon the officers who have charge of the work. I realize that as political head of the department, I must shoulder the responsibility for the mistakes.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand from the hon. gentleman that his officers are not competent to prepare this book ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have always supposed them to be competent, and I still suppose them to be competent. If they do not carry out their duty it will be my duty to see that they do so in future.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I would not have it understood that I am opposed to the publication of the agricultural report. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I find its work extremely interesting and instructive. I am sure the reports which go out from that committee must be interesting and instructive to the farmers. I find great pleasure in distributing those reports, and I find the farmers receive them gladly. It is some of the other reports which do not seem to be of interest to anybody. I am sorry to learn from the discussion which has occurred to-night that there should be anything wrong with the Year-book. I think we should have such a Year-book, and that it should go into the hands of every teacher in this country for use in the schools. I think it would be a good move to put it into the hands of every teacher, showing the growth of the country and the growth of its business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want my hon. friend to understand that I am reflecting upon the Year-book in any way. I quoted from it, and I believe that what I quoted was correct. I have no fault to find with it at all. I was calling the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the reflections which have been cast upon this book not from this side but from the other side of the House, and from the Liberal press of this country. The only thing that surprised me was that the Minister of Agriculture did not see fit, after the matter was brought to his attention, to make some defence of his own publication while the item was passing.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) My objection to the Year-book is its shabby appearance. I do not call it a Year-book at all, it is not bound, and I consider that a book giving information of the Dominion of Canada should have a respectable appearance. There is a Year-book published by the colony of New Zealand for the year 1901, which contains twenty times the information that our Year-book contains. There is nothing in our Year-book but dry details and figures which very few men in this House or out of it will ever read. The New Zealand Year-book is beautiful and interesting, and contains information of great interest and value concerning that colony, and I would like to see our Year-book made something like it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture neglected our esteemed friend in the distribution of these beautiful volumes such as I hold in my hand. I am surprised that the member for Victoria N.S. (Hon. Mr. Ross) has not seen this beautiful volume; I hope he has no objection to it because it is red. I do not put such confidence in our Year-book as the leader of the opposition does. I confess that I rarely quote from it, or rarely take any information from it without first verifying it. I regret to be obliged to say that there are two or three tables in that Year-book that should not be in it. I believe there are tables put in there for a political purpose. When hon. gentlemen sat on this side of the House years ago, they accused the Conservative party of compiling this Year-book with a political object. Well, if they were guilty at that time, I do not think the hon. gentlemen are less guilty to-day. I will draw the attention of the minister to one table in this book which I hope will be amended next year, because there is not a word of truth in it from top to bottom. It would be unfortunate to place such a book in the hands of our school children. I call attention to the table on page 481 of the Year-book for 1899, which I got from the library a few moments ago. It is a table giving the standing of the different provinces and of their debts. On page 478 it first gives the provincial debts of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, British Columbia, and Prince Edward Island, but leaves out Ontario.

Mr. FRASER. That has no debt.

Mr. HENDERSON. Evidently these gentlemen have been reading this book, and

consequently they are utterly ignorant of the state of the finances in the province of Ontario. Now, we have, at page 481, a statement of the surpluses from 1882 to 1899 also giving a statement of the railway liability payable in the future extending over forty years. It gives the Railway liability in each particular year of the province of Ontario. I shall take the year 1899, where it is stated that our railway liability is $1,962,903. Now, I take the budget speech of the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Ross) given a few months ago in which he states that the railway liability in January, was $3,510,790.

Mr. TALBOT. What year ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Up to the end of 1901. There is just the difference between the two years. The figures have increased somewhat. I am not quite sure that there was an increase in 1900 or 1901, but I beg to say that there is very little difference indeed.

Mr. FRASER. Do I understand that that is the budget speech for this year ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. Well, then that would be up to the end of 1901, and the statistical tables published in 1899 would be for the year 1898, so that you would have three years.

Mr. HENDERSON. No, the table I read from this year is for the year 1899. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) need not try to mix it. There would be a difference of possibly two years, but that would be the fullest extent of the difference. But, of course, there could not be a difference by any means of $2,000,000. I do not think it exceeded $500,000, if it exceeded $200,000. While we have Mr. Ross stating that the railway debt at the end of 1901 was $3,510,790, the Year-book places it at the end of 1899 at $1,962,000. The commission sat since then, as an hon. gentleman suggests, but I do not know that it would make any material difference in the figures. I think they discovered that the debt was just about as large as it had been understood to be. It does not affect the matter that I object to. I will take another column because the object appears to me to be to show that Ontario has no debt at all. It is really the intention to convey that impression to the mind of the young reader in the public school when we all know that Ontario has a debt of nearly $6,000,000. There is $1,815,000 due the Dominion government, and we are paying interest from the province of Ontario to the Dominion on that sum of 4 and 5 per cent, a pretty high rate of interest to exact.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is something on the other side of the account.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, but it is the wrong way. I will discuss the question that the hon. Minister of Finance referred to, in a moment ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not want to debate it with my hon. friend.

Mr. HENDERSON. Leaving the matter, then, of the debt, which, I understand is nearly $6,000,000, I think it is very wrong in publishing a table of this kind to convey the impression that it is under $2,000,000. Another heading is : 'Surplus of assets over liabilities,' and it is put down that in 1899 we have $2,250,932 of assets over all liabilities. Now, every man who is familiar with the financial history of the province of Ontario knows perfectly well that there is not a dollar of surplus and that for many years there has not been. That is a well known fact. A commission was appointed to try and find out this surplus a year or two ago, and when the commission reported, they said nothing about the surplus. However, that did not satisfy the Prime Minister of Ontario. He wanted a surplus and he asked an accountant in the city of Toronto by letter, to see if he could not find one. No doubt, the accountant was well paid for it and he furnished a report in which he actually did find a surplus. I have the report under my hand. I have the report of the royal commission, and it is put in a very peculiar way. The appendix to the report is put under the same cover as the report of the royal commission and went forth to the country actually as a government print and as a part of the report of the royal commission, when it was a well known fact that not a word of it was certified to by the commissioners. The commissioners made their report on the 13th of February, 1900, and the other work was undertaken on the 27th of March, when the Prime Minister wrote a letter to the accountant asking him to investigate this matter. No doubt he found a surplus but he did it by including an asset which was manufactured out of a subsidy that this government granted in 1884 to the province of Ontario, of $142,414, and by capitalizing it at 5 per cent, he made an item of $2,848,000, which he placed among the assets. That sum, however, being in excess of the surplus that the government claimed by some $300,000, shows that instead of having a surplus of assets, they actually had no surplus at all, save that obtained by capitalizing a subsidy that nobody acknowledges as money, and which the hon. Minister of Finance himself, says the province of Ontario has not an unconditional right to, or, to use his own words :

> I do not think your government have any unconditional right to demand this money from the Dominion.

They capitalized the sum representing the subsidy paid year after year by this government to the province of Ontario, and to

which capitalized sum the hon. Minister of Finance here says the Ontario government have no unconditional right to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend might read that letter a little farther in all fairness.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will read the whole letter if the hon. gentleman desires it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not desire it; it has been printed fifty times.

Mr. HENDERSON. (reading.)

I do not think your government have any unconditional right to demand this money from the Dominion. There are certain limitations provided by the statutes; but no doubt if you desired to obtain the money you could easily comply with these conditions.

We all know that. Ontario can comply with the conditions, surrender the subsidy and take the larger sum, but Ontario does not want to do that. The province of Ontario might in the same way sell out any other asset that it had. I fail to see that there is anything gained by my reading the hon. gentleman's letter. This, I assume, is only the hon. minister's opinion, which he gave in order to help the Prime Minister at Toronto on the eve of an election at a very critical time. I am not going to say that the hon. Minister of Finance overstated what he believed to be correct, but I confess there are other men in the country who have given this matter careful consideration and they are directly of an opposite opinion to that of the hon. Minister of Finance in respect to that sum of money. It is simply capitalizing a sum of money that was granted by this government to the province of Ontario, and which this government is compelled to pay year after year to the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. So long as Ontario wants it.

Mr. HENDERSON. So long as Ontario wants it, and until this parliament authorizes this government to pay it over and until the provincial legislature of Ontario authorizes that government to receive it and in doing that they wipe out the subsidy. In that same way they might wipe out any other asset they have. There is not a dollar available to-day for the purpose of meeting the liabilities of the province. I therefore say, that this table is misleading and that it should be eliminated from the Year-book. It is too bad that our young minds should be led away with the idea that we have a large surplus in Ontario when we know that we are paying interest on a debt of $6,000,000, and that we have not a dollar of surplus over and above our actual liabilities. I will not analyse the contents of the Year-book further, but I confess that if I ever happen to quote statistics from this book, I am always careful to verify them by other departmental records.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. FLINT. It is unfair that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) should take up the time of this parliament in discussing the finances of the province of Ontario, with the intention of affecting the result in a local election which is about to take place.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I rise to a point of order. The hon. member (Mr. Flint) has impuned the motives of another hon. member in this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He did not attribute an improper motive. It is not a crime to try to influence an election.

Mr. FLINT. In order to save time, I will withdraw the expression, whether it is parliamentary or not. This whole question of the Ontario surplus was discussed last election and the argument of the supporters of the local government was well sustained by the facts. A careful examination of Ontario finances from an economical standpoint will show that the statement in the Year-book is substantially correct. If my hon. friend wishes to show that the Year-book is incorrect I do not wish to deprive him of the pleasure, but he should not take up the time of this House in providing provincial campaign literature. He was entirely out of order in dealing with the Ontario finances. The Year-book in the main is correct, but all people are liable to make mistakes, and mistakes do sometimes occur in the Year-book without any particular fault except perhaps a lack of care in due preparation of the figures. I have often had occasion to find fault with the manner of the compilation of the Year-book. I think the book might be made more interesting and useful, but I have no particular objection as to the correctness of the figures. The suggestion of the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Brock) as to the enormous expense of publishing and circulating the blue-books is worthy of our attention. I am glad to know, as stated by the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) that a sub-committee of the Printing Committee is considering that whole subject with the view of adopting a plan by which a great deal of money could be saved to the country. I would suggest to that sub-committee that a careful list be made of those who receive these publications. The list has been altogether too large in the past. Ex-members of parliament who may have been here only a short time and who care nothing about these things have these publications sent to them for years and years after they have ceased to be members of this House.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Only in case they apply for them.

Mr. FLINT. The list should be carefully revised and made as small as it can be. I would suggest that a circular should be issued containing the names of all the publications and asking that those entitled to

receive them should mark off those which they desire to receive, so that those which do not interest them would not be sent. In that way thousands of dollars would be saved. I am pleased to get as many publications as the average member of parliament, but a great part of those which I do receive are useless to me and to others. They have the disadvantage that they cannot be burned in the furnace because they block it up, and it is often difficult to know what to do with them. There are, of course, the bound volumes which can be put into private libraries or donated to public libraries and they are useful. I think, Sir, that the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture covered the whole ground in regard to the Year-book. If errors have crept in through carelessness or inadvertence they will be corrected. Personally, I would like to see the Year-book published under a different system in the future, but the minister and his colleagues will no doubt come to a decision upon that. Be that as it may, I do not think that the committee should have its time taken up discussing the finances of Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. I dissent from the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint). There is no thoughtful member of this House who will say that he can dispense with any of the departmental reports. They are the public records of the country. The hon. gentleman will see that he gets two unbound copies, one of which is supposed to be used during the session of parliament and the other he can very easily dispose of because there are many intelligent persons in the country who are always very glad to get them. The hon. gentleman says he has difficulty in burning them, but I ask him now if on reflection he will say that he can dispense with a single public document that is printed by order of this parliament.

Mr. FLINT. I hope my hon. friend does not imagine that I intimated that they should be dispensed with. I merely suggested that the list of those who receive them should be carefully revised, and that those to whom books are sent should be asked to state what they want and what they do not want.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member knows that that is an impossibility. The Printing Committee provide for the publication of a certain number of these documents. If there are some members who do not care for the sessional papers, the committee are not able to determine in advance whether they will take them or not. If the hon. gentleman had the control of this matter he would find himself at the close of the year in a complete difficulty in regard to the distribution, though I have no doubt that some saving might be made in the printing. Coming back to this much-abused Year-book, it does not pretend to be more than a sort of compilation of the public records, and if they have been in any sense false, it would not do for the compiler of the Year-book to undertake to correct them. For this reason the statistician is not to blame for having stated that there was no debt in the province of Ontario, because he simply took the public records as he found them. You would not expect a public official to undertake to correct from his own bat any public documents. I do not think it is a fair charge to bring against the Minister of Agriculture to say that this Year-book is inaccurate, beyond this, that he has sat in his place and has permitted attacks to be made upon it in this House for party purposes. On the whole, it is a reliable and very satisfactory work, and it is not fair to have it go out that there are immense inaccuracies in it. Its compiler would be more than human if no errors occurred in it, but there are none to seriously impair the value of the work.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I was very much surprised to hear the hon. member for Yarmouth speak of curtailing the distribution of one or two of these publications to members of parliament or ex-members of parliament. Who are better fitted or take greater interest in watching the proceedings of parliament than ex-members of parliament? I said a moment ago that a good deal of money was wasted in the distribution of these agricultural reports. I am satisfied that it cannot be carried on as it was a year or two ago, when the evidence, which could all be compressed into four or five pages of common sense, was sent out in books of 200 or 300 pages and distributed in tons throughout the country. A farmer would never sit down to read these books. This system, I presume, has been discontinued.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they are printed by the order of the House. The Department of Agriculture has nothing whatever do with that.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It would pay this country to have some intelligent sessional clerk, if such can be found, condense the whole thing into a nice little concise volume of twenty pages, and distribute that. I think there is a great deal of money wasted, not only in connection with this item, but in connection with the printing of parliament. Very many reports are ordered to be distributed when only two or three copies are wanted; and some of these sessional clerks who are standing around and getting in everybody's way instead of attending to their own business, might be engaged to strike off two or three copies on the typewriter for those who want them.

Mr. SPROULE. With reference to the number of reports of the Committee on Agriculture, the hon. gentleman has exaggerated. I have been on that committee for a number of years, and I understand

how these reports are given out to be distributed. No report of 300 or 400 pages is distributed in large numbers ; but the House recommended the printing of a certain number of copies of the summary reports to be given to members of parliament for distribution, and my experience is that members representing rural constituencies have applied to members representing city constituencies to give them a portion of their number for distribution in their constituencies. We have had many controversies in the committee on this subject, the difficulty having been to get the House to order enough to satisfy the needs of the committee. With regard to the Year-book, I think it is regrettable to see one minister of the Crown getting up and discrediting a publication got out by another department. If we cannot rely on the official reports, what can we rely on ? If they are not reliable, the minister at the head of the department ought to be held responsible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As one member who I am sure would like to say something on the subject of the Year-book is absent through illness this evening, I would suggest that the minister allow this item to stand and take up some other items.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This item has been already once before the House. If my hon. friend did not wish to discuss it, he should have said so when it was first called. But after we have discussed it so long, I do not think we ought to postpone it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I presume the hon. minister will have no objection to discuss the subject on another item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not at all.

General statistics, $3,200.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the item out of which the compilation of the Year-book is paid. There are some extra clerks paid out of this vote, and the balance is available for any statistical work.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the minister if he is going to employ this ubiquitous gentleman who sells books, writes for the magazines and obtains land values. I refer to Mr. Washington. I am not disposed to quarrel with useful expenditure, but we have a return made by Mr. Washington which is absolutely worthless. Mr. Washington is a gentleman who has been taken care of by the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR. For what reason ?

Mr. CLANCY. He said he was not a Liberal but voted with the Liberal party. He solemnly swore he was not a Liberal but a free trader. This is an absolute waste of money.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington was doing, in the course of the last two or three years, certain investigations and statistical work for which he was paid out of this vote. The report is on the Table of the House. He made some investigations into the selling value of rural lands, and the trend of rise and fall in the value of such lands. The work has extended over the past three years and when at work he is paid out of this fund. He has not worked in this fiscal year at all, and consequently has not been paid out of this fund.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Who are paid out of this fund ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. None except the clerks engaged under Mr. Johnston in compilation.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to put the whole sum fairly chargeable to the Statistical Year-book in one item so that we might know from year to year what it costs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The vote for the Statistical Year-book is simply for printing it. The book is printed in the Bureau and the $4,000 is all paid to the Bureau for printing it.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Washington received no pay for the current year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. INGRAM. Then he was paid last year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. His report must have been made to the department last year. How does it come that no report but Mr. Washington's appears in the Year-book ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The portion of this vote is to pay ordinary clerks in the department, a part of the staff engaged on the Year-book and any other statistical work that may be given out, and a portion is employed to pay anybody else who may be doing statistical work.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, we understand that Mr. Washington gets paid for making land values ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, that may be one way of putting it, but I would not put it that way. What I said was that he was paid for investigating land values.

Mr. INGRAM. We asked, on the 25th of February what his duties were, and the hon. minister told us that he was engaged in making land values. That is here on record, and he received $750 for his services. I think we are entitled to know who

these temporary clerks are. Every year the minister has come down and asked for $3,200, and when asked what it was for his reply was, to pay temporary clerks. But I fail to find it stated who these temporary clerks are. If they are engaged year after year why should they not be made permanent officers and paid in the ordinary way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Many are employed in my department who are called temporary clerks. They were there before I took charge, and are practically permanent officers. Some have been in the department for 15 years, some perhaps, for even 20 years.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not make them permanent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not disturbed the order of affairs that I found in existence. It would require a considerable change in the organization of the department, and I have not seen fit to undertake that any more than did my predecessors. I have not the names of the clerks at the moment, but I can get them for the hon. gentleman. For his satisfaction, I may tell him that there is not a single one paid out of this vote that was not there when I took charge of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. I think that only Mr. Johnson and two clerks were working there when the hon. gentleman took office.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) is mistaken. I can get the list of clerks.

Mr. INGRAM. Some other time will do.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think the committee is disposed to accept as final the hon. minister's statement that he will consider whether he will retain Mr. Washington as a fixture upon the service of this country. It is not pleasant to be forced to state in the House the opinion one holds of one in Mr. Washington's position. But when a man is paid hundreds of dollars—running into thousands by this time—and yet does not hesitate to state his conclusion and put it in writing that during the exact year when the Liberals were in power, the hard times had the effect of enhancing the land values, and that they had the very opposite effect when the Conservatives were in power, what are we to think of the value of the employment by government of such a man ? I have no hesitation in saying that no one but a lunatic would base such a statement upon the evidence produced by Mr. Washington. I, for one, am not disposed to let this item pass until we have some declaration from the minister that he has at least made up his mind to discontinue a work that is utterly useless and, indeed, disgraceful. If the hon. minister is ready to stand sponsor and godfather for work of that kind, and cannot make up his mind whether to discontinue it or not, I, for one, propose that the item shall not pass until he can tell the House what he intends to do. I do not wish to stand in the way of the item passing, but I think the committee is entitled to some declaration on the subject. This side of the House can make up their minds, if the hon. minister cannot.

Mr. FLINT. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) is unduly violent over a matter which does not necessarily call for such strong language. As to the report made by Mr. Washington, until we have had copies of it printed and in our hands to study, it is impossible for us to come to a conclusion concerning it. That such an inquiry is absurd and valueless, I think has not been proved, and cannot be proved. That there is such a thing as rise and fall of land values in various portions of the country, and that this may be caused by different occurrences, will hardly be denied. But the opinion of the minister, in which I concur, is that to carry on that inquiry throughout the Dominion upon the scale upon which Mr. Washington started out, would take a long time and a great deal of money. I, for one, as a member of the committee do not see that we could reasonably ask the House to vote the sum necessary for such a work. But I do not think it fair to discuss Mr. Washington's report until it is in our hands, and it seems to me that the language used by the hon. gentleman is not justified under the circumstances.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Where do we find recorded the salaries paid to this man Washington ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington has no salary, and he has not been paid anything by the department in the current year. This item is for general statistics for next year and, so far, I have formed no plan for paying Mr. Washington out of this item. When he was paid, he was paid out of this item in last year's vote and the vote of the year before.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Was he paid out of any other department or any other fund ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me clear that if Mr. Washington was paid out of this vote, an improper use was made of the money. Judging by his report, Mr. Washington is only a political jobber, a land valuator getting up the case for the Reform party. The sum and substance of his work is an effort to show that the land went down in value when the Conservative party were in power and went up when the Reform party came into power. And I think

the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was quite right in saying that the data Mr. Washington gave could not be used as a basis for his conclusions by any one other than a lunatic. He had nothing reliable to go upon, and yet, for the purpose of his party he was willing to make this report. And we pay him under the head of general statistics. I say he is improperly paid if paid out of this item, and he is improperly employed if employed at all.

Mr. CLANCY. I wish to say a word to my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint). That hon. gentleman seems to have an abhorrence of public records and to have forsworn the use of them. This report of which we are speaking has been on the Table for a month, and if the hon. gentleman was inclined to be informed he has had the opportunity. Yet, though he has not read this report, he does not hesitate to rise and defend it. Now if the hon. gentleman appeals to the Minister of Agriculture he will put him in possession of that within two minutes.

Mr. FLINT. I think the hon. gentleman has the manuscript of that report in his pocket.

Mr. CLANCY. Not at all, the manuscript is in the possession of Mr. Polkinghorne, I have not had it in my pocket at all. The hon. gentleman should have been informed before he made the statement. I repeat that Mr. Washington is a pensioner on the department. The Minister of Agriculture says he has not been paid anything during the current year. The hon. gentleman knows that besides being paid for this job, he has been engaged in the census department for a considerable time, he is in fact a man that must be taken care of. When he is not there he is going through the department selling books. The hon. gentleman's own department has bought books from him, every department has bought books from him; he is a perfect nuisance, if I am forced to use such language. That he should be paid out of the public funds of Canada to make up a record of what he calls land values for the use of the intelligent people of this country, is a perfect outrage. It is curious to see how he arrives at the difference in land values. He tells us that he does not take into consideration any improvements made on the land. The truth is that Mr. Washington has disclosed that his report is utterly worthless. Yet hon. gentlemen will no doubt later on use that report and say that during the period the Tories were in power land values went down, and during the period the Liberals were in power they went up. I say a man who will commit himself to a statement of that kind unrebuked is past redemption.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why didn't you rebuke him the other day when you had him under cross-examination ?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. CLANCY. Perhaps I had a good deal better manners than my hon. friend, because, having the opportunity, I would not use it. I was not disposed to take advantage of my position to say unkind things to this man, because I hoped at least that the Minister of Agriculture and hon. gentlemen opposite would put an end to the farce.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would say it to his face rather than behind his back.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend and his friends have brought this upon Mr. Washington. The Minister of Agriculture evidently thinks that Mr. Washington is a very valuable man, and that he cannot possibly part with him. Why cannot the hon. gentleman admit that the whole thing is a farce ? Surely his own friends do not sympathize with the attitude he has taken this evening ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman evidently is not very well satisfied with the outcome of the investigation that has been carried on by Mr. Washington. Mr. Washington undertook to investigate facts, not a theory, not a policy, or anything of the kind, but facts in regard to the sales of land in certain counties, which were picked out for the purpose of investigation, through a certain number of years. The facts show that during certain periods land seemed to go down in value, because it sold for less than it brought earlier during those periods. In other periods the land seemed to be rising in value because it sold for a higher price at each successive sale.

Mr. INGRAM. Where did he get that information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From the registry books of the counties which he examined.

Mr. INGRAM. How did you get that information ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From his report, and from the details on which he based his report. He based his conclusions on figures in a multitude of cases, where he found that on one occasion a certain property was sold for a certain sum and on a subsequent occasion it was sold for a higher, or a lower price. Mr. Washington's investigation shows that during certain years there was a steady decrease in prices, and in certain other years there was an increase in prices obtained for the same properties. It happened unfortunately for the hon. gentlemen opposite that there was a very marked difference since the present government came into power, and that a little while afterwards lands in the rural districts began to increase in value. During the period before the present government came into power lands steadily decreased in value. That is what nettles the hon. gentleman. If Mr. Washington's investigation had told in the other

direction, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman would have thought Mr. Washington a heaven-born genius, but as it is, he finds Mr. Washington is something very bad indeed.

Mr. BROCK. It is evident from what we hear this evening that this gentleman has taken a great deal of unnecessary trouble to go through the registry books and find out at what prices lands in particular localities have been sold. The value of land, as every one knows, is to be found in the value of its products, the value of the wheat for instance. To find the value of wheat you have only to consult the Liverpool market from time to time. The value of land, like everything else, is measured by what it produces. The employment of this gentleman to go through the country and examine registry books in various counties is a most ridiculous waste of money, and must have been done, not for statistial purposes, but for the purpose of bolstering up the pretensions of hon. gentlemen opposite to be the saviours of the country. As to the value of wheat, or the price of any other product of the land, no one pretends that this government or any other government has anything to do with it. The value of timber land is measured by the value of the lumber that it produces. You can always get those statistics without the employment of a man like Mr. Washington to go through the country and examine the registry books. When gentlemen like Mr. Washington start out on a job of that kind they always know what you want them to do, and they are prepared to keep at it as long as the salary is forthcoming. I really think the Minister of Agriculture should be ashamed of this whole business.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman was asked on the 25th of February, this question :

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister says that the inspiration to appoint such an officer came from himself. As it was he who inspired the idea, he must have known who this gentleman was and where he came from. Did he come from the hon. gentleman's own riding.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, he did not. I never knew the gentleman until I met him here at Ottawa and do not know where he came from.

Then the minister says further :

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington is a gentleman who has been engaged for years in statistical investigation. When I first met him we had a discussion on statistical work. I believe he was at one time in the press gallery, but I did not inquire particularly into his antecedents.

How does the hon. gentleman know that if he never knew the gentleman until he met him here at Ottawa ? Then my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) asks :

Was he on the Montreal 'Herald'?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think he ever was connected with the Montreal 'Herald,' and I cannot remember who introduced him to me, but I have known him a good many years and have frequently discussed statistical work with him.

These three answers do not corroborate each other very well. Now, look at the wonderful work this gentleman did. When the hon. minister was asked where he employed this man his answer was :

I think he went to three counties in Ontario, to one in Quebec, and to one or two in the maritime provinces.

I doubt whether he did come into Ontario with that small expense account of $54.67. The minister proceeds :

I know he was in Prince Edward Island, and I think he examined a county in Nova Scotia.

Mr. CLANCY. Does he state that ?

Mr. INGRAM. That is what the hon. minister states, and yet we have been told that the valuable work of this man shows a wonderful decrease in land values under the Conservative regime and a wonderful increase during the time that hon. gentlemen have been in power. Then we were told by the hon. minister to-night that this man is paid out of the $3,200. He was paid $722.31 for his salary and $54.67 for his travelling expenses. I see that he has been engaged in the statistical department, for which we are paying $4,000 in one instance and $3,200 in another instance. We have the right to have that gentleman's report included in the Statistical Year-book.

Mr. CLANCY. No, no ; for heaven's sake no.

Mr. INGRAM. If it has any value at all it should be placed in there, and the hon. gentleman should assume responsibility for it and not come down to this House and lay it on the Table. Not many hon. gentlemen in this House have any opportunity of reading it. If he does statistical work his work should be put into the report, so that we could see it, and if his employment is not justifiable, then, the sooner this man is discharged the better.

Mr. SPROULE. He has evidently been getting up a campaign document.

Mr. INGRAM. I think so. The other evening the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) introduced a book, and probably if its pages were carefully perused we would find the report of Mr. Washington in it. As to the value of land this gentleman seems to make out an increased value since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. In my district land has gone up very materially, but it is only in one or two spots where government buildings are erected and where friends of the government get an increased profit. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from London (Mr. Hyman) finds that values have gone up a little. In the county of Elgin land values in the matter of government purchases, have gone up from something like $80 to $300, so that

since the government came into power there has been an increase of about 200 per cent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say that if this gentleman, Mr. Washington, about whom I know nothing, pursued the method of investigation that has been mentioned by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the results must certainly be very valuable. He has gone, the minister says, through the registry offices and investigated the land values there. I believe there has been an investigation of that kind in the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Prince Edward Island and in Ontario.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought it was stated that he had investigated Nova Scotia as well.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why has my province been deprived of the services of this gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not had him long enough to go there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I will require a full explanation of why my province has been deprived of the services of this gentleman before this item is passed. It is one of the most scandalous attempts to impose on Nova Scotia that I ever heard of. However, for my present purpose, it does not make very much difference about Nova Scotia. I do not suppose deeds are prepared differently in Prince Edward Island from the way in which they are prepared in Nova Scotia. I do not know whether they are prepared differently in Ontario or not. I know that in Nova Scotia in not 50 per cent of the cases is the consideration price correctly stated in the deed of conveyance.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is in Quebec.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, the hon. gentleman should have ascertained something about the other provinces before he made any statement as to this gentleman's method of investigation. In thousands of cases, to my own knowledge, in the province of Nova Scotia, in which large transactions have taken place, the sum of one dollar has been mentioned as the consideration.

Mr. McCARTHY. Would that be in the case of farm lands ? That would be simply in the sale of land to some corporation or the passing of property between relatives.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And also in the sale of farm lands in the province of Nova Scotia. Personally, when I purchased a property which I own there, the consideration which was stated was one dollar.

Mr. McCARTHY. Probably that was the real value ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) is welcome to that idea if he desires to entertain it.

Mr. McCARTHY. It shows the increase in the value of land.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Since the government came into power.

Mr. HYMAN. That does not prove it has not increased in value.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In many cases the consideration which is stated in Nova Scotia is one dollar. Now does this gentleman obtain any valuable information by looking at deeds of that character ? Yet, according to the hon. Minister of Agriculture the only way in which he has pursued his inquiries is by resorting to the registry offices. Would the hon. gentleman state whether in different counties he has made these investigations exhaustive as to farm lands?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, in every instance where there were two sales of the same property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is not an answer to the question. Does he take all the farm land in any particular county and go through it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. He takes every case where there are two sales of the same property within the period which he is investigating, so as to see whether there has been a rise or a fall in the value of that property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend mean that he takes a period of say twenty or twenty-five years and investigates every sale of farm property in a particular county during that period ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. A great many of the sales that take place in the province of Ontario at the present time are the sales of land held under mortgage. A portion of the mortgage is paid off and the purchaser agrees to pay a certain consideration and assume the mortgage.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is recited in the deed.

Mr. SPROULE. How does any person know how much of the mortgage is unpaid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is registered.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mortgages are all registered.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, the mortgage is registered but until the discharge of the

whole mortgage there is nothing in the registry office to show how much remains to be paid. There is usually a portion of the mortgage paid before the property is sold and when the property is sold, because the companies are pushing for payment, the party who purchases the property agrees to assume the mortgage. You go to the registry office and you can find no trace there of the actual value of that land, or what it has changed hands for except for that.

Mr. ERB. As there seems to be some doubt in the minds of gentlemen opposite as to the increase in farm values in recent years, I wish to say that I know of two farms in my own neighbourhood that were sold eight or ten years ago, and again sold within the last six months. About ten years ago one of these farms was sold for $10,000, and the purchaser built on it a new barn, costing about $15,000. That farm was sold within the last six months for $13,500. Another farm was sold eight or ten years ago for $6,500, and it was resold about four months ago for $7,500, or $1,000 more, with out any improvements having been made. These are two cases in my own experience.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) I was surprised when I heard some hon. gentlemen say that for the hon. minister to have employed a man who was throughly competent and having technical knowledge, to make up a record of land values throughout the several provinces of the Dominion, was an outrage and a farce. Now, in the province of Quebec, from which I come, and in my own riding, for instance, farmers do not raise wheat, and they depend altogether for their revenue on dairying ; and such being the case, I should like the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Brock) to tell me how he would manage to measure the value of farm lands in my riding, if it be true, as he stated, that to find out the value of lands in this country, you have to consult the London market alone.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am sorry to see hon. gentlemen opposite obstructing these estimates and in both languages. Is it the intention of the minister to employ Washington during the next fiscal pear ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have made no plans for it.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). If such were the intention, I would move that this item be reduced by the amount of his salary. Who paid his travelling expenses of $52, travelling all the way from Prince Edward Island to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec and Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the expenses he charged were paid by the department.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much were they ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell you off-hand.

Mr. CLANCY. The question before us is that the service rendered by this man was utterly useless to the country. In order to show the character of the man I may mention that he stated without a blush on his solemn oath that he worked on Sundays, and of course he was paid for it. How much has Mr. Washington been paid since he commenced, and how long has he been working in the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I find from the Auditor General's Report that last year he was paid $285. As far as I can see he has been paid altogether about $1,000. He commenced I think in 1897 or 1898.

Mr. CLANCY. Better let the item stand until we get definite information.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. If this man were employed to get valuable statistics I could understand the expenditure, but when he came to the province of Ontario he had in the report of the Bureau of Industries, the value of land from year to year as published by the friends of this government. If he desired the only reliable information at his hand he could have obtained it there, but he paid no attention to it and his statistics are worthless. What is the matter with the hon. member for North Simcoe ? He appears to be amused, as he always is, about something that is of no importance to any one but himself.

Mr. McCARTHY. Don't worry about me.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman should know that he is in the House of Commons. We have a right to discharge our duties without these senseless interruptions. The sooner his constituents know the way he conducts himself the better. I say that these statistics are about on a par with the supposed statistics alleged to have been collected by Mr. Cote and his friends in regard to the census of 1891. They are got for political purposes and for nothing else and public money spent in that way is misapplied.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The hon. member (Mr. Clancy) has said that this gentleman worked on Sunday. The question was put to Mr. Washington if he was authorized to work on Sunday, and his answer was 'No.' May I ask the minister if that gentleman is employed in the department now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may tell the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the reason of my amusement was that he stated that the information published by the Bureau of Statistics in Ontario was authentic. That statement coming from him

amused us. He tried to withdraw from that position and he said it was authentic at least so far as government information could be correct. Does he now say that the information published by the Bureau of Industries in Ontario is in his opinion correct.

Mr. SPROULE. I want the hon. gentleman to understand that he is not in court nor am I here to be cross-questioned. He may assume a good deal as a certain class of lawyers do, but fortunately I am not under his control now.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This man Washington has been here since 1897. What other reports has he made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has only made one report.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I object to the minister sitting on his seat when answering a question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Would the hon. gentleman like to see me sit anywhere else ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would now ask the minister how it is that this officer has only handed in one report in so many years ? What has he been doing in the past years ? Has he been engaging in elections ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is asking a question and then answering it himself. Mr. Washington did not hand in his report until his work was finished. When it was brought to a conclusion he handed in his report.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman has not given us the information which I asked for a moment ago, namely, when Mr. Washington began his duties, and how much he was paid each year up to the time he concluded that report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Washington commenced his work, I think, in the year 1897, and he has been working off and on occasionally since that time. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information as to how much he has been paid each year. I could send to the library and get the Auditor General's Report for each year, in which, as the hon. gentleman knows, that information has been published, and he can get it very easily.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to say that he is not employed by him. Is he employed in any other department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. SPROULE. Was he not employed in the Census Department lately ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was. He resigned from the census about two months ago.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if these people are still employed in the department : Mr. Watts, Mr. Monroe, Miss Ross and Mr. Lepage.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, they are still employed. They have been employed there ever since I have been in the office.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there any others besides these ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know of any others.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman said last year that there were two others.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's report, he will find on page D—4 the salaries, and on page D—13 General Statistics and other expenditures, in which he will find the payments to Mr. Washington.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Washington could not have been paid out of this $3,200 last year, because the minister otherwise accounted for the whole amount.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the hon. gentleman give the committee the date when Mr. Washington commenced his services, and where he was making his investigations in 1899, in 1900, and in a portion of 1901, which is not included in this report ? The reason I ask for this is that the hon. gentleman stated that Mr. Washington's report as laid on the Table did not contain all the information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should be glad to give the hon. gentleman every figure and table. I did not lay these on the Table, but they are in the department, and if the hon. gentleman wants them, I will bring them, though I do not think that either he or I would be willing to go through them.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is making it necessary for us to insist on the information, no matter how unpleasant it may be for the committee. If the minister has now found himself in the unpleasant position of being required to furnish the information on which we may judge of this gigantic work which he says is going on, I think it is well that we should have some information to guide us more definitely on that point. The hon. gentleman will recognize, I am sure, that it is a very reasonable request that he should put the committee in possession of that information, and I do not think he should expect the item to pass until he does.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely unreasonable in asking that all the figures from which certain conclusions are drawn should be laid before the House. He might as well ask for every customs paper on which the trade and navigation returns are

based to be laid before the House. The hon. gentleman knows that every report is based on millions of figures and statements obtained from officers all over the country.

Mr. CLANCY. The two cases are not at all similar. In the one case the figures are those of a gentleman who had wormed himself into the affections of the Minister of Agriculture ; in the other case the figures are obtained from regular official documents. I ask the hon. gentleman if he intends to continue Mr. Washington in office ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said I have not made up my mind.

Mr. CLANCY. It is about time the hon. gentleman did.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will do that when ready.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will find it convenient some time to make up his mind. He had better let the item stand until he gets the information. Does he refuse to give us the information in detail which Mr. Washington has given him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the House desires to have every figure that Mr. Washington has on his sheets, &c., I will bring them down, but I do not think that it is advisable to do so. The report Mr. Washington made is based on a mass of detail which he discovered in his investigations. That report is in the hands of the House. I think it utterly unreasonable to ask for all the figures and all the details which are worked into the report.

Mr. SPROULE. The same thing was done by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when the analysis of the census, without request, were laid on the Table. How much was Washington paid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was paid $5 a day all the time he was engaged in the former year. He was also paid $5 a day, and part of the time $3 a day.

Mr. SPROULE. He has been paid a good round sum for his labour and for information that is practically worthless. To enable us to determine whether it is of any value at all, it would be well to furnish the House with all the data.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Reports of commissions may be based on voluminous evidence and the evidence is always reported to the committee. The report is the conclusion drawn from a very large mass of evidence, which the House is no better able to go over than the details referred to here. Not many would want to go over them, but if only one does so wish, there is no reason why they should not be furnished.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the originals are to be brought down, that would not cost much, but to make copies would cost considerable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no reason why the originals should not be brought down and left in charge of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) can go to the department and consult them there, and I think that would be the simpler way. I would be glad to give the hon. gentleman every facility.

Mr. CLANCY. My hon. friend is entirely too generous. It is his business to give the House the information. No more reasonable request was ever made than I am making now. I presume the hon. gentleman will have no objection to stating to the committee the object of continuing this man in the work of the department.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The object is to find out whether there is any distinct rule of progress, the selling value of the land from one date to another. That has been, to a certain extent, shown by the report of Mr. Washington. But that report is what I might call a specimen to show what has been occurring in parts of the country. As the hon. gentleman knows, the investigation took place only in Prince Edward Island and in the counties of Carleton, Durham and Elgin in Ontario. The facts point to certain conclusions, but if the question is deemed sufficiently important to go on with the investigation, I should be obliged to ask for a vote for the purpose. When that comes up the hon. gentleman will be welcome to discuss the desirability of the investigation. Under this vote it is impossible that that work should be conducted to any sort of conclusion. And so I can say that, so far as this vote is concerned, I am not going to carry it out. But as to what is going to be done in the future I am not prepared to bind myself.

Mr. CLANCY. And yet the hon. minister has not told us the object of this investigation. He said it was to gain information as to the rise and fall of land values. But what is the object of that ? I shall not attribute motives to the hon. gentleman; and he may be able to give reasons. But, I confess that I am so dull that I cannot see it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think it is of great importance to the farming community whether lands are rising or falling in value, because it shows, to a great extent whether the agriculture industry is profitable or otherwise. The way to ascertain that would be by a statistical investigation, just as in the case of other economic facts.

Mr. CLANCY. Then, I take it that if the hon. gentleman found that land values were falling, he is so confident of the power of his government, that he would take means to prevent that decline.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If there seemed any way of doing it, we certainly would try. But the lands are rising in value.

Mr. CLANCY. Yes, and in spite of the hon. gentleman. It is surprising that the hon. gentleman can have seen so much and cannot see what a consummate fraud it is. Let the hon. gentleman come to his senses–

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will come to the census by and by.

Mr. CLANCY. The Minister of Finance is usually a very prudent gentleman. And it is a noticeable fact that he has not risked his reputation by saying a word in defence of this scheme. I am sure he does not approve of it—his views are too broad for that. The Minister of Agriculture states that there is nothing in this vote for the purpose of carrying on work of this kind. If he is prepared to say that he will not ask the House during the present session for anything to continue the work, I am perfectly satisfied that the item should pass. But, if he cannot make that statement I think we should insist on our rights to have such information to guide us, for, in the absence of such a declaration we may all conclude that the hon. gentleman intends later on to ask us for money to continue the work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am afraid I cannot pledge myself.

Mr. SPROULE. The fact that the item is here is evidence that the hon. minister intends to continue the work for he told us that this was one of the expenses covered by the vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman was asked what the money was for, and he stated——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave what was spent on this service last year.

Mr. SPROULE. But what was the use of that if it does not indicate how this money is to be spent? Mr. Washington was quoted as one of the gentlemen who were to share this money.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Or some one else to do this kind of work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Any work that might turn up.

Mr. SPROULE. But money is not voted for one purpose and used for another.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I meant statistical work.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, in connection with that I was going to say that if the hon. minister thinks to convince the people that by sending a man around to estimate values—it is only an estimate, for he gets no reliable information from the registry offices—that he will get facts upon which conclusion can be based, he is very much mistaken. Very few will believe that. As I said before, the only source from which these values can be got even approximately is the bureau of industries. I was going to add, when I was interrupted, by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that, while the information given to the bureau covers estimates that are not exactly correct, the general results are approximately correct. But it is little less than absurd for the hon. gentleman to pretend that he can get anything of land values by compiling such figures as these in the three counties in Ontario.

Mr. CLANCY. At page D-13 of the Auditor General's Report, there is an item of $2,284.20 for salaries. Would the hon. minister tell us how many persons were employed and what each received?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is under the head of general statistics. If the hon. gentleman will turn back to page D-4, he will find them all recorded—four clerks whose names had been read by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Cannot the hon. gentleman make up his mind about putting these on the Table? It cannot be a difficult thing, either to bring down the original or to bring down a copy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the leader of the opposition asks that all this mass of details should be brought down, I will yield to his request; but I think he is asking for something which will be of no earthly use to the House or the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will accept my hon. friend's promise to bring it down if required, and I will consult with my hon. friend from Bothwell, and let the hon. gentleman know if we require it. Of course it is understood we are to discuss that matter on some other item if we desire to do so.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On concurrence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I do not mean on concurrence, that is not the arrangement we made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to discuss this item on every other item of my estimates that will come up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think when we passed the item of the Statistical Year-book I had a distinct understanding with the hon. gentleman that this matter might be discussed on some subsequent item?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is the case. I think the hon. gentleman could work it in with the other item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, let us not have any misunderstanding about our agreement. I distinctly understood from the Minister of Agriculture to-night that anything that might be discussed on the item of the Statistical Year-book, might in the same manner and to the same full extent, be discussed on some subsequent item. Am I wrong about that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, you are not wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then I say further that if that is to be done, inasmuch as this item is distinctly connected with the previous item, after these documents are brought down, if we require them, I would like to have the same liberty to deal with this particular subject, after making such examination as we might desire of these documents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are we sure we understand each other ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another thing that I would like to mention. I would like the Minister of Agriculture to be prepared with certain information as to what inquiries have been made of census enumerators respecting alleged frauds, before the census item is finally disposed of. I do not want to refer to what has taken place in the past. My hon. friend knows he said that he thought he would be able at some future day to furnish me with certain information as to that. I would like to know who the enumerators are who have been communicated with, what the nature of the communication to them was, and what reply was received from them in each instance. I think we should have this information before the census item passes, and that we should have it for a sufficient length of time previously to enable us to examine it in connection with the documents already laid on the Table, for the purpose of discussing the action of the government respecting the investigations made into the census of 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would also like to say to the Minister of Agriculture that, when it will be convenient to him, either on his estimates or at some other time, I shall bring to his attention certain facts in connection with the dismissal of Captain D. C. Stewart, Halifax, who was employed, I think, in connection with the quarantine service. I would like the hon. gentleman to be prepared to discuss that, either on his estimates or at some other time which we can arrange between us.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will be very glad to. Perhaps it would be convenient for the hon. gentleman to discuss that on the quarantine item.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 2.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 16, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ALEXANDER GIBSON RAILWAY AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough) moved :

That the petition of the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company presented this day, for leave to present a petition for an Act, be read and received, and referred to the Committee on Standing Orders.

He said : I might explain to the House the reason for this motion. This company, which does business in the province of New Brunswick, are operating a railway, which they got power from this parliament in 1898 to take over. Being a provincial corporation, they believed that the legislature of New Brunswick had power to authorize the separation of the railway from the manufacturing business, and that they could obtain an Act from that legislature for such a purpose; but they have recently been advised that it will be necessary or advisable to obtain an Act of the parliament of Canada for that purpose. They find now that they cannot work the two very well together, and by the time they learned that it would be necessary to come to this House, the time for presenting petitions had expired. All they want now, with the full consent of the shareholders, is to have provision made simply for running the railway under a separate company from the other business. Under these exceptional circumstances, I trust that the House will grant them the privilege of introducing this petition and having it go to the committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the name of the railway ?

Mr. FRASER. The Canada Eastern.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All the parties interested have given their consent ?

Mr. FRASER. All have signed this petition, and they are all agreed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is merely dividing the enterprise, I understand ?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, a purely domestic matter.

Motion agreed to.

INCORPORATION OF RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. H. GUTHRIE (South Wellington) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 110) respecting the incorporation of railway companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman kindly give a brief explanation?

Mr. GUTHRIE. The object of the Bill which I have just asked leave to introduce is to place certain restrictions upon the present system of granting railway charters; a system which I believe has prevailed in this House for a great many years. It is not intended in any way to limit the number of charters nor to impose any unreasonable or unnecessary conditions upon railway promoters. The Bill is aimed chiefly at what are known as speculative charters, or charters which are obtained by parties for the purpose of embarrassing companies which are in possession of constructed works. The Bill, in brief, provides that parties who apply for railroad charters shall accompany their applications with a sum equivalent to $200 per mile of the proposed road, which sum shall be deposited with the government, and on the completion of the proposed work shall be returned to the company with all accumulated interest; but if the work be not proceeded with, then the $200 per mile shall be forfeited to the government of Canada. The Bill is not perhaps as complete in form as it might be, and I am well aware that at this late hour of the session such a Bill introduced by a private member can hardly be pressed to a successful conclusion. However, my idea in presenting it at this time is to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Railways, the members of the House and the public in general, in order that the difficulties which now exist may be dealt with by some kind of legislative enactment, if not by such a Bill as this, then by some other Bill or by a general provision to be inserted in the general Act which the Minister of Railways is now pressing. When one considers that the total railway mileage constructed in Canada to-day is approximately about 18,500 miles and that session after session charters are granted for anywhere from 10,000 to 15,000 miles of new railway—I believe this session for about 12,000 miles; and when one also considers that about a third of the time of this House as well as a great deal of hard committee work is taken up in considering these measures, and that from 75 to 80 per cent of them never materialize, one must come to the conclusion that a great many of the charters now granted are taken out by the promoters for speculative purposes, to be hawked around and sold when occasion offers, or else for the purpose of embarrassing others. It may be that the true way out of the difficulty would be what is known as free trade in railroad charters, a system which I believe prevails in some of the United States, where one is merely required to have the plans and profiles prepared and filed and the work proceeded with. I think, myself, there is a good deal to be said in favour of that system, provided proper financial guarantees are taken that the railway shall be proceeded with and constructed.

In discussing the matter with an hon. member yesterday, he argued that such a Bill would be in the interests of large corporations and strike a blow at men of moderate financial standing. I think, however, that my hon. friend will find upon reflection that there is nothing in that argument. Men of moderate financial standing should not ask for charters for 500 or 1,000 or 1,500 miles of railway, as in all probability they will not be able to carry out their undertaking. But if they ask for moderate charters, there is no reason why they should not be able to put up the $200 a mile, knowing well that if their application be in good faith, the money will come back to them. I think that this is an opportune time to bring the matter before the House, in order that it may be dealt with if possible in a general Act. No doubt the Bill is not perfect in all its details, but any such imperfections can be remedied. I believe that where any substantial performance of the undertaking has taken place no forfeiture should be insisted on, or where the failure is due to some difficulty of an unforeseen character, such as a crisis in the money market or a temporary shortage of railway material, or where there has been a part performance, there should be a pro rata adjustment. But where there has been absolutely no performance or an attempt at performance, there should be an absolute forfeiture of the deposit.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am afraid that my hon. friend will find that his Bill will not accomplish what he desires, if the history of the past may be taken as an index of what will happen in the future. We know how easily deposits made to guarantee contracts are returned to the parties who have failed in their obligations. Take for instance the elevator matter at Montreal, in which a deposit was made with the government, but after keeping it a length of time the government returned the money. We have other instances of the same nature. Some two or three years ago, when a Bill was before the Railway Committee asking incorporation for a company to build a railway in the Yukon district, the company offered to put up a deposit, but the members of the Railway Committee who were supporters of the government,—I do not know if the hon. gentleman took part or not in that committee—absolutely refused to require a deposit on the ground that it was establishing a bad principle and voted down the motion made to require a deposit as a guarantee of the building of the road. Remembering these things and knowing how

easy it is for companies to put up excuses for not accomplishing what they have bound themselves to do, and how easy it will be for them to take advantage of that provision in the hon. gentleman's Bill which provides for a non-exaction of the forfeit condition in certain cases, or for a pro rata return of the deposit made, in my opinion the Bill will practically be of no effect whatever.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to amend the General Inspection Act. He said: This Bill is intended to amend the General Inspection Act regarding hides, skins and leather. It is intended to apply only to the cities mentioned, namely: Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton and London. I have no objection to extending it further, but I have limited it to these places because they are the centres of the hide business of this country. The object is to have hides inspected wherever practicable, green and uncured, because I am informed that a perfect inspection cannot be had after the hides are salted or cured. It is intended also to have the green or uncured hides inspected in order to compel a proper flaying of the animals by the butchers. I am instructed that at present, owing to the careless way in which the animals are killed and their hides taken off, a great deal of waste material remains in the hide, and if the inspector were obliged to lower the standard of the hides because of improper or unskilful flaying, that would improve the hides in their value. The Bill also aims at preventing any frauds in the inspection such as have hitherto existed, such as resalting or watering the hides and thus increasing the weight, the hides being purchased or sold by the weight. The effect of the Bill will also be to create a uniform inspection in the districts in which it is put into operation. The experience in other places will I think warrant this House in passing a measure of this kind. I am advised that by reason of a more careful inspection in Liverpool, the quality and price of hides has greatly increased, and no doubt a similar result will follow a perfect system of inspection in this country. This Bill, like that of my hon. friend's from Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), is introduced somewhat late in the session, and if hon. members desire to have time to circulate it among their constituents in order to ascertain the views of those engaged in the business, it would not become me to press it to a final reading this session. I have not consulted the Minister of Inland Revenue and therefore the same remark applies to him, but I have endeavoured in this Bill to carry out the ideas I have expressed, and which I think will have the effect of improving the quality and price of the hides bought and sold in this country.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE IMMIGRATION ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) to amend the Immigration Act. He said: My object is to enable the government to deport immigrants from foreign countries, who may be suffering from any dangerous or infectious disease. While there is no ground for the somewhat alarming statements made with respect to the number of diseased persons entering this country, still it has been found that the officers of the immigration branch of the department are not sufficiently armed with authority to deal with such cases. I cannot explain the provisions of the Bill better than simply reading the operative section.

The Governor General may, by a proclamation or order whichever he considers most expedient, and whenever he deems it necessary, prohibit the landing in Canada of any immigrant or any other passenger who is suffering from any dangerous or infectious disease or malady, whether such immigrant intends to settle in Canada, or only intends to pass through Canada to settle in some other country.

In addition to the necessities of the case as observed by the officers of the department, transportation companies and others engaged in the business of transporting immigrants, particularly at Montreal, Quebec and Halifax, have urgently requested that this legislation should be introduced.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON TERRITORY—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend Chapter 41 of the Statutes of 1901, respecting the Administration of Justice in the Yukon Territory. He said: This is a very unimportant measure. It is merely to amend section 3 of the Act in question so as to enable us to increase the salaries of the stipendiary magistrates from $2,400, at which it is fixed, to $4,000. There are now two stipendiary magistrates, one at White Horse and the other at Dawson. In addition to their living allowance they have a salary of $3,000. The intention is to increase the salary to $4,000 and reduce the living allowance to $1,800.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it not necessary to have a resolution to found that Bill upon?

Motion withdrawn.

YUKON TERRITORY—TERRITORIAL ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 113) further to amend the Yukon Territory Act and the Acts in amendment thereof. He said : Hon. gentlemen are aware that, at the present time the appeal from the court in the Yukon Territory is to the court of British Columbia. The intention is to constitute a local Court of Appeal within the Yukon Territory and also to provide that the appeal from the court constituted shall be from a single judge to the Court of Appeal, and from that Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, where the amount in controversy exceeds $2,000. It also provides that, in mining cases, there shall be a right of appeal from the judgment of the Gold Commissioner.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 114) to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said : This is a mere matter of procedure. The Bill first authorizes an appeal from a judgment on demurrer. As hon. gentlemen who are members of the legal profession are aware there is no appeal from a judgment of the Exchequer Court, unless it is a final judgment. But there may be a case in which there is a demurrer which is decided by a judge of the Exchequer Court which may not decide the case itself. If an appeal could be taken, the case might be decided upon that, and so save the expense of further proceedings and of calling witnesses. Another section authorizes the service of process in the Exchequer Court upon residents abroad, whether they be British subjects or foreigners. Another section provides for leave to appeal from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court in cases where the amount in controversy does not exceed $500. At present it is necessary that the amount shall exceed $500. This is to provide for special cases that have arisen under the Expropriation Act. The appeal is made conditional upon receiving permission to appeal from the court to which the appeal is to be taken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there not an appeal in a judgment on demurrer in the Exchequer Court in which it finally disposes of the case ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, then you get a final judgment. But this provides for cases where judgment does not finally dispose of the whole action. For instance, suppose a case is brought against the Crown. We put in a demurrer. The demurrer is dismissed. There is no appeal and we are forced to go to trial and expend a large amount of money in bringing witnesses. Then, when the appeal to the Supreme Court is taken, the whole matter may be disposed of on the original question raised in the lower court.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 115) further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893. He said : This Bill is introduced at the suggestion of some judges in Ontario. It is intended to limit the number of expert witnesses that may be examined on either side to five, unless the court think that the number should be increased. I understand that great abuses have arisen in the province of Ontario through excessive calling of expert witnesses—dozens of them called, and the expenses of the trial increased accordingly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does this apply only to the province of Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It applies throughout the Dominion, but, I understand that the abuse has been noticed particularly in Ontario.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

I.C.R.—PURCHASES OF CAR TRUCKS, &c.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART asked :

1. What number of Simplex truck bolsters and body bolsters have been purchased between the 30th June, 1900, and 15th March, 1902 ?
2. What has been the cost ?
3. What amount of car forgings or parts of car trucks have been purchased from the Crossen Manufacturing Company, or other persons, between the same dates, and at what cost ?
4. What number of patent steel trucks, known as the Joughin's truck, have been purchased between the same dates, and from whom ?
5. Of all these trucks and parts of trucks, what quantity was in stock on the 15th March, 1902, and what is the value thereof ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Ten thousand one hundred and forty Simplex truck and body bolsters have been purchased between 30th June, 1900, and 15th March, 1902.
2. The cost has been $264,440.
3. Four hundred and fifty-five thousand one hundred and thirty pounds car forgings and 480 turn buckle drop forgings were purchased from the Crossen Manufacturing Company between the 30th June, 1900, and 15th March, 1902. Cost, $14,229.20.
4. Two hundred and forty patent steel trucks, known as Joughins truck, were purchased from the Record Foundry and

Machine Company, Moncton, and 805 from A. E. Peters, Moncton, between 30th June, 1900, and 15th March, 1902.

5. On the 15th March, 1902, there were 761 Joughins trucks in stock, the value being $63,924; 822 Simplex truck and body bolsters, value $22,932; 332,910 pounds car forgings, value $10,253.63.

I.C.R.—SECTION FOREMAN, JOHN BARBOUR.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) asked :

1. Was section foreman John Barbour, on the Intercolonial Railway, dismissed ? If so, when, and for what reason ?

2. Were any charges brought against him ? If so, what were they, and was he given an investigation ? If not, for what reason was an investigation denied ?

3. For how many years had he paid into the Insurance Fund, and what amount each year ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to refund, with interest, the amount so paid ? If not, for what reason is it withheld ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. He was dismissed on the 30th November, 1901, for political partisanship, on the representation of Mr. O. Turgeon, M.P.

2. No charges were brought against him except that of political partisanship. He was not given an investigation. It is not usual to grant investigations in such cases unless ordered by the department.

3. He paid into the Insurance Fund for eleven years and seven months, from 1st May, 1890, to 30th November, 1901. He paid the following amounts each year :

1890, May and June	$ 1 40
1891	9 40
1892	10 46
1893	9 00
1894	8 25
1895	8 50
1896	18 00
1897	22 50
1898	23 80
1899	25 50
1900	23.10
1901	23 60
1901, July to Nov.	10 00
	$193 51

4. The amount paid into the Insurance Fund cannot be refunded, but any member of the Insurance Fund Association who has contributed while in the service may, under the regulations, continue a member of the fund, after he ceases to be in the employ.

MAPLE CREEK POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOYD asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General received any petition from the residents of Maple Creek, N.W.T., asking for the removal of the post office to some building separate from any other business ?

2. What answer was sent to the said petitioners, and what action, if any, has been decided upon by the department ?

3. Is it the policy of the department, when an office has sufficient earning capacity, to have such office located in a separate building ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. Yes.

2 and 3. No final conclusion has been reached, but if the revenue of the office continues to increase it may in the public interest be necessary to make a change. Whilst there is no hard and fast rule upon the subject, still when the revenue of a post office attains such proportions as to afford a fair and reasonable living to the postmaster it is considered not unreasonable in the public interest that he should give his undivided attention to the affairs of the office. Ordinarily a change of postmaster under such circumstances would involve the carrying on of the office in a separate building.

UNIT OF REPRESENTATION, CENSUS, 1901.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Hughes—asked :

1. What is the unit of representation as shown by the census of 1901 ?

2. Will the representation in the House of Commons from the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island be diminished as a result of their small relative increase of population since 1891, as compared with that of the province of Quebec, as shown by the said census ?

3. If so, by how many members will the representation be diminished in each of the said provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This question is altogether premature, it cannot be answered now.

DOCTOR ALFRED BOUILLON, MATANE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Was Dr. Alfred Bouillon, of Matane, dismissed as port physician at Matane in 1896 ?

2. If so, for what reasons ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Dr. Alfred Bouillon was never employed as port physician by the Department of Agriculture, and was consequently never dismissed.

I.C.R.—FIRE INSURANCE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Is there any fire insurance on the locomotives, rolling stock or buildings (stations, car houses, machine shops and elevators) of the Intercolonial Railway ?

2. If so, for what amount, in what companies, and by whom were they placed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). There is no fire insurance on the locomotives, rolling stock or buildings, &c., of the Intercolonial Railway.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT JOLIETTE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Before deciding to dismiss John James Sheppard from the office of postmaster at Joliette, did the government have an inquiry made into the conduct of that officer ?

2. Did the government, before deciding on such dismissal, inform the said Sheppard, that his dismissal was demanded, and has Sheppard had an opportunity to be heard or to set forth his reasons in opposition to the complaint formulated against him ?

3. Has Sheppard himself written to the government, or to one of its members, that he desired an inquiry before being dismissed ?

4. Why has the government not granted an inquiry to Sheppard ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The postmaster at Joliette was dismissed upon the information contained in a letter, of which the following is a translation :

House of Commons,.

Ottawa, March 7, 1902.

Sir,—I have already asked you several times for the dismissal of the postmaster of Joliette, Dr. J. J. Sheppard.

Our friends are complaining, with reason, of the conduct of Dr. Sheppard. He is an ardent Conservative who has continued to fight our friends. In spite of his position he exercises his influence in the city of Joliette, where he lives, and outside of it with his patients and friends.

During the elections of 1896 he compelled two persons to vote for the Conservative candidate, Mr. Belisle, whose wife was employed in the post office and Mr. Mireault, mail courier of Joliette.

During the elections of 1890 he exercised the same influence over Mr. Mireault and two of his sons who live with the latter. During the same elections again, with the intention of hurting the Liberals and helping the Conservatives, Dr. Sheppard detained illegally at his office letters which the committee of organization of the Liberal party addressed to the political Liberal leaders of each parish ; amongst others, two letters addressed to political friends in two parishes requesting them to announce on Sunday after the service political meetings which the Liberal party was going to hold in these two parishes one day of the following week.

The consequence of this, was that I went to these two parishes with speakers to have the discussion and I found no one there, because the meetings had not been called for, the friends to whom I had addressed letters requesting them to call meetings could not hold them, not having received their letters.

I could bring to your attention a quantity of faults in the administration of the post office. Dr. Sheppard looks more after his medical practice than after his post office, where he gets young girls quite incompetent to replace him.

Therefore, in the interest of the public the removal of Dr. Sheppard from the postmaster-

ship of Joliette should take place, and I beg for it with great confidence.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) CHAS. BASINET.
F. O. DUGAS, M.P.

The Hon. Mr. Mulock,
Postmaster General,
Ottawa.

This evidence was considered conclusive, and therefore any inquiry would apparently have served no useful purpose. Therefore no formal inquiry was held. The postmaster, since his removal from office, has written denying the charges against him and asking for an inquiry.

POSTMASTERS, COUNTY OF JOLIETTE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Borden (Halifax)—asked :

1. Who are the postmasters of the county of Joliette whose commissions have been revoked since the month of June, 1896, up to to-day ?
2. Who has been the substitute in each case ?
3. What has been the cause of each change ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). I would ask the hon. gentleman to make a motion.

GROUNDING OF THE SS. 'TIVERTON.'

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was the ss. 'Tiverton' grounded in the month of April, 1901, between Montreal and Quebec ?
2. If a pilot was in charge of said vessel, was he duly licensed by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners ?
3. Was an inquiry had into the circumstances connected with such grounding of said vessel ?
4. Did the board of inquiry censure the pilot of being at fault, or did they exonerate him ?
5. If the finding of the board was that the pilot was in fault, does the Department of Marine consider that the said pilot's services should be dispensed with and his license cancelled ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. The court declined to censure him.
5. The court did not find that the pilot was in fault, but the department has learned that since the accident to the steamer in May last, this pilot has been superannuated by the Montreal Pilotage Commissioners.

I would like to add that this answer was furnished to me by the department; but on reading the judgment of the court, I would be inclined to think that a different construction might be put upon it, for they could not censure the pilot. The implication was that he was not to blame, although perhaps he was to blame to some extent, but it was the Pilotage Board that was to blame for keeping him in that position after

he had sent in his formal notice that he was disabled from holding the position.

MANITOBA GRAIN INSPECTION.

Mr. DOUGLAS asked :

1. What changes have been made in the standard grain grades of the Manitoba grain inspection district since the year 1899 ?

2. If made, by whom made, through what medium were they made, and what is the nature of such changes ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) :

1. No. 2 hard and No. 1 northern wheat have been consolidated as No. 1 Manitoba northern, and a new grade called No. 3 Manitoba northern has been established. Commercial grades of oats known as Nos. 1 and 2 Alberta have also been established.

2. As regards the wheat, the change was made by Act of parliament, vide 1 Edward, chapter 24, amending 62-63 Victoria, chapter 25. The reasons therefor are set forth in the discussion on the Bill, vide 'Hansard' of April 16th, 1891, commencing at the bottom of page 3094 and continuing on 3095.

As regards the oats, the change was made by the Western Grain Standards Board, which board is established by Act 55-56 Victoria, chapter 23, section 15, and authority given to the board to make changes of grade under certain conditions as per section 4 of the schedule to the Act 62-63 Victoria, chapter 25.

USE OF FRENCH IN ONTARIO COURTS.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure) (Translation) asked :

1. Has the government received the following resolution adopted by the St. Jean Baptiste Society of Ottawa ?

If so, what answer did it give ?

The St. Jean Baptiste Society, of Ottawa.

Copy of a resolution passed on Sunday, April 13, 1902, at a special meeting called by Mr. J. U. Vincent, the president :—

Whereas Mrs. Joseph Roi, Duke street, Ottawa, having brought a judicial complaint against one Larochel, appeared before Magistrate O'Keefe, of Ottawa, to give her evidence ;

And whereas that lady demanded the privilege of giving her evidence in her mother tongue, because speaking English only imperfectly, she feared to express herself wrongly and to be misunderstood ;

And whereas Magistrate O'Keefe, disregarding that legitimate demand, directed her to express herself in English, and then dismissed her complaint, condemning her at the same time to pay a fine of $2 for contempt of court, because she dared to persist in her demand ;

Be it resolved, that the St. Jean Baptiste Society, of Ottawa, in the name of the French Canadians of the Capital, energetically protest against the unjust and arbitrary decision of Magistrate O'Keefe in this instance ;

Be it resolved that this incident be brought to the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, and that the French Canadians of the Capital do beg of the hon. minister to kindly take the necessary means in order that in future a like injustice may not be repeated, in a country where equity should be dispensed irrespective of nationality.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The Department of Justice has received the resolution referred to in the question. In answer to that question, I am obliged to say that the government have no control over the magistrate nor over the proceedings which took place in this court.

WORKS ON RIVER SAINTE ANNE.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. What price per running foot was paid for the timber used for the protective works on the east side of the River Sainte Anne, at Sainte Anne de la Perade, during the years 1900 and 1901 ?

2. What price per toise was paid for the stone used in the said works ?

3. What price was paid for iron, from whom was it purchased, and what is the total amount paid for the said iron ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. 4 cents.
2. $7.00.
3. 3 cents per pound.

Total amount paid, $86.29.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. What amount has been expended to make the protective works on the east side of the River Sainte Anne, at St. Anne de la Perade, during the years 1900 and 1901 ?

2. Under whose superintendence were these works done ?

3. Who paid the workmen who were employed on the said works ?

4. Did the paymaster of the government himself pay each of the said workmen, or has the money intended to pay said workmen been remitted either to Hermenegilde Leduc, or to Ernest Vallée, or to Joseph Hivon, to be paid to the workmen ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. $3,289.44.
2. Superintendence of J. E. Valleé.

3 and 4. The departmental paymaster paid all men who presented themselves for payment when he went there. Some of them however, had gone to the lumber woods after having received money from J. H. Leduc to whom they had given receipts. The paymaster repaid these amounts to Leduc.

Mr. CASGRAIN—by Mr. Borden, Halifax—asked :

1. Were Ernest Vallée, Hermenegilde Leduc, Jimmy Rivard, Joseph Hivon, Napoleon Marceau, Jeffrey Jolin and Felix Lafleche in the employment of the government during the years 1900 and 1901 ?

2. If so, what was the employment of each of them, the salary of each per day, the number of days they were employed, and the total amount received by each of them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. Yes.

2.—

J. E. Vallée, inspector, 34 days at $3 ..	$102 00
H. Leduc, carpenter, 25 days at $2.. ..	50 00
J. Rivard, carpenter, 6 days at $2..	12 00
J. Hivon, labourer, 17 days at 90 cents..	15 30
N. Marceau, carpenter, 14½ days at $2.. ..	29 00
J. Jolin, carpenter, 13 days at $1.25.. ..	16 25
F. Lafleche, labourer, 8 days at 90 cents..	7 20

YUKON TERRITORY.—CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH LINE.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Orders of the Day I should like to say that some time ago, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), there was a question on the order paper about the cost of the Yukon telegraph. The hon. gentleman incidentally remarked to me in the corridor, a day or two before, that he had all the information and would give it to me. When the question came up before the House in the absence of the hon. minister the statement was made that the information was not obtainable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I do not remember the question that was asked. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) will be good enough to tell me what it was I will be happy to give all the information that is available.

SUPPLY.—LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE AT HALIFAX.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants). Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I wish to be permitted to make a reference to a matter affecting the constituency represented by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). It seems that a strike has taken place in the city of Halifax amongst a number of men employed in the shipping trade and the strike is one of very serious proportions. I have seen several references to the matter in the newspapers coming from that city and it seems that a sympathetic strike has been organized in connection with the strike of the longshoremen involving some 1,000 or 1,400 men. I suppose the government have had their attention called to the matter. I wish to know to what extent they have interposed, as I think it was their duty to interpose in connection with it. The matter is one of extreme importance to the port of Halifax which is very well known in this House and which is recognized by the whole Dominion as one of the most important ports of this Dominion—I would say the most important port that we have, taking it all the year round. This port is open all the year round, it has great advantages not possessed by other ports although some of them, in other respects, are of greater importance. So that, the matter is not one of purely local interest, but it is of general interest, affecting the Dominion as a whole. I should like to know if the government can give us any information regarding this matter and if they can tell us whether any steps, and if so, what steps have been taken in connection with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) I would say that the attention of the Department of Labour was called to the strike in question by a telegram received on behalf of the striking longshoremen last week. The same day the Deputy Minister of Labour was sent from Ottawa to Halifax to lend his friendly offices in order to bring about a settlement and after an intervention extending over a little more than a day I am glad to say that he was able to bring both parties to an understanding and on the Saturday following the men returned to work. The strike had been in force a week or ten days, it involved some 600 or 700 longshoremen who were directly parties to it and who were directly concerned and several hundred other workmen who were described as sympathetic strikers went out on strike at the same time. I may also add that there was danger of the strike extending and including many others who, would most probably have taken part but have not done so. The arrangement come to was mutually satisfactory to the men, the companies and the merchants interested, was reduced to writing, agreed to by the men in meeting and signed by the companies and employers. I received a report from the Deputy Minister of Labour on the subject and I might trouble the House by reading the conclusion of it which will perhaps more clearly dispose of the matter. After having arranged a mutual agreement between the parties it was necessary for him to bring it to the attention of the strikers in meeting, and to the attention of the companies. He proceeds to refer to the agreement in the following words :

> After the terms of both agreements were read to the meeting a motion in favour of acceptance was carried without a dissenting voice, and the president and secretary of the Longshoremen's Association were authorized to sign the agreements on its behalf. There were over 1,000 strikers present at this meeting. Motions were then carried, declaring the longshoremen's strike and the three sympathetic strikes at an end, and all agreed to return to work on the following morning. A noticeable feature of this meeting was the perfect order which prevailed throughout, and the unanimity which characterized the acceptance of all resolutions which were put to it. As evidence of the good feeling which appears to have resulted from the disposition on the part of the employers to negotiate in a friendly spirit with the men in arriving at the terms of agreement, I should possibly mention

that a proposal of cheers for the steamship agents and other employers, received as hearty a response as any other like proposals which followed the conclusion of this meeting.

The agreement itself is a somewhat lengthy document, and certain provisions in regard to the rates of wages and hours of labour, Sunday and holiday labour, work performed on stranded or wrecked vessels, and under other exceptional circumstances, as well as other conditions governing employment. The agreement also contains a clause intended to prevent the possible re-occurrence of a strike or lock-out, by requiring that 30 days notice in writing shall be given before any change in the terms of the agreement can be made by either party, and that no strike or lock-out shall be declared without 30 days' notice in writing.

On Saturday, the morning following the ratification of agreement at the mass meeting of strikers, the fish-handers, coal workers and coopers, concerned in the sympathetic strikes, resumed work, and work was recommenced along the wharfs by the longshoremen, at the docks where there was loading or unloading to be done.

I have every reason to believe that the settlement as arranged by this agreement has given mutual satisfaction to the parties interested, and that an immediate settlement of the strike has been of the very greatest importance to the commercial and other business interests of the port of Halifax. Moreover, judging from the nature of a number of interviews which I had with different persons, both employers and employees, subsequent to the settlement of the strike, concerning the prevention of possible future differences, I am led to believe that the principle of conciliation and arbitration has become more generally appreciated and is likely to play an increasingly important part in the future. As evidence of the appreciation of the services rendered through the good offices of the department under the Act, in regard to the present strike, I need only add that at the mass meeting of the strikers, called for the purpose of ratifying the agreement, the motion extending a vote of thanks to the department was carried unanimously, and with the very greatest enthusiasm, while the appended letter from the chairman of the committee of the steamship agents and merchants concerned, is sufficiently clear in its expression of their feelings in the matter.

Board of Trade, Halifax, April 12, 1902.

W. L. McKenzie King, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Labour.

Dear Sir,—The steamship agents and the merchants of Halifax, concerned in the recent strike of the longshoremen, desire to place on record their appreciation of your services in arranging a settlement which has been accepted by both parties to the dispute. They feel that a prolongation of the trouble has been mainly averted by the tact, good judgment and impartiality shown by you, and in making this acknowledgment, believe that they are expressing the sentiments of the longshoremen as well as their own.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) G. S. CAMPBELL,
Chairman.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) W. L. McKENZIE KING,
Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). We have had an exhibition on the other side of the House of a very pleasant little mutual admiration society, and the only thing lacking to make it perfect is the absence of the sweet little girl to present the Minister of Labour with a beautiful bouquet of roses, paid for by himself, as a mark of appreciation for what he has done. The people of Canada, no doubt as well as the members of this House, will feel deeply grateful to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) for bringing up this important subject, and allowing the Minister of Labour such a favourable opportunity of telling us what we have been reading in the press for several days past. The whole little play reminds me of what we sometimes see in country newspapers where the townspeople are about to present a gentleman with an oil painting of himself, and the recipient of which expresses himself as being completely taken by surprise, yet makes a most appropriate and fitting reply. The Minister of Labour comes down here with a beautifully written document that has been prepared some time ago. Of course he is quite taken by surprise. But for the purpose of unloading that document upon this House and upon the country, he gets his handy man of all work on that side of the House, to ask him a question.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I am going to give something fresh to the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FRASER. Curiously enough the Halifax 'Herald' which has just arrived contains something worth reading, and which refers to this matter. It will be noticed now that I am going to quote from the organ of the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The hon. gentleman is making a statement which is not correct.

Mr. FRASER. I do not mean that the gentleman (Mr. Borden) controls the 'Herald,' or that it is his special organ, but I do say that it is the organ of the party of which he is the honoured head. This is what the Halifax 'Herald' says, and it will be seen that it is a little more complimentary than the felicitous remarks of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) :

The longshoremen's strike is over to the great relief of all concerned. In bringing this about too high tribute cannot be paid to Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, Deputy Minister of Labour. He arrived from Ottawa on Thursday evening, and in twenty-five hours had everything arranged. A 'Herald' reporter interviewed Mr. King at the Halifax hotel last evening after the longshoremen's meeting. Mr. King was up to his eyes in business, and was besieged by those who were anxious to offer him congratulations. These included many who were prominent both among the employers of labour and in labour circles.

That is the opinion of that great organ of

the Conservative party on Mr. King and on what he did. The Halifax 'Herald' continues :

A Personal Impression of the Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. King is a very young man to fill with such success the important position which is his. He may be thirty, but he does not look it. In countenance he is almost boyish, with his smooth-shaven face and quick, alert movements. He is brimful of energy and enthusiasm. But the impression of youthfulness is dissipated after a few moments' conversation, for even the casual observer is impressed with the fact that this is a man of affairs, level-headed and decisive.

That is the impression Mr. King leaves on the leading minds of the party opposite :

Mr. King believes the labour problem is the problem of the age, and is engrossed heart and soul in his work.

I wish hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to this with bated breath :

The impression he leaves is that he is a fine combination of brains, energy and optimism—just the kind of man into whose hands the Lord gives the thing that needs to be done, and done swiftly. To such natures the world's work naturally comes.

I read that as showing two things. First, the appreciation which this organ of the great Conservative party has of the work done by Mr. King, and second, to congratulate the minister upon the settlement of that strike, notwithstanding the little play that the member for Grey sees in this matter. I congratulate the minister that a great strike of that kind was so speedily settled. Twenty-five hours was a very short time in which to arrive at a settlement. We have been amply paid in the province of Nova Scotia for all the expenditure we have incurred in connection with that department. We should all be very thankful. It is my opinion that very often the strikers as well as the employers are at fault in these matters, and so we have to congratulate ourselves that there are methods that can be used to bring capital and labour together, and to enable them to get along in peace and harmony.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) While we are all glad that this strike has been settled, we have no guarantee that other strikes may not crop up in different parts of the Dominion. Would it not be well for us to consider the compulsory Arbitration Act passed in New Zealand and which constitutes a conciliation court presided over by a judge of the Supreme Court. The New Zealand Act has been adopted by the commonwealth of Australia, so that both these countries have a law for the compulsory settlement of strikes when they occur.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I am glad the Minister of Labour was not taken by surprise when this matter was brought up. I am of opinion that this settlement is of such importance that it deserves to have the wide publicity that can be given to it by a short discussion in this House. A very serious disturbance has not only been settled, but a more serious disturbance has been averted. I wish to take this opportunity to bring to the notice of the Minister of Labour, certain amendments to the Conciliation Act which I have on the Order paper, and I trust he will take them into consideration, because they are framed with the hope that they will extend the application of our Conciliation Act. In this case under discussion the prime credit for this settlement is due to the Longshoremen's Union, who telegraphed to Ottawa asking for conciliation. It is oftentimes considered a sign of weakness that either party to the strike should apply for conciliation, and for that reason both parties are often deterred from asking interference. The amendments I have foreshadowed are calculated to get over that defect in the Act. When a serious dispute of this kind can be settled, it points to us the reasonableness of trying to settle other disputes. Some of the most serious disputes we have had last year have not been shortened by one day because of the Conciliation Act. It is to try and increase the scope of that Act, that I would ask the Minister of Labour to help me to have my amendments adopted, especially now that he has evidence that a great deal of good can be done to settle trade disputes by legislation in this parliament.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). It is, I assume, the business of this Labour Department not only to settle disputes, but to try and prevent them. I have heard of late that there is a probability of an extensive strike among the saw-mill employees on the shores of the Georgian bay. These men are obliged to work from half-past six in the morning to six at night with one hour for dinner, making ten and a half hours work instead of ten hours. Before any strike occurs it would be well that the minister should at once commission his deputy to interview the employers with the object of making the working day ten hours at most. As the Deputy Minister of Labour is rather busy at present, perhaps he might commence his operations in the neighbourhood of Ottawa, and prevail on some of the saw-mill owners in this neighbourhood to reduce the hours of work of the men in the mills to those of men employed in other avocations, and then the same rule might be extended to other parts of the province.

Mr. EDWARDS. May I ask the hon. gentleman what hours the saw-mill men work in Ottawa ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Perhaps the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) can tell.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that they work from half-past six until six. If they

work from seven until six, I am glad to know it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Those are the hours—from seven to six.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of that fact, then, it will be very easy for the Deputy Minister of Labour to go to the Georgian Bay and prevail upon the mill owners in that neighbourhood to accept the same hours, and prevent a threatened strike. Again, let me remind the Minister of Labour of this fact, in which I shall be borne out by the Minister of Public Works—that the Department of Customs or the Department of Trade and Commerce, I do not know which, saw fit last season to allow American tugs to come in and, in defiance of the coasting laws, to be employed on the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that while the Minister of Public Works did us the honour last season to pay a visit to the Georgian Bay, American tugs were pointed out to him being employed, while Canadian tugs at times were tied up at the docks. Perhaps there might be a strike among the marine men because of the employment of these American vessels, and I hope the Minister of Labour will prevail on his colleagues not to permit any American tugs during the coming season to be employed on the Georgian Bay, in contravention of the coasting laws, especially in view of the fact that the United States will not allow Canadian tugs to be employed in their waters. I trust that these matters will engage the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour, and that we may hope to hear at an early day that the deputy minister has appeared on the Georgian Bay and has endeavoured to bring these mill owners to that sense of duty and fair play which will lead them to limit the time at which the men shall work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to say that while I do not in the least desire to take from Mr. King, the Deputy Minister of Labour, any credit to which he is entitled, I would like to point out that the present is not the first occasion on which strikes have been settled, and settled in a very short time, in the city of Halifax. In past years there have been strikes, and they have been settled quite as satisfactorily, I think, as the recent one, and that without the intervention of the Department of Labour—in fact, before the Department of Labour was created. I would further like to say that I consider that that result was very largely due, as no doubt the result in this case has been due to the good sense, good judgment and forbearance or the labour men of Halifax and their employers. I am glad that the Department of Labour has accomplished something in this case. I recognize that Mr. King is a gentleman of industry and also a gentleman of some considerable frankness, because although hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have told us that the exodus in this country to the United States had ceased long ago, the editor of the 'Labour Gazette' has told us from time to time in its columns that it still continues in many sections of the country. I think we ought to recognize Mr. King's frankness in this respect, and acknowledge that he is more accurate in details of that character than some of the hon. gentlemen who speak from the Treasury Benches in this House. I would like to correct a statement of my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who was at first of the absolute opinion that the Halifax 'Herald' was my personal organ.

Mr. FRASER. No, never.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman so stated.

Mr. FRASER. When I said that it was the hon. gentleman's personal organ, I meant his organ politically. I knew that the hon. gentleman had nothing to do with the paper at all, as owning it as personal property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is just as far off in his second statement as he was in the first. So far as I am aware, and I think I have some knowledge of the facts, the Liberal-Conservative party has not the slightest control over the editorial or other utterances of the Halifax 'Herald.' It is a paper published by an incorporated company; it has never pretended to be under the control of the Liberal-Conservative party, nor has the Liberal-Conservative party ever exercised or attempted to exercise the slightest control over its utterances.

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

Railways chargeable to capital, $1,975,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am ready to take up the item which you have read, but I have had a request from one of the hon. gentlemen opposite, in which he said the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) joined, that these items might stand until we had the report of the Public Accounts Committee, which they expected would complete its labours during the current week. I have no wish to refuse to accede to the hon. gentleman's request if he desires that that course shall be taken; but otherwise I will go on.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought the hon. gentleman was going to make his statement on going into Committee of Supply, for under the rules of the House he could not make it now, because his observations would have to be confined to the particular item before the committee. I made the suggestion to the premier, who told me that the estimates of the Minister of Railways were

coming up, that as we need the report of the Public Accounts Committee, and we have a witness still to examine, which I thought would be done this week, it would be more convenient to have the statement made at the beginning of next week. I understood the premier to agree to that, and I suppose the hon. minister is carrying out the suggestion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My right hon. colleague the Prime Minister, mentioned to me that the request had been made, and asked if I had any objection. I had none. At the same time, I think it will be more convenient, if agreeable to the committee, that any general statement I should make—and I desire to make one before going into the details of the estimates—should be made with the Chairman in the Chair. The discussion will then be less formal and more convenient. That procedure was adopted with the consent of the House on a previous occasion. We will then let the railway items stand until a later day, but I would like to have it understood now whether the hon. gentleman will agree to my suggestion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection to our adopting this procedure with the unanimous consent of the House. With the Chairman in the Chair, we can have the fullest latitude in discussing every item in reference to the Intercolonial Railway and not be limited to the rules of the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, under the circumstances the railway items will stand, it being understood the general discussion is limited to the opening discussion.

Item allowed to stand.

Experimental farms, $80,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the usual vote, but I may say that the vote the last year or two has not been found quite sufficient to meet the increasing demands of this work, and in the supplementary estimates for next year I shall have to ask for a slight addition. The work is being continued on the same lines as hitherto, but is gradually increasing and expanding. Last year the vote taken did not quite cover the expenditure, and we found at the end of the year a number of accounts left over which had to be paid out of the vote for this year. The increased expenditure is due to the extension of the work, the greater calls upon the staff, and to some extent to increases in salaries and wages. The expense of living has increased in the country lately, and it has been found necessary also to give some recognition of the efficiency of men during a long period of service by an addition in some instances to their salaries and by increasing in general the pay of a good many of the staff.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the expenditure divided among the different farms ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is not divided in the vote, but is all lumped together. The Auditor General's Report shows the expenditures on these farms :

The Ottawa Experimental Farm	..	..	$48,400
Nappan	"	"	.. 9,700
Brandon	"	"	.. 8,100
Indian Head	"	"	.. 7,200
Agassiz	"	"	.. 6,400

Mr. SPROULE. Where is the increase ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The increase is not shown in this vote, but I will have to ask for an additional amount in the supplementary estimates, so that at the 1st of July next there will be a clean sweep. The same thing had to be done on one or two occasions by my predecessors, so that although the vote for the farms during the past ten years, in the main estimates, has been the same, there has been in every year, as a rule, some increase in the expenditure, which is shown in the Auditor General's Report. I find that it will be necessary to ask for a supplementary vote for this year, and, in view of the circumstances of the last ten years, I think it will be necessary to ask for the supplementary vote for the ensuing year also. Just what the extent of that vote will be, I cannot say at present.

Mr. SPROULE. I take it that the $80,000 voted last year included both main and supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Last year a large number of accounts were left over and have been paid out of this year's vote. That will make necessary the supplementary vote for the current year. With this supplementary vote I shall be able to pay the bills and start with a clean slate. But, as I say, the experience of the last ten years lead me to believe that the $80,000 now asked for will not carry on the work of the experimental farms in a thoroughly efficient way and that a supplementary vote will be needed.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the hon. minister taking steps to establish farms in the northern part of the country, in Alberta and Saskatchewan ? There are vast areas there that, in the opinion of those who claim to be able to judge, are better adapted for farming than the more southern regions, where the present farms are located. In a very few years, probably, settlers will be filling up that country, and it would be a great service to the people if experiments were carried out in advance, so that they might know what to sow, when to sow and otherwise be advised as to the best means of taking advantage of the conditions in that country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have been frequently asked for additional branch farms in various parts of the country. The portion referred to has made

a request through the representative in this House from Saskatchewan (Mr. Davis).

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). And how about Alberta ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not sure, I think that a request came from there within the last year or two. The establishing of more branch farms is not within my power, the number being limited by the Experimental Farms Act. I fear that if I were to get parliament to amend that Act, we should be obliged to go to considerable lengths, and establish as many as eight or ten new branch farms. These could hardly cost less than $5,000 a year each, and might easily cost $10,000 each a year. I confess that, while I realize the good that could be done by these farms, I think that greater good could be done to the agricultural interests of Canada by spending that money in some other way.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What is the object of an experimental farm if it is not to instruct the people in the development in important sections of the country. The farm at Brandon, for instance, covers Manitoba and a couple of hundred miles west; the farm at Indian Head covers the southern region of which it is the centre. But the experiments carried on there cannot be used by farmers in the northern sections as a guide in their operations, and they have a good deal of trouble, and lose, it may be, several crops, before they find out just what the conditions require. In the northern part of Saskatchewan and Alberta there are vast areas of land that are not surveyed, much less settled, that in a few years will be the home of millions of people. I would urge upon the minister the necessity of establishing at least two farms in this northern country.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. minister increased the number of the staff in these experimental farms ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no increase at the Central Experimental Farm, but there have been increases at Brandon and Indian Head. At each of those farms there has been appointed a secretarial assistant to aid the manager in his work. The managers, Mr. Bedford at Brandon and Mr. McKay at Indian Head, are being constantly called upon to make trips through the country and address farmers' meetings, yet their office work was so great that they could not compass all that was required of them. It was thought better to employ a young man at a comparatively low rate to relieve these more important officers and leave them free to do wider and more useful work.

Mr. ROSAMOND. No doubt the minister is spending this money in a useful way. At one time, hon. gentlemen opposite were opposed to these extra expenses and thought that the experimental farms should be self-sustaining. I would like to have the opinion of the minister as to whether this money is a valuable asset to the farmers of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rosamond) that, if he will go back to the time when these experimental farms were established he will find me on record as concurring fully in the establishment of these farms and saying that I thought a great work might be done for the farmers by this means. As a matter of fact, I was a member of the committee on agricultural industries on whose report these farms were established. I have always believed in them heartily and completely. The work which has been done by the experimental farm has been of the greatest value to the development and progress of agriculture in Canada. I am happy to say that this has been accomplished, first, by the organization and the idea, and secondly, by the happy choice of the officers, and especially of the director who has charge of these farms, and has carried them on in a way most acceptable to the farmers.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I have no doubt that the officers in charge of the experimental farms are very valuable, and have rendered great service to the farming community. Can the minister say off-hand what amount is yearly expended by his department for the benefit of the farming community ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the estimates will show that. I suppose the hon. member means expenditures made directly for that purpose, because all the work of the department is meant to be in the interest of the farmers. I may mention, however, the following items: The experimental farms, $80,000 ; printing and distribution of the reports and bulletins of those farms, $4,000 ; the fumigating stations which, in a different way, have helped very much to protect the fruit-growing and forestry interests, $3,000 ; the commissioner's branch for agriculture, $210,000 is asked for next year; and the vote for Professor Robertson's branch, $40,000. I suppose I might also consider the cattle quarantine vote as directly in the interest of agriculture, although it has also much to do with the public health.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The other evening the minister made a statement with reference to the cheese industry which, I was sorry to hear. He stated that it had not been as successful this year as in previous years. I notice also that he proposed to spend a sum of money for the purpose of improving that industry, and I am personally in favour of such an effort being made. But I would like to call the attention of the government to the fact that if this industry is not prospering under the conditions which have heretofore prevailed, then I presume one member of the government may

be expected to say that the farmers ought to get out of that industry, and turn their hands to something else. I do not think myself that would be advisable, but I am pointing out to the minister that such a conclusion may very properly be drawn from recent ministerial statements. For my part, I think it is quite a proper expenditure, and I am glad to see this industry encouraged; but I think the government ought to have the same regard to other industries, which are quite as well worthy of encouragement as the cheese industry.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that anything in the way of investigation into the methods of any industry would be valuable to that industry, in the same way as the work we propose to do with regard to cheese curing would be valuable to that branch, and would be worthy of consideration. We have, I think, shown evidence of our regard for other industries, but perhaps it would be hardly proper to discuss them under this item.

Mr. BLAIN. Were any experiments made on the farm last year with respect to the curing of cheese?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We do not make any cheese on the Experimental Farm, the dairy there makes butter altogether. The experiments that were made in connection with cheese curing were made in outside factories under the direction of Professor Robertson's branch.

Mr. ERB. On this item I would ask the minister, who is it that directs the officials of the Experimental Farm in making the experiments that are carried on during the year? I find in the last report of the Experimental Farm, page 272, an account of a feeding experiment. Two lots of cows were fed; one lot on barley, oats and oilmeal dry; another lot on bran, and gluten meal wet. The tables are given here, and show the quantity of milk given by each cow, both morning and evening, and the butter fat contained in the milk. Now to my mind this table shows nothing whatever, it proves nothing, although the statement is made that the result of this experiment seems to show a slight difference in favour of the dry feed. But in the one case the feed was given dry, and in the other case a different class of food was given wet. Now, we do not know whether the difference in results was owing to the moisture in the one case and to the dry character of the food in the other case, or to the different kinds of food. If the same kind of food had been used, in the one case dry and in the other case wet, then the results might be of some comparative value. As it is, they prove nothing, and I think the officers of the farm might have devoted their time and energy to something of more value to the farming community.

Mr. ROSAMOND.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The experiments carried on in regard to the feeding of animals are done under the special management of the agriculturist, Mr. Grisdale, but under the supervision of the director. The comparison perhaps would have been more complete if the same food had been used dry in the one case and wet in the other. The composition of those two foods, gluten and oil, is very similar.

Mr. ERB. It is not shown whether the difference is due to the moisture in the one case as against the other, or to the difference in the composition of the feeds.

Mr. SPROULE. What stock is kept at the Central Farm now, and what experiments are being carried on at the present time?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The annual report gives a statement of pure bred animals kept at the experimental farm as follows:

Shorthorns.

1 bull calf, Lord Dinsdale (imp.) 6 months old.
3 cows (imp.), 3, 5, and 8 years old.
2 cows, 10 and 12 years old.
2 heifers (imp.), 1 year old.
1 calf (imp.), 1 year old.

Ayrshires.

1 bull, Twin Beauty (imp.), 2½ years old.
4 cows (imp.), 3 to 6 years old.
3 heifers (imp.), 2½ years old.
1 heifer, 1½ years old.

Guernseys.

1 bull, Wedgewood, 7 years old.
1 bull calf (imp. in dam), 5 months old.
4 cows (3 imp.), 3 to 6 years old.
1 cow, Canadian bred, 3 years old.
1 heifer, 18 months old.
1 heifer calf, 5 months old.

These are the pure breds. There are also certain grades. I have not a list that I can turn to immediately of the grade animals but in the herds there were these pure bred animals and a few grade cows. There are 9 milking cows, Ayrshire and Ayrshire grades, 9 milking cows, Shorthorn and Shorthorn grades, and 9 milking cows, Guernsey and Guernsey grades. I think that one Guernsey grade cow is really a French Canadian grade and not of Guernsey blood. In addition we have breeding bulls and some young bulls which have been bred on the farm and which are offered for sale at the present time. We have also a number of animals which we buy for the purpose of feeding during the winter on the farm and sell when they are ready for the market.

Mr. GILMOUR. How many of that kind?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were about 120 head of cattle last winter on the farm.

Mr. GILMOUR. Of that kind?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of all kinds.

Mr. GILMOUR. How many were for feeding?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nearly 70. When I say that I mean the number of cattle ready to be sold this year. There are also some young animals which we feed from their birth upwards but which are not ready for the butcher yet. I think there will be between 60 and 70 which have either gone to the butcher or will in the near future.

Mr. GILMOUR. What is intended to be demonstrated by the feeding of 70 head of cattle every year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We try to feed them on different combinations of food to see which would make the greatest profits, but for the last year or two, we have been rather trying experiments of feeding dehorned or not dehorned steers, and feeding steers running loose as compared with those tied up and also feeding two year olds, three year olds and four year olds. We take some two year olds, some three year olds and some four year olds and feed them on the same rations so as to see which make the best gain at the lowest cost. We have the barns so constructed that we have rows of stalls holding 9 animals to the row, in which we have two year olds, three year olds and four year olds. Then we have two lots one tied and one running loose in boxes and we are comparing the results of this experiment. This has been going on for two years.

Mr. McGOWAN. What is the effect of feeding loose as compared with tied up cattle ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have not been able to come to any conclusion which would enable us to say that there is an advantage one way or the other. When we began it there were a number of statements made in the agricultural press that if animals were dehorned and allowed to run loose in the boxes they would do better. We have carried on these experiments, not only on the experimental farm here, but also at Nappan, Brandon and Indian Head and the results have been somewhat conflicting. There has been nothing to indicate a clear line of advantage in one case or the other.

Mr. McGOWAN. May I ask the hon. minister what he does with the surplus stock of pure bred cattle ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We sell it.

Mr. McGOWAN. By private sale or auction ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When we can, we sell it by private sale, and we have sent some animals to the auction sales which have taken place in the province of Ontario recently.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Have you some for sale now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, there are several animals for sale. There the several bulls for sale of the three breeds.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). What is the age of these animals ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are quite young calves. I do not think there are any over a year.

Mr. KAULBACH. From the experience at the Experimental Farm, would the hon. minister inform me which is the best description of cattle for stock raising, whether the shorthorn Ayrshire, or Holstein ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think I would like to say that there have been any definite results so far. The dairy herds have only been established very recently on a comparative basis. We have to-day 9 representatives each of the Shorthorns and Shorthorn grades, of the Ayrshires and Ayrshires grades and of the Guernseys and Guernsey grades, and we are compiling the results of their production. I am not prepared to give an opinion as to their special qualities and as a matter of fact, we know that men engaged in stock breeding have very strong predelictions for their own particular favourite breeds and it would be a very difficult task to satisfy them that a particular breed was not the best. All we can do is to show what the herds on the farm do and make a record of it. We publish the records in the reports and the people will have to judge, what, under their particular conditions and circumstances would suit them best.

Mr. KAULBACH. My reason for referring to the Holstein breed in the manner I have done is this : some years ago, the Holstein was looked upon very favourably, and a very large number of that breed were imported into my county. Experience has shown, however, that they are not serviceable for beef. They produce a poor descripton of meat, whereas the Shorthorn is far preferable in that respect. I want to know if that has been the experience of those who have given their attention to the matter at the Experimental Farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I may say that the Shorthorn is a better beef animal than the Holstein. The Holstein is generally looked upon as one of the dairy breeds and I think it is pretty generally accepted amongst farmers to be a fact that the dairy breeds and those which are particularly satisfactory for dairy purposes are not very good for beef purposes. There seems to be a pretty well drawn line between those two purposes in breeding cattle. There is no doubt that the Shorthorn is eminently a beef producing breed. The Holstein is classed among the dairy breeds, and I do not think any one would expect

that the Holstein would be suitable for beef purposes.

Mr. KAULBACH. The experience in my county has been that the Holsteins are unserviceable. I would prefer using the word unprofitable, for either beef or milk. The Jersey and the Guernsey are, as a rule, better for milk, but for general purposes we find that the shorthorn Durham is to be preferred. As a profitable investment I would certainly recommend to dairy people—although perhaps it is presumption on my part—that the Shorthorn Durhams should be preferred above all others, if you can get the good milker, at least that is my experience.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In England the great mass of dairy cattle are Shorthorn or Shorthorn grades, although in this country the Shorthorns have not been considered as dairy cattle. There are some Shorthorns which are very great milkers, and I have no doubt that it would be advantageous to the people of this country if we got on the experimental farm a herd of Shorthorns which would fairly be representative of beef animals and still good milkers. Whether we can get a general purpose animal suitable to every one is for the future to tell.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). The people in my country place their faith in Shorthorns, The gentleman who took the sweepstakes and two silver cups at Guelph, Mr. James Leask, who lives at Greenbank, thinks there is no animal like the Shorthorn. At the Guelph sale of thoroughbred stock this spring the Shorthorn females swept everything, they sold the highest of any animals that were offered for sale there. Our people believe that for general uses the Shorthorn is the best.

Mr. SPROULE. What have been the results of the feeding experiments at the farm?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have two herds, one of which is confined in a small space comparatively, and the other is allowed more freedom of exercise, both being fed the same. That is the experiment in the line of feeding. We have also the three milking herds, the records of which are being kept. We have some experiments with regard to the feeding of horses with the idea of discovering whether a mixture of grain feed for horses working on the farm might not be more economical than the almost wholly oats feed which Canadian horses usually get. We have a representative flock of Leicester sheep, and a representative flock of Shropshire, and we keep an account of what they eat and of what they yield. We have also a number of pigs with which we experiment from time to time. We carried on very extensive experiments with them in our investigation as to soft pork and the results of which appeared in the bulletin which was issued by Professor Shutt and Mr. Grisdale.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the result of the experiments in feeding cattle ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The results have not been conclusive. The impression was that it was more profitable to feed animals running loose. But in some cases we found that the loose animals did better and in other cases it was the reverse.

Mr. ERB. Is the minister in a position to tell us how many acres of the 200 which are set aside for ordinary farm purposes were last year devoted to pasture ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The 200 acres are divided into 5 fields of about 40 acres each. We have always had too much pasture in the rotation for the year of pasture, and we have had to mow the fields ; the cattle not keeping it down. Last year part of it was mowed and part pasture the whole season, and the part mowed in the early part of the season was pastured afterwards. Roughly speaking, there are 40 acres in pasture each year, but that 40 acres each year has been partially mowed. I do not think I can give an absolute statement off-hand of the exact amount of pasture for the whole season.

Mr. ERB. In adding up the number of acres mentioned for the different crops, I can only find 160 acres accounted for, and of that, 16 acres are said to be in pasture. I cannot gather from the report what the other 40 acres were devoted to.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. As a matter of fact, there are not quite 200 acres. We intended to have 200 acres, but in actual measurement there are only about 196. As I have explained, the hay and pasture overlapped, because a portion of the land which was left in pasture is also used for hay, there not being enough stock to keep it down. We had to take the stock away for a few days to cut the hay, and then turn them back. I could not give a full explanation of all the details without studying them more than I am able to do at the moment.

Mr. ERB. I have looked over the figures carefully, and I find that there were 35 acres in oats, 5 in barley, 5 in pease, 16 in mixed grain, 16 in pasture, part of which was mowed, 37 in hay, 4 in clover for ensilage, 30 in corn, 6 in mangels, 2 in turnips, 2 in carrots, 1 in sugar beets, 2 in rape, and half an acre in pumpkins. This makes 160 acres.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. gentleman has left out one field. The idea is to have a rotation of the five fields—one year in pasture, one in hay, one in hoed crop, and two in grain. In the management of this farm we have adopted what might be fairly called the ordinary

practice of good farming. We have a definite rotation, and the instructions are that the feed raised on the land shall be fed to the animals on the farm, and the manure put back on the land. We hope in that way to show what can be done in the growing of crops, and the maintenance of farm fertility. We have hardly got far enough yet to show the result. The work has been going on for three years, and it is a five-year rotation. I think I may say, however, that in consequence of this rotation, and perhaps a certain treatment of the soil, the crops on the farm have been materially better during the last year than they have ever been before. Last summer when I was in England, I visited a good many of the leading farms of the country, and had an opportunity of seeing some of the best land in the best state of cultivation. I was much struck with what I saw ; but when I came back to Ottawa, I went to the Experimental Farm within a few days of my return, and drove all over it, and examined the crops ; and I am well within the mark in saying that at no place in England did I see crops which could at all compare with the crops on the Experimental Farm here last season.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he can state offhand the prices charged in feeding experiments, say for hay, oats, pease, ensilage and straw.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They are all given in the report. The hay, straw and ensilage are all charged exactly the same in every case, so as to make a fair comparison. For the grain, the market prices as nearly as possible are charged, but always the same in all comparative experiments. On page 278 of the report, the prices given are as follows : Roots, $2 per ton ; ensilage, $2 ; clover hay, $6 ; straw, $3 ; corn, which I think means the whole corn, unground, $18 ; oats, pease or barley, $19 ; bran, $15 ; shorts, $16 ; oil meal, which means the oil cake meal, $32 ; gluten meal, $16 ; skim milk, 15 cents per hundred weight, $3 per ton ; calf meal, Blatchford's, $90.

Mr. CLANCY. I notice in a return which was brought down in answer to a motion made by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson), that a statement is given in regard to the farm of 200 acres which is being farmed apart. The fields appear to be given in each case, with the prices charged for the work done by way of ploughing, cultivating, harrowing, and so on, nothing of course being charged for rent ; and there seem to have been some very extraordinary crops. I see that straw is credited not at $3 a ton, but at $4. The hon. gentleman will find at page 5 of this return, and again at page 6, that a profit of $12.30 an acre is shown. The profit on the first field was only $3.25 an acre ; that was a field of 30 acres under pasture. On page 6, a field of 30 acres in corn shows a profit of $12.30 an acre. On page 7 there is an eight-acre field in corn and roots, which shows a profit of $15.46 an acre. On page 9 it is stated that a field of 37 acres in hay gave a profit of $16.10 an acre and, including the second crop of clover, yielded a profit of $18.40 per acre. Those figures are rather startling to those of us who have never been able to realize any such profit. It is reported here that these 37 acres yielded 120 tons of hay or something over three and a quarter tons per acre. I am not going to say that that is not possible, but I feel bound to say that it is entirely misleading to give out to the country that you have 37 acres which have produced so much hay.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that every load of that hay was weighed on the scales at the farm, and the figures are absolutely correct.

Mr. CLANCY. I venture to say that it was not weighed in the matured condition in which it would be found in a farmer's barn, but when the hay was somewhat wet. Of course, I have no personal knowledge, and perhaps have no right to venture an opinion as to the condition of the hay when put in, but no man could take thirty-seven acres under ordinary conditions and get a crop from it averaging three and a quarter tons per acre. It appears somewhat strange to find that the crop measured exactly 120 tons. Then, taking the second crop, we find that there were twenty-one tons from twenty acres. I can quite understand that that might be the case, although a ton to the acre of a second crop of clover is a pretty fair crop. I am now coming to the prices credited. The report says that in addition to the above, 22 milch cows were pastured on the remaining 17 acres during two months, and the value is estimated at $2 per cow per month. There would not be much profit in the milk business if you had to pay $2 a month for the pasture of the cows. Nobody would think of paying that if we were compelled to rent the land. One dollar is about the usual price. I simply point this out because I think our reports ought to be reasonable, and 95 per cent of our farmers would say that this shows a very extraordinary state of things, not to be found in any other 200 acre farm in the country. I want to point out also that the horses and machinery are charged at $2.50 per day. Take the case of the hay crop. You must invest in a mower, a hay rake, a tedder, you must have a wagon, horses and harness, in fact, the whole outfit, and yet the hon. gentleman has charged up for all that $2.50 per day. Every farmer must know that that is below what it would cost, including the feed and the keeping up and maintaining of that machinery, paying a fair rate of interest on the purchase money, feeding the horses and caring for them. Everybody knows that that is not a reasonable price. That includes wear and tear and interest on the whole outfit. It seems to me that such highly

coloured statements are not useful in the country.

Mr. KAULBACH. I think I can relieve the mind of my hon. friend. Without any desire to be egotistical or boastful, let me tell him, when he speaks of three tons of hay per acre, on 37 acres, as something extraordinary, in my opinion it is a small average on a well cultivated field.

Mr. CLANCY. Where ?

Mr. KAULBACH. In my own province. On a farm which I own, I average something like four tons to the acre, and I know of other fields that will give something like four and a half.

Mr. CLANCY. Timothy or clover ?

Mr. KAULBACH. Both mixed. We find it more profitable to raise hay for stock instead of raising other crops. While we are on this subject, it may not be out of place for me to say something with regard to our system of farming in the county I represent. We have been using oxen for a long period and some use horses. But we find that the oxen are far more profitable, and for this reason : When you use a horse, you require a harness that will cost not less than $35 or $40, and which will not last a year in daily use without considerable repairing. But with oxen yoked at the head, two straps, at the cost of a dollar, which will last for years in daily use, is all that is required, to have the oxen do excellent work. Neck yoke is a thing of the past. We have made tests at exhibitions, and we find that an ox will haul 50 per cent more than a horse on a fair draft. I find it profitable to use oxen on a farm, and frequently have from four to seven yoke of oxen in daily use. We use them moderately and always keep them in perfect condition, so that if a butcher wants an ox, he goes to the man in charge and purchases at a fair rate. We find them profitable, but of course if you work your cattle from day to day and feed them scantily or perhaps overwork them, they will not be fit for butchers use. As a rule, an ox for work on the farm is far better than a horse, more steady, and will do the same amount of work and as I stated with less cost. We also find that oxen when yoked by the heads, will step as quickly as a pair of horses, particularly when they are managed by a skilful driver.

Mr. CLANCY. Does the hon. gentleman drive them occasionally ?

Mr. KAULBACH. I do not, but I have seen them driven, and I have been told by others that oxen are preferable to horses—they do the same work with a larger return. If anything happens to an ox, you can stall-feed him and kill him. If his foot injured it can be readily cured.

An hon. MEMBER. Or if he gets sick.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am not speaking of cases of sickness, but of an injury. But if a horse is injured, you must set him aside or shoot him, which is a dead loss. I make the suggestion that others should adopt the same system that we adopt. We call it the German method, and the yoke, we call the German yoke.

An hon. MEMBER. What breed are the oxen ?

Mr. KAULBACH. Shorthorns.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The figures given in the return and those given in the report of the Experimental Farm from year to year are absolutely accurate. The weights are given in detail. As to the hay, it was in good cured condition. As a matter of fact, it was fed to the animals all winter and what was left came out in good condition. It could not have been green or wet when it was weighed. I grant the crop was a large one judged by the average crop of the country. But I am glad to say, the crops at the experimental farms, as a rule, are larger than the ordinary crops of the country, whatever the reason may be. I can assure my hon. friend that the crop that he referred to was the actual return of the land. Yields of grain and hay last year at the Central Experimental Farm were really phenomenal, and I do not expect that they can be repeated. I said a few minutes ago—perhaps my hon. friend did not hear me—that returning from England in June, the crops I found at the Experimental Farm, were out of sight, better than anything I had seen anywhere in England.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the hay was weighed in the barn ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Weighed in the wagon as it was driven into the barn.

Mr. KAULBACH. As we have an Experimental Farm, and are supposed to experiment in everything that is likely to benefit the farmers, would it not be well that some member of the staff when visiting Nova Scotia, should come to my county and see how oxen are used for draught ? If one of these gentlemen would come to me, I could take him to my farm and there he would see oxen in the hands of an expert driver, yoked by the head—not by the neck, and doing excellent work. The driver carries his whip, not as an instrument of cruelty, but to have the cattle to understand that it is there for a purpose, and, if their memory is very short and they are not sharp and up to time, he does not fail to remind them of it by the use of this implement. Each ox has its own name, and the driver can stand on the team and talk to them, and twist them about in any way he pleases, and have them move as quickly as horses. They do the same work that horses do, with a better return. If the minister will send a member of the staff to pay us a visit, I shall be happy to show him around and give him all the

information he desires. And I would certainly recommend him to try the experiment of using oxen for work, yoked by the head, on the Experimental Farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should be glad to.

An hon. MEMBER. You are fifty years behind the times.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hear an hon. member say: 'You are fifty years behind the times.' In this respect, I say certainly you are as you have been accustomed to the neck yoke, and know nothing of the excellent labour that can be performed by oxen yoked by the head.

Mr. CLANCY. I am afraid the Minister of Agriculture is somewhat remiss in his duties in not visiting the province of Nova Scotia. If he went there he would see how oxen could be used instead of horses, doing more work, doing it quite as quickly and more cheaply. He would see that the expense of horses and harness, and, to a great extent of modern farm implements is a waste of money. And, if I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) aright, the minister will find that the expense of feeding and housing as carried on in the Experimental Farm might be largely done away with.

Mr. KAULBACH. I did not refer to feeding.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman touched on a subject that involved feeding. He gave the House the useful information that, if you want a fat animal, all you had to do was to unhitch him in the field and he was all ready.

Mr. KAULBACH. They are always in condition.

Mr. CLANCY. I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture will not neglect to go to Nova Scotia and that he will go with an open mind upon these questions. I want to ask the minister, in view of the prices given in this statement, are books of account kept at the Experimental Farm showing the prices of these crops and the cost of these experiments in feeding ? Take this two hundred acres of land—is an account kept of every dollar's worth on that land, and accounted for again in the course of the experiments in feeding and otherwise ? If that is done, and the figures show that the stock are sold at a profit that would be very useful information to the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is an accurate account kept of every hour's work of every man on the farm; of the use of machinery and the teams, and of the results of their work. And these items are charged against the crop or against the work which they are doing. In the same way there is an accurate account kept of the yield of every field, and it is credited to that field. If manure is put on, the manure is charged against the field. The accounts are absolutely accurate and every statement given out is made up from the books.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not think the minister has quite got at what I want to know. In this return charges are made for the actual day's work. But there are times when work is not done, as on every farm. Yet teams must be maintained, implements are lying idle and earning nothing. There is the original cost and the expense of maintenance besides. I wish to know whether a strict account is kept of every dollar's worth produced on the 200 acres, that is, hay, oats, roots, ensilage, in fact everything that is produced on the 200 acres of land—if there is an accurate account kept of that, and then as to the value of the stock after it has been fed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is an account kept of every crop, showing its cost. That crop is then brought into the barn and used for one purpose or another. When it is used to feed animals they are charged with it ; if it is used, as a good deal of our grain crops are used, for distribution throughout the country, the seed grain distribution is charged with it. Sometimes some of the orchard crops and small fruit crops are sold and the money goes to the Receiver General, but it is credited in the farm books, although the farm vote is not helped by it. There is a certain amount of grain, roots and ensilage raised on that 200 acres, that is all accounted for, it is taken into the barn and used in the course of the year, and every bit of it is accounted for. We have to-day a large number of steers being fed for sale to butchers, and everything they eat is charged against them. The original cost when they are bought is charged against them, and the profit is shown at the end of the operation. In every case of the feeding of steers at the experimental farm a considerable profit has been made between the purchase of the animals and their sale, charging not only the food they have eaten but their original cost. Then again this spring it is likely we will have a considerable amount of ensilage left over ; the farm has been so productive that we have not got barn room enough to-day to hold a sufficient number of animals during the winter to eat up the crop of last year. We propose this summer to buy a number of steers and put them into a lot and feed them that ensilage left over, to see whether, in the summer time, we can feed ensilage to advantage in comparison to feeding the animals in a pasture. In many sections of the country where there is a great deal of drought in summer, the pastures get short, and people have been recommended to grow ensilage and take it out of the silo in the summer season and feed it to the animals. We have a lot of ensilage left over this spring, and we are going to make experiments on

that line this summer. In that way I trust the whole of last year's crop will be used up. That ensilage will be charged against the steers, they will be put in a small pasture and fed largely on ensilage, and the results of feeding them in that way will be shown in the price for which the steers are sold.

Mr. LENNOX. Did I understand the minister to say that he is now experimenting to find whether it is profitable to feed cattle on ensilage during the summer months ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said we proposed to try an experiment of that kind the coming summer.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister think that feeding ensilage in summer is in an experimental stage at present ? I think that is well understood among farmers at the present time, and is constantly practiced by many.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it is much practiced in Canada. There are some people who have practiced it, but in no case to my knowledge where an accurate account is kept of all the details and results.

Mr. LENNOX. I have heard farmers speak of it, and I think it is well known among farmers. Where grass is scarce during the summer months they have been in the habit, for years past, of feeding cattle on ensilage.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman says that during the past year most exceptional crops were grown upon the experimental farm; that he has undertaken to account for every particle of stuff grown there in one way or another ; that the feeding experiments have been profitable upon the whole. Now a farmer listening to that would conclude that the experimental farm made a considerable amount of money. In view of the hon. gentleman's statements I want to ask him what the profits were upon the experimental farm during the year. He will agree with me that the average quantity of new machinery should be charged up as against that year, because the life of machinery is not long, and it soon wears out. The hon. gentleman will take the stuff charged up to these fields, and the cost of raising it, with the cost of machinery bought during the year, the horses bought, in fact everything that was paid out for equipment and maintenance. Now what has been the profits as between the two sides of the account for the past year ? It has been an extraordinary year, as the hon. gentleman states, and the farm should show a good margin of profit.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Books have been kept showing the profits of each field in connection with each crop, and we would have to add the various fields to see what the profits on the whole land are. The work of the farm is such that it is necessarily mixed up with the work on the experimental part, and it would be impossible to lay aside certain implements and use them only for that one part. We therefore have to overcome that difficulty by charging to each field its share of the general wear and tear of the implements on the whole establishment. I think any business man would say that is the usual way of doing it in their business establishments. I grant if we were running a farm under ordinary circumstances, and not with a view to experiment, that could be accomplished by just taking the net profits at the end of the year, taking everything into consideration. But, in such an establishment as this it seems to me that the only way we can do is to say that there are 200 acres divided into so many fields of 37 acres, or 40 acres, 38 acres, or whatever it may be, that on that land so much crop was raised, that that crop cost so much, and in that case the land must be credited with it. When we come to work in the barn we have to feed that crop to the animals and we have to charge the value of the feed which is given to each of the individual animals. The aggregate of that is the result of using the whole of that crop. Then the product of the animal, either in milk or beef, or in other things, is credited to the feed and a balance again is struck to see whether there has been a profit or a loss. In the working of the experimental farm I understand that the work of the teams is charged at so much. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) will notice, I think it is charged at $2.50 a day.

Mr. CLANCY. That is too low. The hon. gentleman knows very well from his own experience——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would like to finish what I am saying. In that is included the cost of the maintenance of these teams. Part of the feed which has been got off that land has to be fed to these teams, and they are credited with the work they do. We value a day's work at $2.50 and there are the man's wages besides. That is credited to a certain part of the whole crop which is raised on the farm. A certain portion of the feed is fed to the bulls which give no return beyond a little service fee, to the pigs, the sheep, and so on. It is not all fed to the animals which are under experiment. Part of it is fed to the animals which are not under experiment, but which we keep as an illustration of the different breeds of animals for the benefit of visitors to the farm.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman will see that this report is entirely misleading in view of the statement which he has made himself. In the first place the fields are charged with the use of the horses and machinery by day's work. The hon. gentleman knows that this is not a fair propo-

tion. They must be charged, in a fair proportion, to all the fields during the year, because these are not hired teams that are brought in for a day's work. These horses are kept, some of them die, they grow old, the machinery wears out, and yet the hon. gentleman charges just for the day in which he employs them. No farmer would say that that would be a fair charge. The returns, so far as this is concerned, I venture to think, are entirely misleading. I am sure they do not appeal to any farmer in the House as being anything within near range of being accurate. I want to ask the hon. gentleman to follow this up. Taking the first field here, would he be able to show what has become of these 30 tons of straw charged up to four teams. Would he be able to say where it has gone, what account it is charged to, and if it is to be consumed, how much of it has been consumed, and how much of it is on hand? Then, take again the next field, where 510 tons of ensilage is produced and see where that ensilage has been accounted for. I will take the next field, where there are 160 tons of ensilage. Where has that been accounted for? If we do not attempt to account for feed of that kind under the same service, then I venture to say that this calculation is entirely without value. If such an account has been kept and worked out, then, I could understand the utility of it. But, the hon. Minister of Agriculture knows much better than I can tell him, that the charges that are made here are not such charges as would be made in actual farming. While the hon. gentleman says that it runs into the experimental portion as well as into the profitable portion, I admit that there would be some difficulty, but not an insuperable difficulty, in keeping them apart. I could connect the experimental portion with the feeding of stock. If the hon. gentleman's statements are to be accepted the experiments in the feeding of stock are profitable. These are just the expenditures incurred in the growing of grain on the 200 acres, or of crops generally and which, as well as the feeding of the stock, include labour and everything else involving a larger amount of charge against the farm. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman ought to undertake to give to this committee, at some future period, a statement of how the farm stands, and he should also recognize that the expense should be charged to the experimental portion of the work. I will venture to say that if the hon. gentleman reverses this method of keeping the accounts on the books, he will find the experiments making a profit and the farm going behind, because, if he charges the experiments with the day's work of the men, horses and machinery, he wil simply reverse the state of things. I desire to point that out to show that these accounts, on the face of them, are misleading.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that a charge of $2.50 a day for a team was too high.

Mr. CLANCY. No, too low.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, I was going to say to the hon. gentleman that while it may be too low, if you went out in the open market to hire teams, as a matter of fact that amount covers the cost of the team to the experimental farm, and so much more does it cover the cost that it makes up for the days when the teams are idle during the year. The actual charge which is made against the crop for team work if it were to be added up, would be considerably more than the cost to the farm of keeping all these teams there.

Mr. CLANCY. And the machinery?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a charge for the machinery besides.

Mr. LENNOX. Do you know that to be the case by actual experiment?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We know that $2.50 a day is more than the actual cost of a team.

Mr. LENNOX. Can you show that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, we know practically that it is so, and it is made higher for the express purpose of covering the time when the teams are standing in the barn. But, at the experimental farm, as a general rule, the teams are standing very little in the barn. Of course, in the summer time during wet days they must be in the barn, but during the winter time, when they would be standing in the barn on an ordinary farm, they are hauling manure for the experimental part of the farm and the horticultural work and that work has nothing to do with this 200-acre part of the farm. The men are utilized during bad weather from year's end to year's end in preparing grain for seed distribution, in preparing grain for exhibition work, and things of that kind, perhaps a little outside of the routine work of the farm, but still work that has to be done, and which is paid for out of the grain distribution apportionment of the farm and by the vote for exhibition purposes. If I secure agricultural specimens at the experimental farm, for sending to the exhibitions, every hours work of the men upon that, is paid out of the exhibition vote. That work is done at odd times when the men would possibly be idle otherwise. We have an immense amount of cleaning of grain for the seed distribution, which is done during the winter months. We have the threshing of all the experimental plots. That grain has to be kept carefully separate so that we may be able to find out the result. That takes hours, days, weeks, and

even months, for some men during the winter. All the men can be turned on to that work when there is bad weather and when they cannot work outdoors. There is no loss of time of the men on the farm and very little loss of time of the teams. Although this 200 acres is more than half the land cultivated on the farm, it is cultivated much more easily than the experimental plot work which takes a great deal more time, labour and expense, and the crop of which is not expected to pay; the returns from it being its utility to the farmers of the country. I cannot give the statement which the hon. gentleman desires for last years work, but I will try to have it incorporated in the next annual report so that the gross sales and the actual cost of working that part of the farm may appear in the report.

Mr. McGOWAN. How many horses have you on the experimental farm.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have six teams of horses. We have three horses to run the omnibus back and forwards to the city, an express wagon to carry mails and parcels; I think in all we have nineteen horses.

Mr. McGOWAN. How many employees?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the hon. gentleman means the labour. I am informed that it runs in the neighbourhood of forty all told. That includes all the experimental work and things of that kind.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THE COSMOS COTTON COMPANY.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved third reading of Bill (No. 64) to incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company. He said: The hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) called attention to section 8 when this Bill was in committee, and he thought that the wording of that clause might be changed. I receive any suggestion of the hon. gentleman with a great deal of deference because of his experience and his candour, and the fairness with which he always treats matters of this kind. I have no doubt that his suggestion was intended for the benefit of the stockholders of this company. But, I have looked over the statutes for several years back and also the Bills of the present session, and I find that two out of five of them contain this clause word for word. I would ask my hon. friend not to press his objection. I would instance that the Ross Rifle Company Bill contains the same clause and the hon. member did not object to it. This company is chartered for the particular purpose of buying out another company which has a provincial charter, and it was thought that instead of asking for enlarged powers from the local legislature it would be better to ask for a new Bill here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The only objection I had was that it gave the directors of the company power, without the consent of the company itself.

Mr. FLINT. All these clauses are framed in the same way.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Very well.

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

CENTRAL COUNTIES RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 68) respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Edwards.

On Section 4,

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the absence of Mr. Edwards, I beg to move that the following clause be added to the last section of the Bill:

Section 5. Paragraph 'b' as enacted by section 1 of chapter 60 of the statutes of 1899 is amended by striking out the words 'or Casselman' in line 5 thereof, and inserting after the word 'Russell' in line 6 thereof the following words: 'And then to the city of Ottawa in the county of Carleton.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. State the reason for the change?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have had no explanation from the hon. member for Russell, but I understand that it refers to the direction which the line is going to follow. The promoters of the Bill do not want the line to go to Casselman, but they want it to go from Russell to Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The members of the committee who are present will remember that the promoter of the Bill stated that the line as laid down in the Bill crossed the Canada Atlantic line either twice or three times, and by this change it would not have to cross the other road. It was stated by the gentleman who addressed the committee that he had a telegram from one of the railway companies, I forget whether it was the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canada Atlantic, requesting that this change in the route be made. I do not think there is any objection to it. It is purely a local matter, and the change is in the interest of the public.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not suppose there is any objection to the change, but it

would have been better to have followed the rules of the House, and to have given notice of the amendment. I will not object, however. This is an added clause which amends a previous section of the same Act. However, if the hon. gentleman is satisfied, let it pass, and it can be amended, if necessary, in the Senate.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 71) respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, Limited.—Mr. Préfontaine.

Bill (No. 43) respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Maxwell.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 91) respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 97) to incorporate the Dominion Railway and Power Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Experimental farms, $80,000.

Mr. GANONG. Before examining the estimates of the Minister of Agriculture, I had a great deal of sympathy for the farmers of this country. I still have that sympathy, for I believe them to be one of the most if not the most important class of workers we have. But I think it well for us to examine these estimates a little closely. At page 35, I find such items as these: Aid to agricultural societies $7,000; experimental farms $80,000; printing and distribution of reports and bulletins of farms $4,000; fumigating stations $3,000; for renewing and improving Canadian exhibit at Imperial Institute, London, $3,000; to promote dairying interests, etc. $40,000. And on page 36; I find cattle quarantines and veterinary divisions $7,000. Then at page 74 there is an item to meet expenditure under the Adulteration of Food and Fertilizers Act $25,000, of which $12,000 would probably apply to the Agricultural Department. I have given only a few items, yet we find here a total of $434,000 which is, in effect a direct bonus to the farmers of this country. This is a class of protection which these gentlemen probably do not recognize that they receive. Nevertheless, it is a direct bonus and a protection to them. This does not cover all, for there are such items as cattle inspection, $2,800; protection for timber planting in the west,—designed to afford shelter and to help in retaining the moisture precipitated—$15,000, running the amount up to $450,000, without including the salary of an expensive minister. If you include this and other items it will easily amount to $500,000. We have heard it stated a good many times on the floor of this House that the farmers have no protection. As a manufacturer, I claim that the farmers have protection in these items amounting to $500,000. The claim is made that the farmers were called upon to pay duties on the importation last year of $1,927,000 worth of agricultural implements. But this bonus given outright to the farmers would more than pay the duty on all the agricultural implements imported last year. And this does not cover it all either. If we consider the Glasgow exhibition, the Paris exposition, the Pan-American and others, which cost this country a large amount of money, we find that that money is laid out for the benefit of the industrial portion of the community and largely for the benefit of the farming class.

There are some other advantages that the farmers get, and for which they do not perhaps pay their proportion of the cost. I would not have the House imagine that I am objecting to these amounts, nor am I objecting to the item I propose to speak of just now, that is the postal service. The Postmaster General's Report will show that the postal service of the country districts is not self-sustaining, that the large centres of population undoubtedly have to pay for it. That report will show to any reasonable mind that the people in the country districts to-day are paying more for their postage than they ever paid in the history of the country. They are not paying it directly in the way of postage, but indirectly in other forms of taxation. Every one knows that the large corporations, the insurance companies and others, having a large amount of mailing matter, are receiving great advantage from the change in the postage. Personally, I have no doubt that the change benefits the firm with which I am connected at least $150 a year. But if we save $150, some one else has to pay it; it may not be paid in postage, but it is paid in taxation, and that is largely borne by the farmers of the country.

Then they have other advantages as well. We have expended millions of dollars on transportation, very largely in the interest

of the farmers. Our great railways have been built mostly for that purpose, and our canal systems have been built and will be enlarged in the future on the same basis. So that they have not only this direct bonus of $500,000, but they have these other advantages from which they are constantly receiving benefit. In this year's estimates the improvements to harbours will cover a very large amount, directly to the advantage of the farmers. Why are we spending money at Collingwood, at Owen Sound, at Depot Harbour, at Goderich ? Simply in order to afford better facilities for the transportation of the products of the farm. We are spending in dredging harbours, also in the interest of better transportation, a sum of over $600,000. Then in steamship subventions the farmers have an advantage. So that in addition to the protection the farmers have in the tariff on wheat, flour and such products, they have all these other advantages as well. There is also another scheme that may come to the front. Why is the building of the Georgian Bay canal mooted at all ? That is not for the benefit of the manufacturers, by whom the Minister of Trade and Commerce used to say that the country was being bled white, but in the interest of the farming community of the west; and if it is ever built it will be built in their interest alone. The criticisms from this side of the House are in a fair spirit, they are not against these grants themselves, but in the mode of their expenditure. We desire that the farmers of this country may get all the advantage possible for the amount of money that is being expended. That is the object of all the criticisms made in this House by the opposition. We do not object so much to the expenditure, but we believe that the farmers and others are not getting a fair equivalent for their money. We are told that the farmers have no protection, but that the manufacturers are getting all the advantages. The Minister of Trade and Commerce has in years past rather abused the guild to which I have the honour to belong. I say we have as honourable men in it as the hon. gentleman who occupies the position of Minister of Trade and Commerce. We have not in it men who have tied up water powers and are refusing to sell them when they are needed for the development of the country. We have not men who have decried cabinet positions and afterwards accepted $7,000 a year of the people's money to fill those positions. I resent the statement the hon. member has made in so far as the manufacturers of this country are concerned. I think the grants that are before us to-day are all right in themselves, but I want an assurance from the minister that they will be expended in the best possible manner in the interest of the farmers.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister tell us what experiments are going on now at the Central Experimental Farm ?

Mr. GANONG.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have about 1,000 different plots of various sizes on the experimental farm. These are all handled separately, and the crops grown on them are carefully weighed and recorded, and the results of the comparisons are worked out in the office, and these are published in the reports of the experimental farms.

Mr. SPROULE. I noticed some time ago there was a change made in the silos, which were originally square, and they are now round. What has been the result of the change ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I am safe in saying that the results show that the round silos is preferable. There is less waste in the round silo. Some ensilage may spoil in the corners of a square silo.

Mr. SPROULE. What is your experience in regard to the diameter of the silo that is most suitable for ordinary occasions—say where there are 40 or 50 head of cattle to be fed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is desirable to have the silo of sufficient size to enable the feeder to take three or four inches of the surface off every two days, because, when the surface is exposed to the air, it will begin to spoil.

Mr. SPROULE. The ensilage would not be injured in the course of a day or two in the winter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Two days are quite safe, but many days would not be. The state of the weather may influence the length of time during which it would be safe to allow ensilage to be exposed to the air.

Mr. SPROULE. If you take three or four inches off every two or three days it would not take long to exhaust the silo at that rate of going.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There will be about 18 feet in depth of ensilage.

Mr. SPROULE. What diameter ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The diameter is about 14 or 15 feet.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been your experience in regard to the preservation of wood in the silo ? Is there any difference between a round and a square silo ? What kind of wood did you use ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We used ordinary pine. Its durability depends a good deal upon the way it is treated. The wooden ones which were rotted when these new ones were put in had been there about ten years. They were treated with a preparation of linseed oil and resin on the inside to fill the pores of the

wood and prevent it from absorbing moisture from the ensilage and rotting it. The time during which that silo lasted, however, was not as great as the time during which some other silos have lasted. I have a silo at home that lasted for 14 years before I had to renew it, but the ones on the farm gave out in ten years. The new ones have not shown any signs of decay. They have only been in existence about two years. We cannot say whether they will last longer than the old ones.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) had attended our Farmers' Institute and grange meetings he would have learned all these things years ago. It seems to me that all day we have been doing farmers' institute and grange work and that every farmer in this House ought to know all about these matters without asking the questions that have been asked of the hon. minister. I do not object to it, because the country will be educated, perhaps, and especially those members of the farming community who do not attend these meetings will get information from the hon. Minister of Agriculture to-night that they have not had an opportunity of getting before. But, what astonishes me is, to hear members of this House getting up and deploring the work that the hon. minister is trying to do for the farmers. They appear to complain because he is protecting the farmers, because he is assisting them in the matter of transportation and experimental farms and trying to improve in other ways the work of the farmer. I think if the hon. Minister of Agriculture devotes his time to that work he will be doing a grand thing for this country and when we speak about that as being protection to the farmers I would say that it is an excellent thing that he is protecting the farmers in that way. The farmer has to pay for his clothing a protection to the manufacturer of about 30 per cent. That is $30 on the hundred added to the expense of maintaining his family, which goes to the manufacturer of clothing. If he consumes confectionery he has to pay 25 cents on the dollar and if he consumes biscuits he has to pay 27 cents on the dollar. Every manufacturer in this country is protected more or less and yet an hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) gets up and complains because the farmer is assisted in developing his business.

Mr. GANONG. I made no complaint if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson) is referring to me. On the other hand I rather complimented the minister.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Perhaps you did, but I thought you were complaining because we were getting protection in this form. Go on and protect the farmers, give them cold storage, improve their transportation facilities, teach them how to raise more and of a better quality and you will do something for the benefit of the country. But, the discussion of all these little items in this House, thus wasting the time of 213 men who have to sit and listen to it, is, it seems to me, entirely out of place. I have no objection to this item passing.

Mr. SPROULE. The committee must feel grateful to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) for the lecture which he has read to us on the propriety of our proceedings here telling us what we should do and what we should not do. We were innocent enough to believe that when a proposal for the expenditure of public money is before the House it is our duty to ascertain in what way the money is being spent and to bring out such information as will enable us to determine whether it is a wise expenditure or not. It is not a discussion but rather more in the nature of asking questions, which it is legitimate and proper for us to do. It is not a question of whether the party who is asking the questions knows anything about the business or not. There are experiments being carried on at the farm. It is our duty to ascertain as far as possible, whether they are being conducted on proper lines and what the results of these experiments have been. If they have not been conducted on proper lines it is our place to offer such suggestions as in our judgment might be of assistance to those engaged in them. It is for the purpose of bringing out this information that these questions are being asked. In connection with these experiments I want to say a few words on another line. Experiments have been carried on for some time in regard to the feeding of pork to determinate what class of foods produce soft pork. I listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of Mr. Shutt of the experimental farm when he was before the Committee on Agriculture to give information upon that question. My understanding, before the experiment was commenced was, that it was to be carried on for the purpose of determining what classes of food were the most suitable for producing a good quality of pork, but it seems to me that the whole sheet was made out with the aim of determining whether corn produces soft pork or not and it had very little relevancy to the question of determining the effect of other kinds of food. Those who are in the habit of raising pork know that there are certain kinds of food which will produce soft pork and that some food prepared in different ways produces different qualities of pork. I think that experiment fell far short of what it should have been to bring out information that should have been available to the farmers of the country. In all the combinations of food that were made in the course of the experiment corn was one-half of each ration. If half was made up of different things like mangolds, turnips, oats, and barley ; while it might be proper to use corn as one of the rations it was at least

equally valuable to determine what were the cheapest possible kinds of feed we could use to produce good pork. In my section of the country the principle feed used is mangolds, beets or turnips, with pease, oats and barley ground up and put over it. There is a great deal of difference in the quality of pork produced from feeding raw turnips and from feeding boiled turnips. There has been no sufficient inquiry into the results obtained from such feed as that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have done just the very thing which the hon. gentleman points out. The bulletin shows that some of the rations were of boiled roots and some of raw roots. Corn did not enter at all into a number of the rations.

Mr. SPROULE. In my judgment one of the most desirable things to know is : What cheap food will best produce a good quality of pork. If you can produce as good a quality of pork from sugar beets and a small quantity of grain, as you can from an entire ration of grain, then you will have a larger profit because roots are cheaper than grain. We had practically no information along that line in the committee. If you can convince a farmer that he can use feed which costs him only one cent a pound or less, and four pounds of which will make a pound of pork which he can sell for 6 cents, you will show him how to make a profit. If grain is high in price it is not profitable to feed it to hogs. In this respect the experiments were deficient. Now, we have had no information given us as to the yield on that part of the farm which was cultivated for the purpose of showing how much profit there was in agriculture, and we were not told how much manure was put on these fields year after year.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The manure is included in the account of every field.

Mr. SPROULE. For one year or for many years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The manure is only put on in rotation once in five years, and what is done is to charge one-fifth of the manure to each crop.

Mr. SPROULE. It is claimed that the farm being so close to Ottawa there could be a large quantity of manure purchased.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no purchased manure put on that portion of the farm. The manure put on that land was the produce of the feed raised on the land itself. The purchased manure was put on another part of the farm.

Mr. SPROULE. What quantity of manure was put on per acre ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twenty tons.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. SHERRITT. How do you charge your hay and oats ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hay is charged at $6 a ton and the oats at $19 a ton. The grain we raise for feeding is charged in round figures at a cent a pound.

Mr. SHERRITT. How do you count your hay when you grow 3¾ tons to the acre ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is charged the same.

Mr. SHERRITT. Surely the hon. gentleman does not consider that is a fair report to send out to the country. Every farmer in this House knows that there is about 25 per cent difference in the weight of hay as taken off the field and after it is thoroughly dry.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a shrinkage, no doubt.

Mr. SHERRITT. I am certainly pleased with the announcement which the minister has made, that he intends to bring down a statement next year showing exactly what the produce of the farm has been, as one cannot tell anything about it in the present condition of affairs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have all the data, but it has never been worked out in the way the hon. gentleman desires, but I shall be very glad to have that done.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will have no objection to my giving the House the result of my experience in the culture of the soil. For example, I had unwillingly to take a farm which came into my hands that had been exhausted of all fertility. My desire was to have it restored, and to accomplish that end, I went to the experimental farm to inquire what would be the best method to bring the soil back to its virgin condition. I was advised to take a sub-soil plough very early in the spring and turn up the bottom earth. The inquiry was made of me, what did the soil consist of ? I said that it was a red clay covered with a black light loam, which, from having been cropped frequently, was exhausted of all its properties, and grew very little more than carraway, witch grass and weeds. I followed the advice given to me by the experimental farm people and, after having turned up the sub-soil as advised with a good sub-soil plough, I was advised to sow it with clover seed thick, enough to produce a good thick crop. After the clover had grown about six inches, I had it turned under by shallow ploughing ; and then sowed the land with oats, timothy and clover, and had an excellent crop that season, coming in about the month of August, which was cut for food, stored away in the barn, and fed to the stock ; and the next year I had the manure from that stock used as a top dressing. I treated

five acres the first year in this way and five acres the next year; and, after applying that method for five or six years, I had an immense yield of good, wholesome food. That farm only kept four head of cattle at first, but now it has thirty-six head on about sixty acres of land, half of which is in pasture. Therefore, I say that farming, if conducted in a proper manner, will give a handsome living to the farmer. A farmer, I contend, is a king among peasants. Now, as the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has referred to hog raising, I may say that I made inquiry on that subject at the experimental farm, and was advised to feed hogs on clover and sugar beets. I received that same advice from other parties, and was also advised to use the sugar beet for horned cattle. The clover and the sugar beet, put into a vat and boiled up together, along with some middlings, pease, beans or any thing of that kind, gave an excellent food for hogs ; and as a result I had an excellent herd of hogs raised principally on this description of food. I imported eleven, out of which I had a product of 101, and from that product I netted in one year, from November to November, a clear profit of $1,000.

Mr. HEYD. On how many acres altogether.

Mr. KAULBACH. I kept the hogs in pens. I did not use any acres at all.

Mr. HEYD. You said you had sixty acres of ground.

Mr. KAULBACH. I dropped that subject. It was on another farm that I raised the hogs. I sold the whole of the young stock, weighing about 250 pounds a piece. I sold them without any difficulty right at my door in the town where I live, for seven and eight cents per pound dressed weight, and I could not give them to the butchers as fast as they were applying for them. The farm had all the trimmings. I employed a party at $14 a month to do nothing but look after the hogs. I gave him his house rent free, all the roots he required for his family, all his firewood and other small perquisites, and I found that it was the most profitable investment I had on the farm. I had an orchard on the farm, and when there was a little breeze some of the apples fell which used to be picked up by hand ; now the hogs are turned in and they pick up the apples without any trouble, and which is good food for them. After the hogs picked up the apples they are sent back to the pen.

This year I only have half the number, because my men had to give their attention to other work, but I advise every farmer to grow pork and use the methods I employ, namely, feed with young clover and the sugar beet. The sugar beet will be far better employed in Canada in the feeding of stock than in the production of sugar. We have had experience in the manufacture of sugar from the beet, which has shown to be an utter failure, and with all due deference to my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), I believe that if we would give our attention to the growth of the sugar beet and use it in the way I mention, we would have much better returns than we could possibly have by converting it into sugar. Might I ask the hon. minister if any experiments have been made with regard to the destruction of the cattle fly. Our cattle in the maritime provinces are greatly tormented by that pest, and we have used in a rude way every method we could devise to get rid of it. We have applied the fish oil and paraffine—a very slight mixture of paraffine with the fish oil—every day to the cattle, and some of our people have tied rugs about the horns to protect them. That latter precaution, however, is an inconvenience to the cattle, as it makes them too warm in the summer season. If the hon. gentleman knows of any method for getting rid of this pest, I would be very glad to have the information.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The entomologist has dealt with that subject exhaustively in a special bulletin issued three years ago or more. Among the remedies he recommends is fish oil, but that is not quite so easily obtained here as as where my hon. friend lives. Kerosene emulsion he also recommends. But the horn fly is still troubling cattle a good deal, all through the country. I have no doubt, however, that those who take precautions to keep it away from the cattle reap an abundant return for their trouble.

Mr. KAULBACH. Our experience shows that the cattle fly and the horn fly are separate and distinct. The one is larger than the other. The horn fly is very small and gathers round the lower part of the horn, whereas the cattle fly is larger and places his head downwards, penetrating the skin and causing great torture to the animal.

Mr. SPROULE. Experiments were made a few years ago to ascertain how many head of cattle could be kept per acre the year round. Has aything been done in that line since ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing definite.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the result of the experiment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It showed about an average of 22 head of cattle to 40 acres of land. That experiment was carried on four years.

Mr. SPROULE. What experiments are going on with regard to hybridization ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Prof. Saunders has been carrying on steadily experiments in the hybridization of grains and fruits. He is experimenting on the

cross fertilizing of different varieties of grain, to see whether new varieties might be found, and when found he tests them and compares them with the older varieties. His work in connection with fruits is chiefly in experiments to get an apple which will stand the North-west climate. By hybridizing the more tender and larger varieties on the wild Siberian crab, which is perfectly hardy but too small to be of much use, we find that we are getting varieties which we may hope to grow with success in the North-west. We find to-day some trees there, the results of such cross fertilizing, which are producing fruit, and in course of time we hope to produce a fruit which will flourish in the North-west and be quite good enough for culinary and household purposes. The progress so far as been very encouraging.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you propose adding any new buildings this year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I propose to add a horse stable to the Brandon farm.

Mr. BELL. Perhaps I might now introduce a matter which I mentioned to the hon. minister in connection with fumigation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the papers here in connection with that and would ask the hon. gentleman to bring it up on another occasion.

Salaries and contingencies of organized districts and public health in other districts, $110,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire, if this is the proper time, to call attention to a case of quarantine, though the nature of it may possibly make it rather a matter for the consideration of customs and come within its province. There was a vessel belonging to Lunenburg that went to Boston and was discharging and taking in cargo within a short distance of the contagious hospital there. The crew, it is reported, were not on shore, but the steward, through flies in the galley, became infected with small-pox. The vessel left on her voyage to Georgetown, Prince Edward Island. Arriving there the captain reported the steward sick, feeling that the disease was of a serious character. The doctor went on board and pronounced it small-pox, and advised the captain that he and the crew should remain isolated, and not leave the ship. After a day or two's delay, the doctor informed the captain that he with his ship 'Monitor' was to proceed to Pictou. The vessel proceeded to Pictou under difficulty, going out in a storm. Reaching the port of Pictou, the captain reported himself through the captain of another vessel, and remained in quarantine waters. After two or three days delay at Pictou, this poor man suffering from this terrible disease, without the necessary treatment, the vessel was ordered to Charlottetown across the bay. What I contend is that this poor man should have had medical treatment during all this time. When the vessel reached Charlottetown, it was after a lapse of six or seven days from the time it had arrived at Georgetown. The sick man was landed, but had been on shore hardly any time when he died. The captain reported to me that it was through the want of proper attention shown by the customs or quarantine official at Georgetown, that the poor man met his death, and the unnecessary detention of the ship in Georgetown and Pictou. It appears that, under the Act, the customs official becomes the quarantine agent when a vessel with sickness aboard is reported. The vessel was kept in quarantine at a late season of the year, after she should have been out of the gulf, the gulf being prohibited waters. She was paying a percentage to go into the gulf, intending to have carried a chartered cargo from Georgetown, and if that vessel had been looked after quickly, she would have been out of the gulf and out of quarantine in time to have completed her charter. But, leaving the port in which the ship was quarantined, then being released, and going into the gulf in a storm and trying to make Pictou harbour in a snow storm for shelter in the night, she met with shipwreck. The vessel, which was a new one, just launched the year previous and specially built of special material for a certain purpose, was lost to the owners, and the crew barely saved their lives. The vessel was sold as a derelict and was bought in by other parties. I would ask the minister to look into this matter carefully and give such satisfaction as is within his power. I will write him a carefully drawn letter giving the facts, to which I will ask his careful attention that he may give me information as to the position in which this poor unfortunate master and owners are to be placed. The vessel was worth $7,000. The captain is deprived of his season's work, which was his living. All he asks now is not the value of the ship, but, in consequenece of the want of proper attention on the part of the custom officials at the quarantine station at Georgetown, that the captain and owners should be compensated to the extent of the charter which would be about $600 or $700—I can give the exact amount by referring to a letter written to me by the master.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly the case comes under this vote. I know the case quite well. The vessel arrived at Georgetown. I do not remember where she came from, but it was at Georgetown she first came into contact with Canadian officials. But my department did not hear anything of her until she arrived at Pictou. I have not the official statement, but I understand that the provincial health authorities at Georgetown ordered the vessel away. Georgetown is not an organized quarantine port. Nor is Pictou, though it used to be three or four years ago. I sup-

pose the health authorities at Georgetown ordered her to Pictou on the supposition that it was still an organized quarantine port. Charlottetown is an organized quarantine port and was the proper place for her to go to with a quarantinable disease aboard. The moment we heard of her being in Pictou, she was ordered to proceed to Charlottetown, which would take but a few hours. The case was attended to by the quarantine officer there in due course. The quarantine law had to be carried out, and neither the government nor the department can be held responsible for damages accruing in carrying out the law, which is for the protection of the whole people against disease coming from abroad. The course of the department in taking the vessel from Pictou, a non-organized port, to Charlottetown, an organized port, was quite in accord with the necessities of the case and with the law. It was extremely unfortunate, no doubt, that the man died in the quarantine at Charlottetown. Whether that death was in any way due to the voyage from Georgetown via Pictou to Charlottetown, we have no means of knowing. The man had every care and attention in the quarantine hospital at Charlottetown, but unfortunately he died a few days afterwards. The vessel had to be quarantined and disinfected, and the people who were on board the vessel and had been exposed to contagion, had to be kept in quarantine until the period of the incubation of the disease was over.

Mr. KAULBACH. I understand how requisite it is that the quarantine regulations should be carried out very strictly. But what I complain of is that this man at Georgetown did not communicate at once to Pictou by wire and inform the officer of this vessel being there. Then he would have been advised that she could not be received at Pictou, but must go to Charlottetown. I think it is clear that this man neglected his duty. I may be wrong, but I understand that the customs official in Georgetown becomes the quarantine officer for the time being in cases such as that. He leaves off his official position as customs official, and becomes quarantine official. But I contend that the quarantine official should have communicated at once with Pictou by wire, because the life of that man depended upon all despatch being used and the shortest time employed to get him off the ship and under medical treatment. And finding that Pictou could not receive him, the vessel could then have gone direct to Charlottetown ; she would have been running on one side of the triangle, whereas she had to make three sides by sailing first to Pictou and then to Charlottetown.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are no records in the department showing what the hon. gentleman says about the customs collector at Georgetown. The first intimation we had of the vessel was when she arrived at Pictou. I will be glad if the hon. gentleman will give me the facts, and I will look into them.

Mr. KAULBACH. I will send the hon. gentleman the full particulars by letter to-morrow.

Mr. HACKETT. This poor sick mariner was a Canadian who had paid his sick mariner's dues. It is true that at Georgetown there is no quarantine hospital, but when a ship arrives the customs officer sees that a doctor is sent on board. The doctor was acting under the authority of the Dominion government, and the customs officer at that port was also an official of the Dominion government. There was a case of small-pox, and they had no means of taking charge of this sick seaman at that time, and I do not know for what reason they did not communicate directly with the Departmet of Public Health at Ottawa. Instead of doing so they ordered this vessel away from Georgetown to Pictou. I cannot understand why such a proceeding was allowed to take place. This vessel having a case of small-pox on board, was ordered from Georgetown to the port of Pictou in Nova Scotia, simply because the vessel hailed from a port of Nova Scotia. Now, we are all Canadians, and there is no reason why this poor sick seaman should have been dragged about from one port to another. Arriving at Pictou, the vessel was ordered back again to Charlottetown, where there was a quarantine hospital. I say it was a case of gross inhumanity, and was so regarded by the people of the maritime provinces, that this poor man should have been carried around in this vessel for seven or eight days without medical treatment, when he was paying into the government his sick mariner's fees. Certainly there was neglect somewhere. The poor man went into the quarantine hospital at Charlottetown and died there, in fact, he was so near dead when he landed that he only survived a few hours. You will understand that the merchants of Prince Edward Island charter these vessels from the province of Nova Scotia to carry away produce in the fall of the year, and it is important that these vessels should come freely into our ports for the purpose of carrying away cargoes. Another case of small-pox occurred, and this time, notwithstanding the experience of the former case, the vessel was boarded by the customs officer, a doctor diagnosed that sick seaman's case, and then he was taken in a vehicle and driven from Georgetown to Charlottetown, a distance of thirty miles, through the country, exposing to contagion the people all along the route. No attempt whatever was made to warn the people of their danger. I have no doubt the minister is conscientious in this matter, but I want to impress upon him the need of taking precautions in cases of this kind where the public health of so many people is exposed to danger. There should be some provision made at a port like Georgetown, some kind

of a temporary hospital outside the limits of the town, where cases of this kind can be attended to by doctors and nurses.

Mr. BELL. I think there is a hospital at Pictou for contagious diseases of seamen, a hospital building.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. At one time Pictou was what was called an organized port, having a quarantine hospital and grounds. We found that the arrivals at that port were so few in number that there was no necessity to maintain it. I think Port Hawkesbury was another place in the same position, and was abandoned as an organized port. Having the property there we still keep charge of it, and if occasion arises at any time, it will be possible to use it.

Mr. BELL. I observe that there is a charge in the Auditor General's Report for a caretaker for that building and it would seem, that, having that building available, this person should have been received into the hospital, instead of having him sent back to Charlottetown. The port has a medical officer and it also has a hospital.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have no medical officer under salary.

Mr. BELL. But still, you had the hospital and this caretaker, and it would seem much more in the interest of the sick man if he had been introduced into that hospital which was at hand at the moment. Another point; apparently in the ports where you have no organized system, you rely on the customs officer?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We ask the customs officer to call in a medical man in case of need.

Mr. BELL. There should be such information in the possession of these customs officers as would prevent them from sending a person to a wrong point which possibly may arise from the conflict of authority, as the customs officer is in one department and the quarantine is under the charge of the hon. minister's department. It would be an improvement if instructions were given to customs-house officers which would prevent a recurrence of this incident.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Instructions are sent to them regularly and if a customs officer at Georgetown did send this man to Pictou I do not know why he did so.

Mr. KAULBACH. The medical officer in Pictou informed the captain that the man would be taken on shore there and receive treatment. After he was there three days, this was recalled, and the captain got orders to proceed to Charlottetown, which involved delay again. I quite agree with the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) that, having a building there, the man should have been received and placed under the care of a medical man. If so, and if he had received proper treatment, it would probably have saved his life. The difficulty arose from the customs officer or the quarantine officer at Georgetown not having despatched that vessel immediately to Charlottetown, first having communicated the fact to Charlottetown as quickly as possible. If this had been done there would only have been a day's delay between the time of the vessel leaving Georgetown and her arrival in Charlottetown.

Mr. SPROULE. This item was held over on a previous occasion for the purpose of allowing the minister an opportunity of furnishing certain information to the committee regarding the points at which quarantine officers were employed owing to the prevalence of small-pox. Has he that information?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I have already given the list of those who are still employed. I was asked to supply a list of those who had been employed and whose services had been dispensed with. I have the list now.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the hon. minister give us the names of the parties who are employed now, what kind of work they are doing, and at what point they are stationed?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All over the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. I am specially interested in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Ontario there is Dr. Gibson at Sault Ste. Marie, whose services were dispensed with on 31st October, 1900. He was reappointed on the 22nd of November, 1900, and is employed still; Dr. Sheppard, whose services were dispensed with on November 30, 1901; at Thessalon, Dr. Baxter, whose services were dispensed with on November 15, 1901; Port Arthur, Dr. G. W. Brown, whose services were dispensed with on 30th November, 1901; at Collingwood, Dr. Aylesworth, whose services were dispensed with on 31st November, 1901; Fort William, Dr. Hamilton, whose services were dispensed with on 30th November, 1901; Bruce Mines, Dr. Carter, whose services were dispensed with on 30th November, 1901; Mine Centre, Dr. D. McKenzie, who is still on; Rondeau, Dr. McCully, whose services were dispensed with on the 15th November, 1901; Owen Sound, Dr. McCulloch, whose services were dispensed with on November 30, 1901; Chippewa, Dr. Gray, whose services were dispensed with October 22, 1901; Beaver Mills, Dr. McCrimmon, who is still at work; Cornwall, Dr. Wheeler, whose services were dispensed with on February 28, 1902. These are all in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you none at Sarnia or Detroit or places like that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention is to guard the frontier wherever there appears to be danger of the

disease coming over. The parts of the United States opposite these ports that I have referred to and from which vessels are coming to these ports are parts of the United States where, apparently the disease is not well under control. In Detroit and that neighbourhood the reports from the United States authorities and the information of the provincial authorities of Ontario show that the disease is well under control and that there is not any likelihood of persons carrying the disease in crossing the frontier. The same is true of Buffalo on the Niagara frontier and that is why we have not undertaken to place observing physicians at these places. We have worked as far as possible in conjunction with the provincial health authorities and wherever they have considered that there was danger and when they have notified us we have acted, but, where they seemed to consider there was no danger we have believed them to be acquainted with the conditions and we have thought it was not necessary to make an appointment.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen it reported at different times that the disease was prevalent in Michigan and quite close to Detroit. It has been imported into our section of the country on the train. There was one case at least. Is there no provision for examining passengers on trains coming across the line so as to prevent the importation of disease ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That work is only done where there is danger which the director general of public health ascertains from information supplied him. The frontier at Sarnia and Niagara did not seem to be dangerous and we have not done work there. But in other parts, on the representations of the provincial authorities we have taken precautions.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that people are prevented from going from Canada to the United States unless they are vaccinated.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There may be parts of Michigan where this is done, but it is not general.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard this was done at Buffalo.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister read a list of men who had their services dispensed with last fall. Does he intend to re-employ these men when navigation opens?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Wherever there seems to be any danger some one will be appointed.

Mr. SPROULE. What rule guides the minister as to where there is danger and where there is not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have representations from the provincial authorities on that matter.

Mr. SPROULE. You mean the provincial Board of Health.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have always taken representations from the provincial Board of Health and in some cases the town authorities have asked for protection. The director general of public health decides if these representations are well founded or not.

Mr. McGOWAN. I understood the minister to tell us that he had only jurisdiction over the frontier and that the provincial authorities look after the public health elsewhere ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. McGOWAN. I see by the report that Dr. James Paterson, of Winnipeg, was sent by this government to the North-west territories.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The territories have no provincial organization and my department has been charged by the government with looking after the health work there. Dr. Paterson has been sent to superintend that work. We have done the same thing in the Yukon.

Mr. BELL. I understand that we have the right reserved to us to discuss other matters affecting this department. I want to speak briefly about the Year-book.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That item was passed last night on the understanding that if any gentleman wished to speak on it again he could do so. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) thinks it desirable he can do so now.

Mr. BELL. Looking at the papers this morning I find that the minister stated last night that some errors had crept into the Year-book, and that he would see that it did not occur again. There has been a very serious misapprehension in regard to this matter. So far as I have been able to look into it I am satisfied that the Year-book has been absolutely correct within the sense it professes to be correct. The criticism that was addressed against the Year-book was based upon the figures giving the estimated population of Canada, and these figures were not quoted correctly from the Year-book by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. He did not quote them with absolute accuracy. I am referring now to the unrevised version of 'Hansard.' For instance, the figures for 1897 were quoted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who substituted 4,875,005 for the correct figures in the Year-book which are 4,875,035. It is not an important error, but it shows that there was not absolute accuracy in quoting the figures. The first occasion on which

that hon. gentleman referred to the figures, he gave the estimate as not 4,875,035, but 4,856,236, and so on throughout. Whether there was carelessness in transcribing or not I cannot say, but the figures were not presented to the House absolutely as they are in the Year-book.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From what Year-book is the hon. gentleman quoting now ?

Mr. BELL. The Year-book for 1889, which the Minister of Trade and Commerce informed the House later he was using. In my first criticism I did not know what volume he used, but I took 1900. I am referring now to the Year-book of 1889. The minister on that occasion, referring to the year book of 1889, made this very extraordinary statement. He said: 'They suppressed 1890 and 1891, and I will supply the figures.' Now, how could any man rationally say that the Year-book of 1889 suppressed the figures of the two following years ? Evidently there was some great confusion of ideas on the part of the gentleman who made the charge. He goes on to say that he will supplement these figures, and he does it, not by quoting from the volume of 1890, where he would have found the estimates for that year ; but supplying an estimate on his own authority while giving the Year-book as his authority. He gave 5,210,000 for 1890, whereas the Year-book gives 5,189,099, and for 1891 he supplied the estimate of 5,345,000, where the Year-book contains the actual figures of the census of that year, namely, 4,843,256. If the hon. gentleman, in giving this calculation to the House, had followed the same system as was followed by the Year-book, instead of adding 134,000——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If I might suggest to the hon. gentleman, he is going into a number of figures, in which I confess I am not able to follow him, because I have not studied the question. He is practically making a criticism of statements made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. BELL. I may say that that matter is past, so far as I am concerned. I am merely speaking in consequence of what I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say last night.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. member is apparently undertaking to correct what the Minister of Trade and Commerce stated, and I was only going to suggest that he had better do that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce himself is present, when any statements he may have to make in reply to the hon. gentleman could be made. I am not myself in a position to go into the details of all these figures.

Mr. BELL. I was going to call the attention of the minister to the fact that I have already attempted to make that correction in the House, and I am precluded from doing so by the rules of the House. I am not doing that now. I am merely quoting the figures of the Year-book to show that the statement to the effect that this volume is inaccurate was thrown out I think too hastily. That statement was based on the fact that the estimated population of Canada did not turn out to be the correct population when the census figures were obtained. That could scarcely be hoped for. The Year-book does not publish, and never has published, these figures as being absolutely correct, but always as estimated ; and in order to avoid any misleading impression, the Year-book states as follows :

> No information is available for ascertaining the increase of population since 1881 (except as above mentioned), with any great practical accuracy. The population used in different parts of this work is derived from logarithmetical calculations based on census returns, and is believed to be sufficiently near the mark to be of value in the calculations for which it is used ; but it will be readily understood that from the absence of returns of births and deaths and from the incessant movement of population, both ways, across the long frontier, of which it is impossible to keep any record, it is impossible to obtain any absolutely correct statement of the population between census years.

The Year-book in making that careful provision has certainly prevented the estimated figures being the occasion of any error, and I may say that there is no other way in which this House or the departments could have the advantage of knowing what the population of Canada is in any particular year, except by using an estimate made up in this particular way. I would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this system is not peculiar to Canada, but that the same system is adopted in the official figures used in all countries. I quote from the Statesman's Year-book of 1892, to show that the system followed in Canada is followed in that publication. It says :

> The registrar general's estimate of the population in the middle of each year is based on the assumption that the rate of increase which prevailed in the intercensal period immediately preceding has since been maintained.

In making up these figures, we have to assume that the census returns are correct, and that the annual increase of population shown by the census returns is correct ; and, using these two factors, by a purely mathematical calculation, an estimate is made each year of the population of Canada. While that is certainly liable not to be correct, still it is apparently made with every degree of honesty, without any intention to deceive, and is approximately correct; and I am sure that the minister, when he looks into the matter more fully, will find that he has nothing to apologize for so far as this publication issued under the authority of his department, is concerned. As the

figures are not represented to be the actual figures, but merely estimated figures, and as they are prepared by a system of logarithmic calculation, which excludes any idea of motive in their preparation, they are the same as any official would have to supply in making up these returns. I would not have made these remarks but that the minister last night seemed disposed to admit that there was an error in the calculation, which is not the case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not going to accept any general statement of errors. If I do not find errors, I certainly will not act as if there were errors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a matter which has been brought to my notice. I refer to the dismissal of Capt. D. C. Stewart, who occupied a position in connection with the quarantine service in Halifax until quite recently. I think he was removed on the 21st of November last, and I would like the minister to make a statement as to the causes which led to his removal.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I would say that it is true Capt. Stewart was dismissed after having being reported to the department as having been off duty without permission. The statement as made was referred to him for a reply. In his defence he distinctly admitted the offence. When the occurrence first took place, Dr. Montizambert was in England attending the tuberculosis convention, and I was also away at the moment for a short time. The gravamen of the offence was his going away from duty without permission, and his making misrepresentations to the head of the quarantine service at Halifax in regard to certain repairs which were being made to the boiler of the ship of which he was captain, the result being that boat was laid up for two weeks sooner than there was any need for, and the department had to hire another boat to take her place. These accusations were submitted to Capt. Stewart, and he was given an opportunity to reply to them. It was clear from his own reply and from the evidence we obtained in regard to the matter, that he had been neglectful of his duty in being away without leave, and also that he had made misrepresentations, causing the laying up of the vessel. Under these circumstances, I did not see how it was possible to maintain the discipline of the establishment if I allowed him to remain in the service. I therefore felt constrained, after long and careful investigation, to dismiss him from the service. I believe that I am stating the main facts correctly, and can supplement them by any further details, if required, from the correspondence before me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, this gentleman was a very long time in the public service—I understand upwards of twenty years—and I am not aware that any charge of any kind was ever made against him before. I took the liberty of asking the hon. member for Victoria, N.S., (Mr. Ross), who, when collector of customs at the port of Halifax, was the chief of this officer for a number of years, and he told me that, while in his department and under his control, Captain Stewart was a most faithful, zealous and efficient officer. And I have no doubt my hon. friend would repeat his statement were he here to-night. The charges against Captain Stewart were made by his superior officer, Dr. Mackay. Dr. Mackay charges him, in the first place, with having on the 24th of July, left the city between 11 and 12 o'clock in the morning, without permission, and with having gone out on the St. Margaret's Bay road on a spree, and remained away all afternoon. Captain Stewart absolutely and specifically denies this charge. He says that no vessel was expected and that, although he did go for a drive, during an hour or two, on the St. Margaret's Bay road, he had made provision so that in his absence there could be no detriment to the public service in case any vessel should be sighted. In the next place Dr. Mackay charges him with not having been on duty when the steamship 'Nassovia' arrived from Stellin, for coal. Captain Stewart explains that Dr. Jones, the quarantine officer, boarded that vessel at seven in the morning, and that no delay whatever occurred in connection with the quarantine service, and in verification of that statement he referred the department to Dr. Jones himself, who is a well known physician in the city of Halifax, an officer of the department, and whose statement, I believe, would verify that of Captain Stewart. Captain Stewart is also charged by Dr. Mackay :

That in the afternoon of the 25th of July, the steamship 'Ulunda' arrived from Liverpool and steamed up the harbour with her quarantine signal flying and there was no word from you of her coming. Dr. Mackay states he saw the quarantine signal on the 'Citadel' and called up his office four different times to ascertain if there was any word from you about the arrival of a vessel and always received a negative reply.

Captain Stewart replied :

When the steamship was coming up the harbour I called up Dr. Mackay's house several times and could get no answer. After trying for some time without hearing from him, I then called up Dr. Jones, and was informed at his house that he was off duty attending the reception of Lord Minto, and Dr. Mackay knew it. After looking around the town, I went to the steamer and found that Dr. Mackay had been there ; I did not think the circumstance very remarkable, as I have frequently known Dr. Mackay to be an hour or so late getting to ships. I may say in this connection, as illustrating Dr. Mackay's anxiety to attend ships promptly that on the 9th August, the ss. 'Damara' arrived from England at 11.40 ; it being Dr. Jones' turn and he being away I called Dr.

Mackay who was in bed and he refused to go to her, telling me to let her stay till Dr. Jones got home; he got home at 1 o'clock and went and cleared the ship.

There seems to be no contradiction of that statement in the papers, and it appears that this gentleman who made the charge against Captain Stewart was willing to allow the vessel to remain in quarantine for hours because it was not convenient for him to attend to it. With respect to the statement of the hon. minister that Captain Sewart misrepresented the circumstances with regard to the condition of the boiler on the 'Argus,' Captain Stewart's statement is as follows :

I beg to make a general and explicit denial. I could have no object in pursuing the course with which he charges me; he knew and we all knew that the work had to be done, that Mr. Dodwell ordered it to be done, and that Messrs. Ferguson & Cox had the contract ; it could not be done without the boat laying up. She was there in the hands of the contractors with whom I had no interest in any way, and whether they were a short time or a long time doing the work was a matter over which I had no control, and certainly I had no interest in making any misrepresentations to Dr. Mackay or anybody else about it. He charges me with refusing to answer a letter he wrote asking for explanation of the work : This charge is not true, I immediately went to him making verbal statement of the condition of the work ; having done so, I did not think it necessary to write him a formal letter on the subject which seems to be the essence of his complaint. In connection with Dr. Mackay's charges against me he makes several statements that are not in accordance with the facts; for instance he says that I told him positively that the boiler was finished at a certain date, with the exception of making a few holes. I never told him anything of the sort, I knew the boiler was not finished, and I never told him that it should take so many days to do any part of the work. I could not say anything about such work as it is altogether out of my line, and it would be absurd to suppose that I would be undertaking to give opinions or statements with regard to the same. If Dr. Mackay was very anxious to know about the progress of the work, he should have consulted the contractors or asked Mr. Case, the engineer, whose opinion would be worth something as it was directly in his line.

I have thus answered categorically the several charges which Dr. Mackay has laid against me in the discharge of my official duties, and will now refer the matter in connection therewith.

Captain Stewart says further :

After about sixteen years of official service under the government both in customs and quarantine, I beg to say that Dr. Mackay is the only man who has ever made the complaint against me during all that time. Dr. Mackay is a difficult man to get along with as everybody knows. I have no hesitation in referring to Dr. Jones with the utmost confidence that he will give me a certificate of character as a zealous and faithful officer as I have always tried to be.

Dr. Jones, to whom he refers is a warm supporter of the present government, a man who is well known and highly respected in the city of Halifax, and I would like to know from the hon. minister whether he has any statement from Dr. Jones that in any way corroborates the charge of Dr. Mackay that Captain Stewart was at any time guilty of any dereliction of duty in the public service ?

There is another circumstance which seems to place this matter in not a very favourable light, from the standpoint of fair-play. Captain Stewart had sixteen years of good and faithful service to his credit, without a single mark or charge against him up to this time. It is quite true, and I think I may say, without reflecting in any way on Dr. Mackay, that that gentleman is not a particularly easy person to get along with. Any one who knows him and is acquainted with his disposition, knows that he is sometimes a very difficult man to please indeed. Would it not have been fair for the hon. minister, under the circumstances, having this positive and categorical denial of all the charges, to have allowed Captain Stewart to bring evidence in support of the statements he made and to be confronted with the man who made the charges against him to have these charges determined by some impartial tribunal, with the right on both sides to call, and cross-examine witnesses, and thus be given that fair-play to which any man is entitled in respect of his property and character in this country—the right to have a charge against him determined by an impartial tribunal in his presence. But that is not the course which my hon. friend has pursued. It is true that Captain Stewart admits that he went out driving on Margaret's Bay road, but surely for a trivial offence of that kind—if it can be called an offence, which I doubt—after sixteen years faithful service, the Minister of Agriculture ought not to have dismissed an official of this kind. If he were to follow that line of conduct, there are very few officials in his department who would not be subject to instant dismissal, and I am sure that if he tested Dr. Mackay—and I am speaking not without the book in this connection—by that same measure, he would have been compelled to dismiss that gentleman long ago.

The Minister of Agriculture should reconsider this matter. He has dismissed this man without investigation, and on the statement of Dr. Mackay, which is absolutely disputed by Captain Stewart, except in the one respect I have mentioned, the trifling matter of taking a drive of two or three hours out St. Margaret's Bay Road. But that was taken after precautions that the public interests should not suffer. Surely, on facts of that kind a man is not to be dismissed from the public service. Every charge made by Dr. Mackay is met with an exact and categorical denial. And what I say is that the Minister of Agriculture should have some regard to the statement made four or five years ago by the Prime Minis-

ter that no man against whom a charge is made should be dismissed without an investigation. Here is a man who seems to have been dismissed without an investigation. He has been in the public service sixteen years, and after giving his work to the country for that time, he is thrown out upon the world without the means of livelihood, no investigation having been held, and no opportunity afforded him of confronting his accusers or of calling witnesses on his own behalf.

There is another circumstance about it which is of an extremely harsh character, and that is that notwithstanding all that this man has paid into the superannuation fund for a number of years, he is absolutely unable to get the slightest satisfaction from the department as to whether any portion of the money paid will be refunded. Does the government propose to keep the money taken from an official in that way? Will the hon. minister add to the consolidated revenue of this country the few dollars which are nothing to the public, but which mean a great deal to this man? Among the correspondence, I have statements showing some of the payments he has made. And it seems to me that the minister has not only treated this man with harshness in dismissing him, but with absolute indifference ever since on the question of these payments. Without casting any reflection upon any official of the department, I may say that the department did not seem to know, for months after Captain Stewart had sent in his denial of these charges, that he had written a letter on the subject at all. On the 13th August, Captain Stewart made his answers to the charges. On the 5th of September he received a letter from the department stating that on the 10th of August he had been written to by the department, but no answer had been received. On the very day he received this letter he sent a telegram:

Replied to letter August 10th on 13th. Will mail copy to you at once.

The 13th would be the day when, in ordinary course of mail, he would receive the letter of August 10th. On the 7th September he received a letter asking why he did not answer the charges. On the same day he received that letter, he telegraphed to the department and also wrote. So far as the correspondence is concerned—if that is any indication of Captain Stewart's conduct as a public servant—he seems to have been up to the mark and to have conducted it in at least as businesslike a way as the department did. On the 16th September he communicated with the department on the question of whether an investigation would be granted or what course would be pursued. The next he heard in relation to this matter was on the 27th November, 1901, when he was coolly informed that, without an investigation, he had been dismissed. And, according to the Order in Council he was dismissed for 'neglect of duty and misconduct and in the interest of the public service.' That remains against his character without his having had a single opportunity of making his defence before any fair tribunal or of meeting his accusers face to face and producing witnesses on his own behalf. I do not suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture desires to be unjust to this man. I understand that, before he entered the public service Captain Stewart was a Conservative in politics. So far as I know, since he has been in the department he has taken no part in politics. If he has been a Conservative in politics in the past, that is no reason why he should be denied a fair trial or investigation. Why should any man in the public service to whom a salary and a position are an asset as much as property is an asset, be deprived of the position he holds and the salary he enjoys without a trial? If that can be done why should not any man be deprived of his property or rights without trial in court? What possible ground can the minister present for treating this officer in the way he has done?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I take no exception to the way in which the leader of the opposition has presented his case. He has presented fairly the facts he has stated, but he has not brought forward the facts which justify the course of the department. I may say that this matter has nothing to do with politics. Captain Stewart's opinions were not in any way the reason for the action taken by the department. Captain Stewart had been for some time in the department as an employee of the Minister of Customs. Years ago, the boat at Halifax was jointly used by the Customs Department and the Department of Agriculture. Some time after the present Minister of Customs and I came into office a change was made. Though it was known to me that Captain Stewart had been a Conservative, I did not take advantage of the change, though it could have been done quite easily, to let him go from the service. This shows that there was no question of politics involved. Whether Captain Stewart has been, since I took office, a Conservative in politics or not, I do not know, and have not sought to ascertain. I certainly did not wish to be harsh in this case—do not like to be harsh in the case of any officer. At the same time, I feel that the discipline of the service must be maintained and, when it comes to a question between an inferior officer and a superior officer, and when the inferior officer has been clearly shown to have been derelict in his duty, it seems to me I must stand by the superior officer and maintain his authority and prestige in the department. Captain Stewart acknowledges that he was absent from duty without leave. He gives excuses, but the statement of his superior officer was very different from the one Captain Stewart

gives. Nevertheless, the fact that he was absent without leave was distinctly acknowledged by him. That was a dereliction of duty. But it was something which might have been overlooked if nothing else had occurred. Here was another matter, however, which was much more serious and which hurt the department much more, and was the fact of his laying up the boat two weeks before he ought to have done so, and worse than that, the misrepresentations, the false statements on his part to his superior officer, as his reasons for doing it. Now it may be said that these facts should have been brought out in an investigation. But as I said, we had first of all the statement of his superior officer, and when it comes to a mere matter of denial or assertion between two officers, I think it is more reasonable to accept that of the superior officer than that of the inferior. I have, however, here a letter written by the people who laid the boat up, who worked on the boat, in which they say distinctly that Captain Stewart's statements and representations are not true, and that as a matter of fact he ought not to have laid up the boat then, that there was no need of doing so. This statement is signed by Messrs. Ferguson and Cox, the machinists who were repairing the boiler of the boat, and it is written in answer to a letter from Dr. McKay asking them about it. It contains a clear statement from a disinterested party that Captain Stewart's representations as to his reason for laying up the boat, was incorrect and untruthful. Further than that, I find in a letter from Mr. Case, who was the engineer under Captain Stewart, that the latter had stated that he had been informed by Mr. Case that the boiler was ready to be put into the boat on the 15th of July, and he laid up the boat on the 15th of July. He represented that to Dr. McKay, and in his defence read by the hon. gentleman that is his excuse and his statement. But here is the statement of the engineer, and here is the statement of the people who were repairing the boiler, declaring distinctly that Captain Stewart had made a false statement and a false representation. Under these circumstances, and with these proofs, and with Captain Stewart's acknowledgment that he was away from duty without leave, I felt that in order to maintain the discipline of the station I had nothing to do but to accept the complaints of the superior officer against the subordinate, and to dismiss the subordinate. I do not see how I could have done anything else under the circumstances.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). If anything could convince one who has examined the papers that there was an absolute necessity for an investigation, it is the answer the hon. gentleman has just made. Dr. McKay states that Captain Stewart made certain statements to him, and then he goes to these men who were to a certain extent under his control, Ferguson and Cox, and gets from them a letter stating that these representations, which he alleges Captain Stewart made to him, were untrue and incorrect. Captain Stewart's statement which I have read, and which the minister has apparently forgotten, if he ever read it—Captain Stewart's defence is, not that these representations were true, but that he made no such representations at all to his superior officer, and he points out the reasons why he could not possibly have made such representations. My hon. friend, in the hurry of departmental business, has apparently overlooked this, and he thinks there is some contradiction of Captain Stewart.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Why was the boat laid up ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He explains why it was laid up, because Mr. Dodwell, the engineer in charge, decided that the boat must be laid up ; and he refers the minister, who apparently has not seen fit to act upon his suggestion—he refers him by implication to Mr. Dodwell, and he refers him by express direction to Mr. Case. But the letters which we have are not a contradiction of Captain Stewart at all, the letters which we have are statements from these men that the alleged representations to Dr. McKay are incorrect. Captain Stewart's answer is that he never made any such representations to Dr. McKay, that he would have no object in doing so. The hon. gentleman himself has demonstrated clearly the absolute necessity there was that this matter should have been referred to an impartial tribunal for inquiry. Then with respect to this alleged dereliction of duty in going out of town, I want to point out to the hon. gentleman further that no vessel came to Halifax that day, there was no detriment to the public service. Captain Stewart was in reach by telephone all the time, he was only a short distance out on the Margaret Bay Road ; and further than that, Mr. Case, the chief engineer who had charge of the boilers and engines while Captain Stewart was away, and the other men in charge were assigned their duties, and even if a vessel had been reported there could have been no possible detriment to the public service. Now the trivial offence of driving out to Margaret Bay Road in one day out of 16 years, is surely not to be assigned by the hon. gentleman as a sufficient reason for the discharge of this man after 16 years of faithful service. I see before me my hon. friend from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Ross) who was the chief under whom Captain Stewart served for a considerable portion of his time, and I venture to think that my hon. friend from Victoria will corroborate what I have said as to Captain Stewart having been, while under his direction, a faithful, a capable and an efficient officer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has tried to infer

that Captain Stewart laid this boat up under Mr. Dodwell's orders. There is nothing to justify any such statement. Captain Stewart's statement is this :

I could have no object in pursuing the course with which he charged me; he knew and we all knew the work had to be done, that Mr. Dodwell ordered it to be done, and that Messrs. Ferguson & Cox had the contract.

That does not indicate that anybody had ordered Captain Stewart to lay the boat up then, nor was there any need for it when the boiler was not ready. He laid the boat up a fortnight before the boiler was ready, when these other people stated that the boiler was not ready, and when Captain Stewart knew it was not ready.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Assuming that his view of the facts is correct, which I do not admit, does my hon. friend suggest that an error of judgment in laying the boat up a fortnight beforehand, is a sufficient reason for discharging this man after 16 years of faithful service ? I do not think he will take that position.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) As the leader of the opposition has appealed to me, I may say, speaking from recollection, that I think Captain Stewart was under me for about ten years. I did not know anything about his politics, whether he had any or not. I found him punctual, steady and attentive. His duties were to go out in his boat upon the harbour and see if there were any arrivals and to report himself to the customs collector in the morning and again in the afternoon. I never had any cause of complaint against him during all the time he was under me, and I am not aware that my successor in the custom-house had any reason to complain of him. I think I may say that if he had been continued under my successor in the custom-house, he would likely have been in his former position to-day. I may say again that this matter was brought to my notice in Halifax. My course, while in the custom-house when any officer neglected his duty, was to suspend him for a certain time and then restore him so as to give him another trial. My own feeling at the time was that to dismiss Captain Stewart without giving him a chance, after two or three months suspension, was, perhaps, applying to the case a more severe discipline than it merited.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Did the hon. member for Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Ross) ever have any occasion to suspend this officer ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I never had any occasion to find fault with him during all the time he was under me.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the hon. Minister of Agriculture going to restore this officer to his position ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I fear it would be quite impossible to maintain the discipline of the port if he were to be restored. It is evident that the tension between the subordinate and superior officers in consequence of this trouble had reached such a point that discipline could not be maintained if this officer were to be restored. In addition to the inferior officer having been derelict in his duty he has also made accusations against his superior officer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has he had an opportunity of proving the accusations against his superior officer ? It is no crime for a junior officer to make accusations against a superior officer in this country. Fortunately we have here no tyranny such as that. Does the hon. minister mean to say that the fact of Captain Stewart simply making charges against his superior officer is a justification for dismissing the junior officer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I did not say that. He was dismissed in consequence of the facts which have already been laid before the House, and not because he made charges against his superior officer.

Mr. HACKETT. After hearing the statement that the hon. minister has made, I think it is the superior officer and not the subordinate officer who is to blame on this occasion. The proper course for the superior officer to pursue, as we are informed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross, Victoria) who has had the experience of many years in the service, would be to suspend this officer if he was charged with a dereliction of duty instead of dismissing him in the arbitrary manner in which he was dismissed. This is not British fair-play or British justice. This gentleman who had been in the service for a long time, as we have been informed by the hon. member for Victoria, N.S., had the right to a fair trial. He might have been suspended by his superior officer and after investigation if he was found guilty of a dereliction of duty, then, he might have been dismissed. But, we find the superior officer, without giving this man an opportunity of pleading his case, or representing his case before his superior officer, dismisses him in the most arbitrary manner. It is the superior officer and not the subordinate who was guilty in this respect. Captain Stewart should be restored to his position and the man who dismissed him without investigation should be dismissed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that I have not used all the material in my possession, because I do not desire to do so at present. I would like him to give this matter some consideration, and at a future time I may ask him as to what course he will take in regard to certain officers in his department in the province of Nova Scotia against whom certain neglect of duty very

much more serious than anything that has been urged against Captain Stewart can be proved, if I am correctly informed. I will ask the hon. gentleman on a subsequent occasion, with that information in my hand, as to what course he will take if the charges which I will mention to him can be proved, and whether he will give any opportunity of proving them. What is right for one officer in the hon. gentleman's department, if politics do not touch this matter, will be equally right and just for any other officer in this department. I would like the hon. gentleman to give this matter some consideration and probably at a subsequent date I will take the opportunity of bringing to his attention certain information which has been placed in my possession in regard to the management of his department by other officers in the province of Nova Scotia.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly. I can take no exception to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) availing himself of such an opportunity, and I can assure him that if wrong-doing is proved against any of my officers I shall treat them in the way that is merited in consequence of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is a perfectly fair answer.

Cattle quarantines and veterinary division, $70,000.

Mr. McGOWAN. Is this for the tuberculin cattle test?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is included in this vote.

Mr. McGOWAN. We want to know something about it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will let me know in what particulars he wishes information, I will be very glad to give it to him.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain the item.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This item, I may say, is a combination of three items, which we have been in the habit of placing in our estimates for years. We have always had an item for general quarantine service, including cattle quarantine, an item for hog cholera and an item for tuberculosis The item for hog cholera was to pay the expenses in connection with the outbreaks of hog cholera and to pay compensation for the animals we slaughtered. The item for tuberculosis was to deal with that disease in the country and to guard against its introduction into the country. The item for general cattle quarantine was for the purpose of maintaining the general quarantine staff and of providing quarantine especially at our seaports, and at one point between us and the United States, and also to provide for certain work that has been done inside the country by the general staff. I have found by experience that sometimes one division of this work was less expensive; for instance, there might be more outbreaks of hog cholera and perhaps very little work in connection with tuberculosis. The result has been on several occasions in the last few years that I have had a surplus in one vote and a deficit in the other. Still the vote being devoted to a certain kind of work, I was not able to utilize the surplus of one to meet the deficit of the other. The work is considerably mixed up. The same officers deal with the work under the different votes, and it is difficult to apportion each part of the vote to their different duties. I have, therefore, asked the House to give me one vote of $70,000 this year for the whole veterinary division. The three votes last year amounted to $75,000, but unless there is more disease in the country than we expect, I think I can do with $5,000 less.

Mr. CLANCY. Is the minister disposed to take into consideration the strong protest made by very prominent gentlemen with regard to the tuberculin test. The minister is aware that the test has become very unpopular, and the protest against it comes from those who are in a position to judge of its value. I am informed that the Minister of Agriculture is at cross purposes with Mr. Dryden, the Ontario Minister of Agriculture, in regard to this matter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) alludes to a newspaper report of a meeting of the Shorthorn Breeders' Association at which they condemned the tuberculin test. The minutes of that meeting contain no such resolution as was reported in the papers. On the contrary, there is a resolution in the minutes dealing with the 90 days quarantine against Great Britain, and another resolution expressing the hope that they may have an opportunity of discussing the question of the tuberculin test with the chief veterinarian. I am very glad to meet them in that way, and as a matter of fact the chief veterinarian has already commenced a discussion with these gentlemen on the matter.

Mr. CLANCY. I did not make any reference to any resolution, but I said that strong protests were made by certain very prominent live stock breeders. I do not think the minister will deny that these protests have been made.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am aware that certain protests have been made. I have had myself a good deal of correspondence with certain gentlemen on this question, and representations have been made to me which I have replied to in regard to statements of fact and also in regard to the question of quarantine. This question is considerably complicated and a good many of the statements made have been

made without full knowledge of certain facts which I have been able to bring to the attention of these gentlemen. Not more than a couple of weeks ago a meeting of the Executive of the Shorthorn Breeders' Association (at which several of the gentlemen who made the strongest protests to me were present), discussed this question with Dr. Rutherford. There was a pretty unanimous expression of opinion that it was well to have further discussion, and that the situation was not such to-day as these gentlemen thought it was when they made the representations. There are reasons why, in the interest of the stock-breeders of this country, it would not be wise for me to state more than I have said in the present condition of the discussion with my department.

Mr. McGOWAN. At Guelph, the hon. Mr. Dryden was very emphatic in his protest against this tuberculin test, and I think he had the sympathy of most of the breeders who were present at that time.

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I appreciate the situation fully with regard to that, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that I am willing to do all that I possibly can to facilitate the importation, provided the interests of the live stock breeders of this country are not jeopardized.

Mr. CLANCY. Has not the hon. minister practically tied his hands by the quarantine arrangements he has made. Is it not a fact that if it is thought well to give effect to these protests it will practically overturn the arrangements made by the minister. If that be the only reason the minister has for refusing to abolish the test, that objection should not be allowed to stand in the way.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can only say that the reason which I have alluded to and which I would not care to state to-night, are not reasons which relate to any work I have done, but are simply in the interest of the live stock trade of the country, as the gentlemen with whom I have discussed the matter fully appreciate.

Customs—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports, $969,865.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is an increase of $10,000 in this item, and it is one that is absolutely necessary in the growing work of the department.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman passed a eulogium on his officers not long since, showing how well and economically the service was being conducted, and how the expenses were going down; but it would seem that the growing time is increasing salaries and causing the opposite course to be taken from that stated by the hon. gentleman not many hours ago. Perhaps he will tell us where these increases are made.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I shall be glad to do that. The increase in work is something like 5 or 6 per cent over last year, while the increase in the expenditure amounts to one and one-half per cent. There are applications from officers in all parts of the Dominion for increases, and they receive the best consideration which we are able to give them, but we cannot meet the wishes of all by any manner of means. It is intended at the beginning of the fiscal year to do something for such officers as we consider are underpaid, if the House gives us this amount of money. We also find that during the year expenses come upon us which cannot be foreseen, in the growing business of the country, and I have to ask the House to have some confidence in me, and to allow me the amount I ask, which will not be expended unless it is absolutely required. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that while the expenditure is increasing the work is increasing much more. I do not simply mean that we are taking in extra revenue, but that owing to the immense increase of traffic receipts, the number of entries has greatly increased the amount of clerical work that has to be performed and the outside services that have to be rendered in the transit of goods. For instance, I have now a requisition from my inspector who says that it is necessary to have two extra men at Fort Erie, in order that the increasing transfer work may be properly attended to. Of course, there is no revenue derived from that. Along the boundary in the eastern townships we have the same thing to look after. At Depot Harbour, where a couple of years ago we had none, it is necessary for us to have one officer all the time, and perhaps this year we may have to have two. I merely cite these as illustrations of the work that cannot be foreseen; and I have to ask the House to have some confidence in me, because in reality I have to provide for a year and a half ahead. We cannot tell what demand will be made upon us. I can only assure hon. gentlemen that there is no extravagance so far as I know. In fact many of the officers to whom we have found ourselves unable to give any increase, have made out a pretty strong case, and we have to try to meet these cases and do justice as far as we can.

Mr. LAVELL. I hope the minister will bear in mind the need of an additional transfer officer at Smith's Falls, where the transfer work has very largely increased.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I thank the hon. gentleman for reminding me of that. That is just one illustration of what I have been saying. Such an appointment is one which cannot be deferred much longer in the interest of the service.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the minister dispensed with the services of any of his officers during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I dare say there have been some—not many, I think.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will he recall them ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. During the past year I think there was only one, He was at Windsor. Unfortunately we had two or three cases, which I regret very much for the sake of the parties involved, in which there were defalcations. Although these were made good to the department, the view taken by the department is that it is dangerous to exercise clemency in cases involving money. Though if I had followed my own feelings I would have gladly have done so. In a case of neglect of duty or perhaps intemperance, there is a suspension for a little time and a restoration ; but where there has been a misappropriation of funds, we have felt it necessary to make an invariable rule applicable to all officers in all parts of the Dominion. But there have not been many dismissals.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). None for poliitcal partisanship, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, I do not remember any for partisanship during the past year. There were some after the election of 1896, but that is all over.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to ask the minister whether the landing waiter at Napanee, Mr. C. B. Perry, has resigned, and if so, whether it is his intention to appoint another.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The landing waiter at Napanee unfortunately had a paralytic stroke, and his resignation, I believe, is in the department, and I think the Treasury Board has acted upon it. If I remember rightly it was recommended that he be superannuated, but I think he was given two or three months leave of absence, the superannuation to take effect at the end of that time. A new officer will have to be appointed there, or, if I am not mistaken, he has been appointed.

Mr. WILSON. Will the minister let us know to-morrow whether he is appointed, and if so, who he is ? Of course he will hardly tell us who recommended him.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I recommended him myself, I suppose. I think the gentleman who has been recommended is Mr. Hanley.

Mr. WILSON. I suppose that is Mr. Hanley who has been station-master a great many years ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the information here, but if the hon. gentleman will call at my office I will not have the slightest hesitation in telling him.

Mr. HACKETT. Was Mr. James Curry, formerly collector of customs at Charlottetown retired from the service, and if so, why ? Were any charges brought against him ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think that he was superannuated and a successor appointed.

Mr. HACKETT. How old was he ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have not the civil service list, but he must have been between 60 and 70. Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows his age.

Mr. HACKETT. Would the hon. minister state upon whose recommendation he was retired ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I did not expect to be asked for the details and have not got the information here, but I will bring it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HACKETT. I am very pleased to hear that the minister will bring the information. I know Mr. Curry. He is a man of middle age, in splendid vigour, and quite as competent for the duties of the office as ever he was.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. How old is he ?

Mr. HACKETT. A little over 60, and but very few years older than the man who was appointed in his place.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The successor is generally older.

Mr. HACKETT. In this case he is younger but only by very few years. I have known Mr. Curry since he has been in the public service, and I know that a better, more faithful and more efficient officer could not be had, and he is quite as capable to-day as he was 20 years ago.

Mr. CLANCY. Why was he retired ?

Mr. HACKETT. To make place for a party heeler—a man who supported the government and for whom no place could be found unless somebody else's head were rolled into the basket. I have nothing to say about his successor, but he is not much younger than Mr. Curry. Mr. Curry must have been superannuated on the recommendation or report of one of the officials of the department. Mr. McLaren is the inspector of customs for the lower provinces, and I would like to know if he reported that Mr. Curry should be superannuated on account of age.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will find out and let the hon. gentleman know.

Mr. CLANCY. I would like to ask the minister if any portion of this increase of $10,000 is intended to be used for the purpose of making the town of Dresden a port of entry. Very strong pressure has been brought on the hon. gentleman's department to make it a port of entry. I admit that the business done there in the past would perhaps not have warranted his doing so, but a large beet sugar industry is well under way there, it is now doing a considerable export and import business, and the people are without those facilities to which a place of the importance which Dresden has suddenly developed is entitled to. The people there should not be obliged to go to Wallaceburg, twelve miles away on the one hand or to Chatham twelve miles away on the other, and I cannot conceive of any more pressing case than this one. More than half a million dollars are being expended there now, large quantities of goods are being shipped from other ports and are being brought in, and to make it a port of entry would not entail an expenditure of more than $400 to $500. Or it might be made an outport of the town of Wallaceburg, if nothing better could be done. If the hon. minister knew all the circumstances and was aware of all the possibilities with regard to the business of the place, he would grant my request. If no portion of this vote is to go for that purpose, I would ask my hon. friend to make provision for it in the supplementaries, which no doubt he will bring down.

Mr. STEPHENS. I wish to back up my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) in his request. Dresden is a growing town. A large beet-root sugar factory is being built there, and it is fully entitled to a customs officer. Many smaller places have such accommodation. I have been asked to press this claim on the minister, and I did put it before him at one time but he did not give me very much encouragement. I hope, however, he will see his way clear to open an office there this year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This is just another instance in which it is desirable to trust me a little in the matter of increasing the expenditure. This is one of the many places asking to be made a port of entry or the outport of some other port. We are unable to meet all the applications, and our usual plan is to send down one of our inspectors to visit the place and ascertain what amount of business is done, and the revenue likely to be derived, and be guided in a large measure by his report. I endeavour to accommodate the people as much as possible. By what my hon. friend as told me, Dresden is likely to become a much more important point than it has been, and while we may not be able to see our way clear to give it the facilities of a port at present, perhaps before I have the opportunity of asking a grant another year, it may become apparent that it should be made an outport. This vote covers the whole Dominion except the Yukon, and I could not possibly meet all the requisitions made out of this vote, but the matter is engaging the attention of the department, and if we have not a report already from the inspector, he will be asked to furnish it.

Mr. CLANCY. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has this place in his mind, and I hope that before the session closes he will see his way clear to grant the request. Where did they enter principally, Chatham or Wallaceburg ?

Mr. CLANCY. When navigation was closed, it would enter at Chatham, but during the season of navigation probably some would come from the American side by rail, and some by water, requiring entries to be made at both places. I am glad the minister has said that he will take the matter into consideration, and hope that before the session closes we will be able to settle it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Is it to Dresden or to Wallaceburgh that they are moving the factory from Michigan ?

Mr. CLANCY. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) is under a misapprehension. In the early history of the Wallaceburgh factory there was some negotiation looking to an arrangement of that kind. The Benton Harbour sugar factory, it seems, had been built in a locality that turned out unsuitable for the growth of the sugar beet. They did not come to an arrangement with regard to Wallaceburgh, but Berlin, I believe, has been chosen as the place to which the Benton Harbour factory is to be removed. The buildings at Dresden and Wallaceburgh are new, and so are the plants. Taking the two places together, the probability is that about a million and a quarter will be spent. So, the hon. gentleman will see, that it is very important that facilities should be afforded.

Mr. WILSON. Is the collector of customs at Napanee also the collector of inland revenue and inspector of gas meters ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. In the absence of my colleague the Minister of Inland Revenue, I am unable to answer that question definitely.

Mr. WILSON. I think Inspector Johnson, of Belleville, inspects the gas.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I am under the impression—but I may be wrong—that the collector of customs at Napanee is an officer of the Customs Department alone.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Johnson inspects the electric light.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. And gas too, I fancy.

Mr. WILSON. I may say that this man's predecessor was collector of inland revenue and gas inspector, and I think the hon. gentleman will find that the present collector of customs at Napanee is also collector of inland revenue. I have no objection to that, but wished to know the facts.

Customs laboratory—to meet expenditure in connection with the testing of sugar, molasses, &c., including pay of officers appointed or employed for that purpose, $121,500.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. There is an increase of $5,000. That is accounted for by the fact that one of the appraisers who was formerly paid from the inside vote has been transferred to the Board of Customs staff. This was Mr. Breadner, whose salary is $1,500. He is check clerk and Dominion appraiser. As the others were paid out of the outside vote, it was thought desirable that he should be paid from the same source. He is one of the Board of Appraisers. We have appointed an additional special officer at $1,000 a year to appraise machinery imported. There is a great deal of machinery coming in. For instance, sawmills have been removed from Michigan and are brought to Sarnia and other points in western Ontario. Of course this is second hand machinery, and we wanted an expert judge of the values of it. I think we have secured a good one.

Mr. CLANCY. Who is he ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. He is a gentleman who was for many years one of the foremen in the large machine shops of the Waterous firm at Brantford.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is where the Minister of Customs comes from.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, though I do not represent that riding now, as the hon. gentleman knows.

Mr. LAVELL. What work is done in the Customs laboratory ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We have a chemist, with some young ladies as assistants. When we adopted the new tariff we reverted to the old polariscopic test for sugar. Samples have to come here from all over the Dominion to be tested. That is the principal work in the laboratory.

Mr. LAVELL. Are no other articles examined there ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. For instance, there are patent medicines. As the hon. gentleman knows, if there are spirits in these articles, however small the quantity, the duty is double. These have to be tested. Many other articles also have to be tested in the laboratory. But the greater part of the work is the polariscopic test of sugar.

Mr. LAVELL. I mentioned the matter because it seems to me that in some ways the work might be extened. There is one item that comes under the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue. But, so far as the goods are imported, it seems to me that the analysis and test might be made at the border. I refer to fertilizers. Under the Act, only fertilizers having a certain quantity of nitrogen or phosphorous or both can be sold in Canada. These articles are manufactured in Canada, and when so manufactured come under the test of the Inland Revenue Department. And so do the others, for that matter. I notice that in the last bulletin, No. 75, issued by the Inland Revenue Department, there are a large number of cases where the requirements of the Act are not complied with, and, almost invariably they are fertilizers that have been imported. This ia a matter to which I intended to call the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue, but the importation of fertilizers affects the Customs Department. The Act says :

No fertilizer shall be sold or offered or exposed for sale unless it contains at least eight per cent of available phosphoric acid, or four per cent of ammonia or its equivalent in nitrogen or nitric acid ; or, when both phosphoric acid and ammonia are present, at least five per cent of available phosphoric acid and two per cent of ammonia or its equivalent in nitrogen or nitric acid.

I find that almost the bulk of the fertilizers imported have under the percentage that is called for and which is required from the manufacturers in Canada. I know at the present time it does not appear to come under the department of the Minister of Customs; but I think it would be a wise thing if these fertilizers as they are imported could be analyzed in the customs laboratory, for once they get into this country it is hard to follow them up.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That work has been wholly done by the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. LAVELL. But it is only done when samples are found here afterwards. And it seems to me the place to head them off is in the Customs Department at the border. Might it not be possible to have articles like that also analyzed in the customs laboratory ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will remember what the hon. gentleman says, and I will discuss with the commissioner to see what can be done. It has been done hitherto by the Department of Inland Revenue, and I thought it had been done well. I think they are required to send samples of all these fertilizers to the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. LAVELL. I think they do so, because an analysis of some samples is given here. I find on one page samples of some eight or ten compound fertilizers, every one of which is a long way below the percentage required.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Act prescribes what shall be the ingredients of the fertilizers ?

Mr. LAVELL. Not exactly the ingredients. I read the Act, that is subsection 2 of section 7. It does not say what other ingredients the compound must contain, but these ingredients must be present that are mentioned, or they cannot be sold within the Act to which Canadian manufacturers are compelled to conform. It seems to me that those importing fertilizers into this country should be subject to some test, and it could be most readily made by the customs officer at the border.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to point out to the Minister of Customs that he seems to have got a very extraordinary conglomeration of subjects under this item. I should think it would be far better to divide the vote according to the different items. He begins with salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and travelling expenses of other officers in the preventive service; then he goes to the customs laboratory and to an expenditure in connection with the test of sugar, molasses, &c., then he leaves that and goes to the board of customs ; he leaves that and goes to salaries of officers employed for compiling statistical returns. It is a remarkable mixture of subjects to include under one vote. Perhaps it has always been so, but if that is the case, it is not any more justifiable. The object of dividing these votes into items as to restrict the expenditure for specific subjects to the amount voted. When you bring together subjects so dissimilar in their nature under one enormous vote of $121,000, it does not seem to me that we are carrying out the idea of parliamentary control to any appreciable extent. Has the item always been voted in this way ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why are these subjects grouped together which have no possible connection with each other ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That vote is what we term the outside vote. The inspectors and their travelling expenses are connected with the outside service, and the appraisers are paid out of this vote. The statistical branch has been brought to Ottawa from the outside, and the work is being done here. The quarterly returns were all prepared at the different ports throughout the Dominion and were sent up to Ottawa where they were compiled and published in the Trade and Navigation Returns. When we instituted this statistical department, in order to get out the monthly statements, the officers performing the duties at the different outside points were brought here. It is really outside work, but they were brought here and are doing it here. That being the case, it was put in under this vote. There are a large number employed, and it was thought desirable they should be placed under that vote instead of being brought into the inside service. Perhaps some of them could not come under the inside service from being over age.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not finding any fault with the removal of the officers to Ottawa for the purpose of preparing these statistical returns. While I do not know much about it, I believe it was regarded by people who were competent to judge as rather a good move. But I wish to know why we should group together travelling expenses, the testing of sugar and molasses, the board of customs and statistical returns. This may be all right, but why group them under one item ? The idea of parliamentary control of the expenditure is inconsistent with that. You might come down to this House and ask us for $57,000,000 for the general expenditure of this country ; that might be convenient for the government, but it would not be consistent with the idea of parliamentary control of expenditure. I would like to have an opportunity of looking into that to see whether there has been any recent change made in the manner of presenting this class of votes. Perhaps, as the hon. gentleman has not his assistant here, and has not been able to give us some information we have asked for, it would be as well to let the item stand and not go any further to-night. I noticed a moment ago there were only thirteen gentlemen on the government side of the House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Shall we vote them down ?

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). I do not think we, perhaps, had better proceed with this item.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have no objection at all if the hon. gentleman desires to allow the item to stand. That is the way it was passed last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are some gentlemen who take a little interest in this department who are not here.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Shall we take up any other items or allow the whole thing to stand ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps, as we had rather a late session this morning, we had better allow it to stand. I do not think it will delay the hon. gentleman in any way. We will try to expedite his estimate.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like some information, when the hon. gentleman discusses the other items, in respect to the investigation made at the St. Thomas port of entry in regard to the last collector of customs.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Customs to the matter of the inspection of coal oil at Port Arthur. During the discussion with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Bernier), while his estimates were being voted, the matter of the abominable coal oil that passed the customs officer and which went broadcast over the country thereby becoming a scandal, the question was asked as to who was responsible for it and the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, whom we believed at that time to be responsible, said that it was the collector of customs at that port who was responsible. I would like the hon. Minister of Customs to be able to say to the House if he has had any complaints against that inspection, or what explanation his officer has made when he takes his estimates up again. I assume that it cannot have been unknown to the government, or to the minister who has charge of the officer at Port Arthur, that he permitted this enormous quantity of inferior coal oil to cover the whole country from Edmonton to the Red River as was shown by every hon. member from the North-west Territories during the time the question was under discussion with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was not in the House when the question was discussed with the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue but, knowing that the question had arisen, I thought we had better have inquiries made about it and I had inquiries made. I did not know whether the discussion would be renewed again or not, but the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Simmons), wishing to go home. I said to him that I did not think my estimates would be reached before he came back. He has gone and now that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has asked me to let my estimates remain and as the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) has mentioned a question that he desires information on before we go on, perhaps I had better alow my estimates to stand till the hon. member for East Lambton comes back, lest he might think it was a breach of faith on my part, although I told him that I could not tell whether the question would come up or not, and so, my estimates, if there are others ready to be gone on with, may be allowed to stand until next week.

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. member for East Lambton stated to me to-day that he had an understanding with the hon. Minister of Customs. He intimated that he was going home and that he felt some security in being able to leave for a day or two in consequence of that understanding.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I would not have gone on to-night at all but there did not seem to be any of my colleagues ready to go on. But I had made up my mind that if the question arose I would ask that an item be allowed to stand upon which to discuss it on a future occasion. If any of my colleagues are ready to go on, my estimates had better stand until next week.

Mr. McGOWAN. Referring to page 169 of the report of the hon. gentleman's department, I would like to know whether the linseed oil mentioned there is entered as imperiol gallons ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I expect so.

Mr. McGOWAN. Do you know as a fact ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will make inquiry. The hon. gentleman is referring to imported oil ?

Mr. McGOWAN. Yes, imported oil. The American gallon is less than our gallon.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. McGOWAN. Is the quantity entered given in imperiol gallons ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes, I have no doubt about it.

Mr. HACKETT. Referring to the matter we were discussing a moment ago in regard to the collector at Charlottetown the hon. minister said that he had not the civil list and that he could not tell the age of that gentleman. I have taken the pains to send for the civil list and I find that James Currie was born on the 7th January, 1835, which would make him 67 years of age. He was appointed to his position on the 10th May, 1880, so that he was 22 years in the service. Of course, he was capable of being superannuated. I find also that Mr. William Albert Lochart was appointed collector of customs at the port of St. John, a very important port, on the 7th May, 1900, and that he was born on the 11th March, 1835, being just the same age as Mr. Currie when he was appointed to that position. Mr. Currie has been superannuated because of old age and Mr. Lockhart who is of the same age was appointed two years ago as collector of customs at the port of St. John. I consider that scarcely fair. Mr. Currie belongs to that race of men who, at 60 or 70 years of age, are active and vigorous as may be instanced by our good friend from Victoria, N.S. (Mr. Ross) who is 80 years of age and who is active and vigorous still. I say it is entirely wrong for this man to be superannuated at the age of 67 when you appointed a man two years ago at the port of St. John of the same age, and especially when you superannuated Mr. Currie, not because of old age, but because you desired to find a place for an importunate partisan.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 17, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RATES.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick), moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 116) to amend the provision with respect to tolls of chapter 1 of the statutes of 1881 respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

He said: The House is aware that in January last an Order in Council was passed authorizing the Canadian Pacific Railway to increase its capital stock by $20,000,000. The Order in Council provided that no part of this stock shall be issued at less than par and also defined the purposes to which the money to be derived from the sale of the stock shall be applied.

It further provides that this increase of stock shall not in any way, be considered as affecting the question of the control of the government over the rates of the company after its earning power has increased to the extent of 10 per cent or 15 per cent on its capital. In order that the House should be fully informed of all the facts, I would ask permission to state the legislation which was in existence previous to the passing of this Order in Council, and which would be affected by the Bill I now introduce.

The statutory provisions relating to the ordinary capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are very few and may be stated as follows :

Section 2 of the company's charter, being schedule 'A' of 44 Vic., chap. 1 (Canada) fixes the capital stock of the company at $25,000,000 divided into shares of $100 each and provides that such shares, or any part thereof, may be granted and issued as paid up shares for value bona fide received by the company either in money, at par, or at such price and upon such conditions as the board of directors may fix, or as part of the consideration of any contract made by the company.

This section, it will be observed, enables the directors to sell shares at a discount.

Subsection 20, of section 7, of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, enables a railway company, subject to its provisions (and in this respect the Canadian Pacific Railway is subject to its provisions) to increase its original capital stock from time to time to any amount subject to the approval of its shareholders in the manner and form set forth in the said subsection 20.

Under this subsection the capital stock of this company was raised to $100,000,000.

By section 10 of 47 Vic., chap. 1 (1884) the capital stock is limited to $100,000,000, of which $65,000,000 was issued to shareholders and $35,000,000 was deposited with the Dominion government.

By section 3 of 48-49 Vic., chap. 57 (1885) the $35,000,000 of stock then in the hands of the Dominion government was ordered to be cancelled and destroyed, and any further issue was prohibited without the special authority of parliament.

The next and last statute in order is 55-56 Vic., chap. 53 (1892). Sections 3, 4 and 7 of this Act, which are the sections bearing upon the matter, are as follows :

3. In addition to its capital stock at the time of the passing of this Act, and to any which may be issued under the authority of the next preceding section, the company, being first authorized so to do by a vote of at least two-thirds of its shareholders, present or represented at a special general meeting duly called for the purpose, may, from time to time, issue shares of capital stock for any purpose for which the company requires new capital, in such amounts and at such times as the shareholders by resolution at any such meeting determine—such issue being first approved by the Governor in Council and notice of such meeting having been given in writing to each shareholder, delivered to him personally, or properly directed to him and deposited in the post office at least twenty days previously to such meeting, stating the time, place and object of such meeting, and the amount of the proposed increase.

Section 4 reads :

All shares of capital stock issued under the authority of this Act shall be subject to all the provisions of section 2 of the company's charter, as fully as if they were part of the capital stock therein named.

(7) The proceeds of each issue of shares of capital stock or of consolidated debenture stock under the authority of this Act shall be applied by the company exclusively to the purpose for which the shareholders authorized such issue.

In the Bill I have the honour to lay before the House, the government has taken the precaution to make it a matter of statute that the money shall be applied to the purposes for which it was said to be necessary at the time the Order in Council was applied for.

Now, with respect to the tolls. At the time of the incorporation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, railways were regulated by the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879, being 42 Victoria, chapter 9, which Act, in so far as its provisions are applicable to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in so far as they are not inconsistent with, or contrary to the provisions of the company's charter, and save and except as is specifically provided in the charter, is incorporated with the Canadian Pacific Railway charter. The only provision in this statute which need be referred to is subsection 11 of section 17, which reads :

(11) The parliament of Canada may, from time to time, reduce the tolls upon the railway, but not without consent of the company, so as to produce less than fifteen per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in its construction; nor unless, on an examination

made by the Minister of Public Works of the amount received and expended by the company, the net income from all sources, for the year then last passed, is found to have exceeded fifteen per cent upon the capital so actually expended.

The only other legislation in existence is section 20 of schedule 'A' of the company's Act of incorporation, 44 Victoria, chapter 1, which provides:

(20) The limit to the reduction of tolls by the parliament of Canada provided for by the eleventh subsection of the 17th section of 'The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879' respecting tolls, is hereby extended so that such reduction may be to such an extent that such tolls, when reduced, shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, instead of not less than fifteen per cent per annum profit, as provided by the said subsection; and so also that such reduction shall not be made unless the net income of the company, ascertained as described in said subsection, shall have exceeded ten per cent per annum instead of fifteen per cent per annum as provided by said subsection.

And the exercise by the Governor in Council of the power of reducing the tolls of the company, as provided by the tenth subsection of said section 17 is hereby limited to the same extent with relation to the profit of the company, and to its net revenue, as to which the power of parliament to reduce tolls is limited by said subsection eleven as hereby amended.

Now, subsection 11 of section 17 of the Act of 1879 has been repealed; but I still hold that it must be taken as forming part of the company's charter, and must be referred to in order to understand section 20, which I have just quoted. I have gone carefully through all the legislation, and am quite satisfied that there is not now in existence any clause similar to subsection 11, and this subsection and section 20 of the charter form the only legislation which need be referred to on the subject of tolls. Subsection 11 was re-enacted by the Consolidated Railway Act of 1886, and appears there as subsection 11 of section 16, but it was not re-enacted in 1888 when the Railway Act was again consolidated. Now, the Order in Council of January 23rd of 1902, so far as it relates to the increase of capital stock, went into force as soon as it was passed, and has been acted upon by the company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the wording of that subsection 11?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have given this with so much detail that, if hon. gentlemen will look at 'Hansard' to-morrow, they will see what my brief really is. Subsection 11 was re-enacted, as I say, in 1886, but was not re-enacted in 1888. At the same time, in order to understand section 20 of schedule 'A' of the company's Act, which refers to this section 11, it is necessary to read section 11 in conjunction with it. Now, this legislation was necessary only with respect to two points: with respect to issuing any part of this amount of capital stock at less than par—for under their charter they would have had the right to do so—and there is a restriction that the $20,000,000 shall not be issued at less than par; and then with respect to the tolls it is made a matter of special stipulation that when you come to apply section 20 for the regulation of tolls, this additional $20,000,000 shall not be taken into account. And, further, they have thought proper, at the suggestion of the Minister of the Interior, to provide that this money shall be specifically applied for the purposes for which the company say they require to have it—that is, it shall be applied in the improvement of the property of the company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The company are a consenting party to this, I suppose?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then, if I understand the minister clearly, this Bill leaves the company in the same position as they were in before being allowed to issue this twenty millions of stock and expend it upon the road. That is to say, the 10 per cent or the 15 per cent, as the case may be, which is provided in the Railway Act or in their charter, shall be only calculated on the $65,000,000 of stock as it is at the present moment?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is perfectly right.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). This Bill is a very important one. There long have been grievances in this country in regard to tolls on the Canadian Pacific Railway. This government is on record, some years ago, when the Crow's Nest Pass legislation was introduced, as favouring a principle which was in the public interest—that if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to get any further concessions from parliament they were to give concessions to the people in return. Now, legislation is introduced giving increased stock powers to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and yet the public grievances existing under the original charter are not being dealt with. These grievances are mainly two. First, there is the regulation of the rates after 10 per cent profit is earned. There is no proposition in this Bill, so far as I can gather, to deal with that. The government told us last year that it was their intention to deal with this question by proceeding to ascertain what the actual cost of the railway was, and on what amount this 10 per cent should be allowed. Are there provisions in this Bill for that being done? Here is a government that says that the transportation problem is the great problem. But what are they doing to ascertain the actual cost of this road, and so protect the public? The profit of that road, I venture to say,

is away above this 10 per cent. Their statements show it. The time has come when the freights ought to be regulated, and a law passed that the government, in the interests of the people, should ascertain what the cost of the railway was. Another grievance against the Canadian Pacific Railway is that of the exemption from taxation of their land grant. It was a very important question last session, and we were told that legislation was to be introduced, and these lands were very shortly to come under taxation, or, at least, a test case was to be made. And I believe that test is promised to be made. But that is not the way to cure this great grievance. The principle to be adopted is that recognized by the government in the Crow's Nest Pass case—that if a company are to get concessions, they are to make concessions. But here we see things done in the old way,—the old rule is followed, and everything the company wish is being granted, but the two substantial grievances, the exemption of the company's lands and the question of the tolls based upon the actual cost of the road, are not dealt with. I now point out to the House that the government are abandoning that principle which they claimed to be in the public interest in 1897, when the Crow's Nest Pass legislation went through, and they are not taking advantage of the opportunity offered them to procure the settlement of these two grievances which the public are labouring under. Then, as to the raising of this $20,000,000. I contend that a great deal of the money could be raised on the bonds of the company and a great deal of it could be paid out of the current earnings. But it is all to be raised on stock, notwithstanding the provisions of this Act and notwitshtanding that it more or less endangers the power of the public to regulate the rates under this 10 per cent clause. Had the government really been in earnest in seeking to promote the interests of transportation in the country, they would have said to the company: If you intend to issue $20,000,000 worth of stock, as your road is a fine road, we intend to take that stock on behalf of the people of Canada.

But we see none of these things advocated in this Bill. The public grievances are not corrected, there is no effort to correct them. There is no regulation of rates that we were promised long ago. And who were the gentlemen that howled against the rates in that awful charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway, if it was not hon. gentlemen opposite? Now they are in power, now they have an opportunity to remove some of these grievances, especially in respect to the regulation of rates. They know the rates are wrong, and they claim, to have secured a reduction of them in connection with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Now was the time, not to send the question to the law courts or a special committee to ascertain the actual cost of the road, but now was the time when they should have sat down with the directors of the company in the same way they did with the Crow's Nest Pass Company, and said: Gentlemen, we will give you your increased capital if you state to-day that you are under the 10 per cent clause. I believe they would have been prepared to say they would come under the 10 per cent clause; and therefore the whole question of the rates on that road would have been under public regulation. And the same thing in regard to that hideous thing that exists in their charter with regard to the land grants of the company, the patents for which are being issued now and were issued last year with enormous rapidity; the contention is now that for 20 years hence the land grants of the company not sold should be free from taxation in the North-west Territories. Public policy should have insisted on the public being protected in these respects. But there is no promise of it in this Bill to-day, but there is an indication that even this government who made that arrangement in 1897 with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway Company, are to-day carrying out the will, and behests, and requisitions of the corporations, and doing nothing for the public.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). It is not customary to debate the principle of a Bill upon the explanation which is given by the minister who introduces the Bill; and I think hon. gentlemen who sit upon the front bench of the opposition will agree with me that it is not conducive to clearness or to a fair and reasonable understanding of important questions, that a debate should be sprung upon the merits of a very important Bill immediately the minister who gave the explanation has sat down. I think the House will agree with me, too, that if my hon. friend was interested in a real solution of this large and important question he would have devoted his attention to making inquiries of the minister who introduced the Bill, with the object of eliciting any further information that might enable him to understand the question, and then give it more mature consideration before expressing an opinion. I may say to my hon. friend that this legislation under which he says the people of the North-west Territories are suffering, was placed upon the statute-book by his own party and not by the Liberal party. The grievances of the people in that respect have been redressed to a considerable extent by the legislation which the Minister of Justice has introduced this afternoon, and I would willingly challenge my hon. friend to lay his finger upon any piece of legislation that was introduced prior to the advent of this government, in which, in so few words, so many important matters were dealt with, and the grievances of the people were so effectually redressed, and the rights of the people so effectually protected as they are in the Bill which my hon. friend has just asked leave to introduce.

We had upon the statute-book the clause which stated that the tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should not be reduced until the net earnings were 10 per cent upon the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway. Now they come along and ask us for leave to extend that capital by $20,000,000. It is not suggested that the application is not a legitimate and an honest application. I think we will all agree, however our views may vary in regard to the policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that that company has now arrived at such a state of development that we need not look for any cheap huckstering or anything of that kind in connection with their capital. When they come forward with an application to increase their capital, we expect them to do so in a bona fide way, to get money for a bona fide purpose. There will be no question in the minds of members of this House upon that subject. They ask us to give them leave to increase their capital by $20,000,000. The first condition we make is this, that in considering the amount of capital actually expended in the construction of the railway for the purpose of applying the control which the law gives to the government in certain cases, that $20,000,000 need not be taken into consideration. So if the public get the benefit of that $20,000,000, and that sum does not add to the amount on which net earnings should be reckoned before we can apply our principle of control, can my hon. friend suggest anything in connection with our legislation for the Canadian Pacific Railway which would have placed the people in a better position in respect to the control of rates? My hon. friend, I believe, is something of a socialist. Perhaps he would have taken the position that he did not care what the law was on that point, or what the legislation was, that he did not care what the vested rights of the stock holders and bond holders of the Canadian Pacific Railway were, but he would simply have done as he pleased. I am bound to say, Mr. Speaker, that this government is not prepared to take that position; but we are prepared, and I believe with the full agreement of the other side of the House—of the responsible members of the other side of the House—to give full, fair and reasonable protection to every vested right of any person who invests a dollar in the Dominion of Canada. That does not prevent us, however, when government action is required, from taking fair and reasonable measures for the protection of the public, and I think it will be the sentiment of members on both sides of the House that we have gone in this respect as far as we honourably and legally could have gone.

Mr. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman say what this government have done to ascertain, in their five years of office, the actual cost of that railway?

Hon. Mr. SIFTON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Immediately before the Order in Council was passed which provided for this particular matter being dealt with in the way I have stated, another Order in Council was passed with the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and it was required that they should give their consent to the passage of that Order in Council before this Order in Council was passed. My hon. friend will learn I think with great delight, that the first Order in Council provided that an immediate reference should be taken to the courts for the purpose of determining the amount of the capital actually expended in the construction of the road, so that we might know exactly where we are in respect to the control of rates on this railway. That was the first thing to take into consideration and that arrangement was arrived at before the Order in Council was finally passed giving the company power to increase their capital stock. I need only add that we have done something more. We have done something which, I believe, speaking subject to correction, has not been done before in the history of legislation affecting railway companies in Canada. That is to say, that we have ear-marked this money to this extent; we have explicitly provided that no less a sum than $9,000,000 of the stock to be issued shall be expended upon rolling stock. I venture to think that the people of the North-west Territories and the people of Canada who have dealings with the company and who have felt the necessity of a very much larger amount of rolling stock being immediately provided, will look on this provision as one which will prevent a diversion of the money to any other purpose, and as evidence of the fact that the government have striven earnestly to protect the interests of the people. I do not think any further reference to my hon. friend's remarks is necessary. I would not have thought it necessary to speak at all were it not for the fact that he has taken the position, which is not a usual one, of criticising the merits of a measure upon its introduction without taking time to acquaint himself with its provisions.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) answer this question? Are you going to proceed with the reference to the courts?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At once.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I just want to ask the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) a question. Before doing so, I may say that the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr Sifton), after lecturing my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean) on the impropriety of discussing this measure on its introduction, has proceeded himself, to follow his example by discussing it at very consider-

able length. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice what has been done in connection with the disposal of the question affecting the tax exemption of this company in the North-west Territories? I do not, at present, recollect whether legislation was passed last session in regard to it or not. If legislation was not passed it was because it was found that there would be no need of special legislation for this purpose. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether this Bill deals with the question at all, and if it does not, would he be good enough to tell us what action has been taken on that question, and whether he expects that at an early date any decision of the court in regard to it will be reached?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill does not in any way affect the question which has been mentioned by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I may say that I expected, of course, naturally, to make a statement in reference to that subject when the estimates were up, and I have prepared a statement which I intended to make then.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is quite satisfactory.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNORGANIZED TERRITORIES GAME PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 117) further to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894. He said: This Bill is not quite so formidable as its name would indicate. It contains a provision for the purpose of extending the protection which we have been giving to the wood buffalo in the North-west Territories. There are still a few small herds of wood buffalo in the Mackenzie River district, 500 or 600 or 800 miles north of Edmonton. For the last six years the law has prevented these buffalo being shot, the only persons likely to shoot them being the Indians. For the last six years we have had a mounted police patrol and the law has prevented these animals being shot, in order, if possible, to secure the preservation and increase of the herd. This Bill is for the purpose of extending the protection until 1907.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

SCHOOL LANDS FUND.

Mr. BOYD—by Mr. Roche—asked:

1. Was the reduction of the rate of interest from 6 to 5 per cent made at the request of the Manitoba government, the beneficiaries of the fund?

2. Is it the intention of the government to amend the Act so that at least it will not apply to the sales made prior to the enactment of 1901?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This question lacks something, as in its present form it is not very intelligible. I presume the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) means the school lands funds.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I presume that the question refers to the school lands fund, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) evidently had an idea in his mind which he did not express in the question. The answer to the first question would be no, and to the second question no.

I.C.R.—RESOLUTION OF WINNIPEG BOARD OF TRADE.

Mr. PUTTEE asked:

1. Has the Minister of Railways received from the Winnipeg Board of Trade a communication recommending that a 'thoroughly qualified expert in the management of railways be appointed to make a report on existing conditions, and what in his estimation would make the Intercolonial Railway a paying concern, and of the greatest benefit to the country; and also to study and make recommendations on the following alternative schemes for the consideration of the government and the people:—

'(a.) As to how the Intercolonial Railway could be extended so as to make it a real and permanent competitive factor affecting the greatest bulk of Canadian traffic.

'(b.) What arrangement for the granting to government might make under the present conditions, by virtue of its general powers, which would tend towards the same end as the above.

'(c.) What arrangement for the granting to other railways of running rights, management or other powers over the Intercolonial Railway would be feasible, and calculated to benefit general transportation; or what running rights over other railways should be acquired by the Intercolonial Railway, to accomplish the same purpose.'

2. If yes, is the suggestion contained therein likely to be accepted and acted upon?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). The answer to the first question is yes. To the second question the answer is: The government has not yet had an opportunity of considering the matter.

SUPPLY—PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITHIN THE EMPIRE.

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

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the rebuke which I have recently been subjected to in the House, I have still the courage to get up and bring to the attention of the public and of this House a further matter on the

lines of the discussion which was raised here two days ago. This question is the most important that there is before the people of Canada to-day. There is no subject of equal importance, and as there is additional light upon it, I propose to bring that additional light to the attention of the House and of the country. I hold in my hand the New York 'Tribune' of yesterday, dealing with the budget speech in England. The correspondent of the New York 'Tribune' in England is a very well posted man. He is in touch with the leading authorities in England. He is in touch, I believe, with the ambassador of the American government to the Court of St. James, and in his despatch to that paper yesterday he uses the following words :

While the colonies will reluctantly surrender their self-governing rights, it is probable that some basis of financial contribution to Imperial defence may be reached if some form of preferential tariff be adopted by the home government. Some colonies may be willing to agree upon a common increase of five or ten per cent in tariff duties and set apart the sum thus raised for defensive purposes, if the mother country be disposed to adopt the preferential system in dealing with the colonies.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a statement made in an important paper, and it is based, I believe more or less on some authority which shows that in the estimation, at least, of that correspondent, the imperial government is prepared to grant a preference to the products of the colonies provided the colonies would be prepared to join with it in defence of the empire. I contend, Sir, that in that budget which was introduced the other day in England, we would have had some arrangement made for preferential trade if the government of this country had said they were prepared to discuss the question of imperial defence. Let me read again the answer of the Canadian government to that invitation, and it is well worth reading it, and re-reading it. The first letter from Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto was of a general character, and it is dated the 27th of December last. I ask the House to bear in mind that date. No answer apparently was ever sent by this government to that general invitation. On the 23rd of January, almost a month after an urgent telegram was sent to Lord Minto dealing with this very question, and what does this urgent telegram say. Here it is :

Copy.
Para. of cypher cable.
Confidential.

Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto.

London, January 23, 1902.

It is proposed by His Majesty's government to take advantage of the presence of the premiers at Coronation to discuss with them the questions of political relations between the mother country and the colonies, imperial defence, commercial relations of the empire and other matters of general interest.

Mr. MACLEAN.

Should your ministers desire to submit definite proposal or resolutions on any of the above questions or should they wish to suggest any further subject for discussion, I should be glad to be informed of purport by cable in order that the other governments can be communicated with.

With view to proposed conference, hope your premier will be able to remain for a short time, say three weeks, after ceremony, as the guest of His Majesty's government.

Please telegraph reply. Despatch follows.

(Signed) CHAMBERLAIN.

Observe these words. The Canadian government was asked to give a speedy reply 'in order that' the other colonial premiers might be acquainted of its contents. They were asked to telegraph that reply. But what took place ? For ten days the Canadian government had this urgent cable in their possession and they never answered it, and therefore no despatch followed, as the British government said a despatch would follow. After ten days this government sent an answer by cable, and I shall read that answer to the House again. They waited ten days until I suppose the dissidents in the cabinet had been mollified in some way, and until some unanimity was come to. Here is their answer :

Copy—Secret.

Lord Minto to Mr. Chamberlain.

Ottawa, February 3, 1902.

Referring to your despatch of the 27th December, my government accepts invitation extended to Prime Minister to attend Coronation. He expects to sail about 10th of June, accompanied by Lady Laurier, but exact date cannot yet be fixed.

Referring to the several questions mentioned in your despatch of 23rd January, the only one which in the opinion of my ministers, gives promise of useful discussion is that of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire. The political relations now existing between the mother country and the great self-governing colonies, and particularly Canada, are regarded by my ministers as entirely satisfactory, with the exception of a few minor details, and they do not anticipate that in the varying conditions of the colonies, there can be any scheme of defence applicable to all.

In the opinion of my ministers, there is thus but a limited range of subjects upon which the contemplated conference can be productive of useful action. Nevertheless my ministers realize the desirability of taking advantage of every opportunity for the discussion by the public men of the mother country and the colonies, of questions of imperial interest, and Canada's representative will be prepared to give respectful consideration to any proposals that may be submitted by His Majesty's government or by the representatives of other colonies.

It was that one-sided answer to all these proposals that were made, that froze the heart of the imperial government, and they did not even send that despatch which was promised to follow. The British government were not in the position they hoped to

be in of getting a friendly answer from this government to the effect that they would come to London prepared to discuss imperial defence ; prepared to discuss imperial defence coupled with preferential trade as between the mother country and the colonies. The result is that a budget was brought down in the Imperial House of Commons putting a tax on grain and on breadstuffs, and the breadstuffs of Canada are not to be exempt from that tax. That is the result of the action of the Canadian government. When the opportunity presented itself they neglected to say that they were ready to discuss these questions. They refused to take the lead as the English Prime Minister asked them to take the lead. No aid was given by this government to the imperial ministers, and as a result the breadstuffs of Canada are taxed equally with the breadstuffs of other countries. In view of the British budget, I ask : Are the government prepared to-day to tell us that they will go over to England to discuss imperial defences ? I do not wish to commit the country, when I ask the government : Are they willing even to discuss that question on the basis of getting a trade preference ? Last night a very instructive article appeared in a newspaper published in Montreal, and with which the Minister of Public Works is connected. The heading is : 'The Interment of Free Trade.' The Minister of Public Works deals with this question in his paper last night, and he says among other things :

> The war, the unhappy war in South Africa, has forced old free trade England to abjure her economic faith, to tax her bread to meet the expenses of the War Office. . . . . The speech of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is as a funeral oration of free trade. . . . A number of London newspapers have expressed regret that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach has not seen fit to propose the adoption of a preference to Canadian flour and cereals in the English market. There are other papers that think it peculiar that at the very moment when we are sending other contingents, the English government has struck a blow at our breadstuffs by imposing on them the same tax as on foreign grains.

There is the opinion of the organ of a member of this administration who says that the funeral oration on free trade has been pronounced. He says there are papers in this country who believe the same thing, and he means his own paper, and he means a certain gentleman in the cabinet. He means to say that he regrets that when we are sending contingents to South Africa, we are not getting a preference in return therefor. And, why are we not to get a preference ? It is because of that chilling despatch which was sent by the Canadian government in reply to the invitation of the Prime Minister of Great Britain. On a former occasion the Prime Minister of Canada said that trade and war do not go together. They do go together. If there is anything that Englishmen know more than another, it is that trade follows the flag. The Prime Minister of Canada on a former occasion argued——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to refer to a previous debate.

Mr. MACLEAN. I stand corrected, and I will say that the argument is being made outside of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. When I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is referring to a previous debate, it is hardly fair for him to say that he is referring to what has been said outside.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Minister of Trade and Commerce pursued identically the same lines the other day, and he was not called to order.

Mr. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I bow to your decision. I see in his place the Minister of Trade and Commerce who is especially charged with the duty of looking after the welfare of this country in connection with treaties ; and I would ask him, is he prepared to tell the House to-day that, in view of England having adopted protection and having gone back to duties on breadstuffs, he has brought that fact to the attention of his colleagues, or has made any move to have the existing commercial treaties between the mother country and foreign countries, which interfere with the project of a preferential trade arrangement between the mother country and the colonies denounced ; and is he or the Prime Minister prepared to tell the House to-day, in view of the developments of the past few days, in view of the contingents we are sending and in view of the position taken by the organ of the Minister of Public Works, that they have protested against the tax on Canadian breadstuffs or have made any effort to secure a preference for Canada ? This is the all-important question before the people of this country to-day, and I again call the attention of the House to it mainly for the purpose of giving this government an opportunity of telling the country where they are on the question, and what they intend to do in connection with this most momentous issue.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I wish to make a few remarks on the subject of immigration. That subject has assumed very important proportions in this country, not alone because of the amount of money we spend on immigration, being nearly a half a million a year ; I believe the exact amount is $445,000. While that is a serious matter in itself, because the money comes out of the taxpayers of this country, I think there is a very much more important view to be taken of it, and that is the kind of immigrants we are getting. I was asked

by an hon. member on the other side of the House the other day to deal with something more than newspaper clippings when I came to speak on this question ; and I am going to do so to-day.

Great changes have been made in our system of immigration agents in the old country, for the reason, I presume, that the High Commissioner in London has told the department in his report that they have done about all they can do on the lines on which they are at present working, and also that we could get a great many immigrants if the government would refund to them the amount of their passage money when they arrived on this side of the water, to assist them in starting life again. I am very glad to know that the minister in other days was strongly opposed to giving any bonuses or assisted passages ; and I hope he will stick to that. I have always been opposed to giving assisted passages to immigrants, because I hold that a man who has reached the age of maturity, if his life has been such as it ought to be, should have saved enough money to pay his own passage, and if he has not, he certainly must have friends who would lend money to him. That being the case, I think it would be a great mistake to advance money to men who would be worthless, and who would in the long run become a burden on the public.

Immigration matters on the other side of the water have become so important that the deputy minister and Mr. White have had to leave this country and visit the old country to make arrangements in regard to immigration ; and I see that material changes have been made there. Mr. Preston's office has been moved out of the High Commissioner's office, and he has an office to himself and is placed at the head of the immigration business in Great Britain and Ireland and on the continent ; and although the deputy minister stated in the committee that Mr. Preston was subject to the High Commissioner, I notice that he reports direct to Ottawa. I also notice that every immigration agent under him has to report to him, and he forwards their reports direct to Ottawa. It used to be that the immigration agents in the old country reported to the High Commissioner, who sent their reports to Ottawa. Another change that has been made is in Ireland. I called the attention of the minister last year to the fact that we have too many paid agents in Ireland, and I see that at last he has come to the same opinion and has sent one agent to England, leaving only two paid agents in Ireland—Mr. O'Kelly and Mr. Devlin. One gets $1,800 and the other $3,000 a year. I suppose the minister, when he explains the difference in salaries, will tell us how he came to raise the salary of Mr. Devlin $1,000 at one time. I tried to find out from Mr. Pedley, who is at the head of the immigration staff, and has charge of the whole immigration of this country, and who is paid only $2,500, while Mr. Devlin and Mr. Preston are each getting $3,000. It may be that the minister can give some satisfactory reason for this difference. There is another feature which I regard as quite as bad if not worse. They are appointing, if I remember rightly, about 100 immigration agents in Ireland, to be paid by commission ; so the deputy minister states. You can easily see the effect of that. It will not be a matter of interest to these agents whether the immigrants they get are good or bad. Their object will be to get as many as possible, because the more they get the more they will be paid. That course, I believe, is pursued in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales. I notice in the report a letter from the Hon. G. W. Ross, which was written to the 'London Times' on the 9th of September last. Mr. Preston thought so much of it that he copied it into his report. Mr. Ross points out the large number of people who are leaving the British Isles and calls attention to the fact that if the mother country and the colonies united in an effort, these might be saved to the colonies instead of going to foreign countries. I think that is a matter which might well occupy the attention of the Prime Minister when he goes to the old country in June next. Of over 700,000 persons who emigrated from the United Kingdom from 1891 to 1900 only 90,000 came to Canada.

Another matter which I am obliged to bring up in this House is the interview held by Mr. Devlin with the 'Montreal Witness.' That interview has a peculiar history, and I think it was dealt with very unfairly by the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. We had it read there, together with Mr. Devlin's reply, and the committee refused to have them put in the evidence. I am going to give Mr. Devlin's interview, his denial, and an affidavit from the gentleman who wrote the interview. I saw in Mr. Devlin's own hand writing two paragraphs of this interview.

It was my intention to call the attention of the House to the attacks which Mr. Devlin made upon members on this side last session, but at the beginning of the session I moved for the correspondence, and I found that the rebuke given him by the Minister of the Interior was quite sufficient and that we have not heard of any more attacks since then by that gentleman on members of this House. But after that was rejected by the committee, and I think it should have gone into the evidence, I brought it up in this House as a question, to which the hon. Minister of Finance replied, and replied very cleverly, for he can get around a corner as well as, if not better, than any of his colleagues. The question I put was : Has the attention of the government been called to the interview with Mr. Devlin ? The Minister of Fin-

ance replied that it had, both by the newspapers and the Agriculture Committee. My next question was whether there had been any communication with Mr. Devlin since then, and the Minister of Finance replied no, but that Mr. Devlin did not admit the correctness of the interview. That I think was a very inadequate reply to a charge so important.

I am sorry to have to weary the House by reading this interview, but I think it is important that we should know what the facts are. This interview appeared in the Montreal 'Witness' on the 17th January, 1902, and I might add, had this been one of the sensational papers of this country, I would have taken very little notice of the interview. The 'Witness' is known to be a strong supporter of this government, although on general principles, once in a while it has to find fault with the present administration, but it would be impossible for any honest journal to conduct its business without doing that. Here is the interview :

Mr. C. R. Devlin, Dominion Immigrant Agent, Is a follower of John Redmond.

Believes that Ireland should have a separate Parliament—Why Canada does not get the Irish Immigrant in large numbers.

Mr. Charles R. Devlin, the Dominion Immigration Agent, Dublin, Ireland, has often, upon the floors of the House of Commons, and the public platforms of the country, eloquently pleaded the cause of home rule for Ireland. An Irish Canadian, he was always candid in his sympathy with those who were fighting for a separate parliament for the Irish people.

A residence in Ireland itself has but served to deepen his love for the cause. Mr. Devlin is an official of the Dominion government, but he is an enthusiastic follower of John Redmond, who is now preaching a no-rent crusade in Ireland which threatens to have far reaching consequences. But Mr. Devlin, while fulfilling his duties, also subscribes to the land league, and is heart and soul with those who desire to have separation from England.

Mr. Devlin is at present in the city stopping at the Windsor Hotel. He was asked this forenoon to say a word as to the condition of Ireland at present, more especially in regard to the acute form which the Irish agitation had recently taken—the form of an overwhelming organization, whose chief doctrine was that the people should cease to pay rent.

Mr. Devlin replied by saying that it must be remembered that he was not a politician, but an official of the government who was subject to criticism, and who must be careful in the answers which he gave. At the same time he had never concealed his opinions when in parliament, and had not changed since he went to live in Ireland.

He was a follower of John Redmond and a subscriber to the funds of the land league. He was an Irish Canadian, but blood was thicker than water, and he did not forget that England had oppressed Ireland because the Irish were Catholics.

You are not a believer in physical force, are you Mr. Devlin ?

No, I have no sympathy for physical force at all. I am for effecting the purpose by constitutional means. There is no necessity for physical force in the premises.

Do you approve of the agitation of which the object is to prevent the tenant farmers of Ireland from paying rent in any shape or form ?

I am in sympathy with the programme mapped out by John Redmond. Here is the stand I take, I do not care who knows it :

I am in full sympathy with the national movement, and as an Irish Canadian and a Roman Catholic I see no reason why Ireland should not receive the same measure of responsible government as is enjoyed by Canada. To put the whole case in one word—before going to Ireland I was a nationalist, and since that I am now such even in a more pronounced degree.

The whole question is this, said Mr. Devlin, shall Ireland have a separate parliament ? I think she should. Others take a different view. They are entitled to their opinion. Indeed, we have frequent discussions over the matter in my office.

I would like to have the Minister of the Interior just mark the use to which the immigration office is put in Ireland. My opinion is that no officer of this government should take any part in politics on either side. I do not think that our High Commissioner has ever done so, nor do I think that it is in the best interests of the country that Mr. Devlin should do so :

There are those in Ireland who say there should be no legislative separation ; on the other hand, the great bulk of the people are in favour of a separate parliament, and I am with them in this. I have nothing to conceal as far as my personal views are concerned, but of course I have no desire to talk politics.

Do you believe, Mr. Devlin, that the establishment of industries in the south and west of Ireland would go far towards a creation of better conditions ?

No doubt this would be a feature of the case.

Is the country prosperous ?

Well, there was a good crop.

Have the farmers money in the bank ?

I have not studied the economic questions.

How are the county councils working ?

Very well indeed.

Do the people take much interest in the local questions which come up in the meetings.

Well, as much as they do in this country.

Mr. Devlin was asked how it was that Canada got so few Irish immigrants, the bulk of whom went to the United States.

First of all, according to Mr. Devlin, there is the question of the flag, which plays an important part with the Irishman. He does not particularly like the British flag. He does not want to go to another country where he will be under it. He goes to the United States in preference. He had no doubt that the action of Sir Wilfrid Laurier in appearing at Mr. Redmond's meeting would do much to remove the prejudice which was felt against the Dominion, while at the same time the Dominion was in no wise hurt by the action of the premier.

In the second place, Mr. Devlin continued, effort should have been made thirty years ago. That effort was only made yesterday, so to say. Ninety per cent of the persons who left Ireland for the United States did so upon prepaid tickets—tickets which had been purchased by

friends who had gone to the United States thirty, twenty, ten years ago. Had the Dominion made an effort thirty years ago, such passages would have been paid to Canada. In the third place, it must be remembered that Ireland had none of the aids to immigration which was so evident in England. She had only three agencies in the whole country. On the other hand, in England there was the work of the Dominion government, the work of the provincial governments, the work of the Canadian Pacic Railway. At the same time, he could say that there had been a considerable improvement, and the Dominion was beginning to get a fair share of Irish immigration. There had been fourteen hundred immigrants from Ireland to the Dominion in eleven months last year, this showed a decided increase over previous records.

The report of the Minister of the Interior shows only 933.

It has been said, Mr. Devlin, that there is lack of zeal on the part of the government agents, who do their work perfunctorily, and who do not stir up the interests of the people in the advantages which Canada can offer.

As I say, efforts should have commenced thirty years ago in Ireland. All is done that can be done under the circumstances.

One of the planks in the new programme of Mr. Redmond, is that the people should be taught to remain in the country. As you are a subscriber to the funds of the league, is your position as an immigration agent not rather incongruous. You sympathize with the desire of the league to retain the people on the soil, and yet you must urge emigration.

But I do not urge it.

No ? Then the office and the work are in the nature of a superfluity ?

Come, come, said Mr. Devlin laughing, you are a desperate interviewer, but I will define my position.

I do not urge emigration from Ireland, and I never will. I agree that Ireland should be the home of the Irishman, and I will be glad when the day comes when no Irishman will have to leave Ireland. I will then gladly come back to work in my own country. But we have to notice the fact that there is a large emigration from Ireland, and my aim is to secure for Canada the largest possible proportion.

Asked if the establishment of a fast Atlantic service would have a beneficial effect upon immigration, Mr. Devlin said he would prefer not to answer the question.

In regard to his present mission, Mr. Devlin said: I am here on important matters connected with my office, and as soon as I can get them settled, I will go back. I am particularly anxious to have a Canadian exhibit at the Cork show made as good and as effective as possible, as I hope to return in two weeks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like the Minister of the Interior when he comes to reply, if he does reply, to say what Mr. Devlin's position is, whether it is to get people to come to this country or to cause them to stay in Ireland. He says he is a subscriber to the Land League, and their object is to keep all Irishmen in Ireland. In fact, I believe they have a society which gives prizes to people in Ireland who will keep others from emigrating from that country. Now, I will read you what the committee call Mr. Devlin's denial. This letter was written to Mr. Pedley from Halifax. The whole letter was there, but the committee refused to read anything but this part of it and refused to let the committee itself be the judge as to what part should be taken. They allowed the superintendent of immigration to choose one paragraph and say that this was all that applied to the case. I think it was, but I do not think that it was fair to the committee to confine its choice in this way. I think that if the letter was to be produced as evidence before the committee, the whole letter should have been produced :

In regard to interviews alleged to have been given by me, I do not admit their accuracy. They took place in the Windsor Hotel, weeks ago, on my arrival when I was with my friends, and I merely answered, as a matter of politeness and courtesy to pressmen, two or three questions having no bearing on Canadian political questions.

Now, I took pains, before I got the affidavit I am about to read, to make some inquiries about the reporter who had this interview with Mr. Devlin. I inquired of the reporters of the gallery of this House, and I am confident that anybody who knows this gentleman will give him a good character. I did more ;—when I went to Montreal I saw some gentlemen occupying high positions in newspaper work, and they said the same thing about Mr. Lutton. I will read his declaration :

I, William Lutton, of the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, reporter for the Montreal 'Witness,' do solemnly declare as follows :—

1. That I had an interview in the city of Montreal with Mr. C. R. Devlin, Dominion Immigration Agent for Ireland, on the 17th day of January, 1902.

2. That the account of this interview as the same was published and appears in the Montreal 'Witness' of the 17th day of January, 1902, is correct in every particular.

3. I further declare that I have in my possession statements in writing in the handwriting of the said C. R. Devlin and written by him in my presence, of which the following are true copies :—

'I do not urge immigration from Ireland, and I never will. I agree that Ireland should be the home of the Irishmen, and will be glad when the day comes when no Irishman will have to leave Ireland. I will then gladly come back to work in my own country, but we have to notice the fact that there is a large immigration from Ireland, and my aim is to secure for Canada the largest possible proportion.

'I am in full sympathy with the national movement, and as an Irish Canadian, and a Roman Catholic, I see no reason why Ireland should not receive the same measure of responsible government as is enjoyed by Canada. To put the whole case in one word—before going to Ireland I was a nationalist, and that I am now even of a more pronounced degree, and I would surrender a position twice as good as that now held by me if, in order to retain it, it would be necessary to modify my opinion in this matter.'

I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, in virtue of the Act for the Supression of Voluntary Extra-Judicial Oaths.

W. LUTTON.

Solemnly declared before me, at the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, this 4th day of April, 1902.

HENRY J. ELLIOT,

A commissioner of the Superior Court of the province of Quebec for the district of Montreal.

Now, I think that ought to settle pretty well any question as to the truthfulness of that interview. It seems to me that any man who will make such statements to the public press as Mr. Devlin has done is one for whom the government should have but very little use. Certainly he is not the kind of man whose salary they should increase, giving him a higher salary than that of the superintendent of immigration. They raised his salary on the 1st of July, 1900, just four months before the general election.

Now, having gone into that matter so far, I wish, for the benefit of the Minister of Customs, to show what they are doing now in Ireland. The hon. gentleman spoke very loudly the other night about the great work of immigration. I have been following it for some years, and I fail to see where they have accomplished any great work, especially in Great Britain and Ireland. They certainly have succeeded in spending a much larger amount of money than their predecessors, and with much less results. I have here a table which I made up from returns given by Mr. Pedley, and I guarantee its correctness. I am perfectly willing to submit it to Mr. Pedley, who I believe knows more about this question than any man in Canada, or out of it, because he has apparently made himself the master of it. This table covers a period of nine years. I do not know whether he made a mistake in only bringing it down for nine years, or what the reason was:

I may say that in 1900 the fiscal year was changed, it used to be on the calendar year and they changed it to the fiscal year, and this is only for half a year. But you will notice that in the half year we spent in salaries $9,942, for printing, $4,000, or a total expenditure for the six months of $13,942. Now we got in those nine years from Ireland 7,855 people; we paid in salaries and other expenses $55,854, and for printing and bonuses $28,000, making a total of $83,854.

I said we were spending a great deal more money and getting a great many less people. If you will take the first four years, from 1893 to 1896, you will find there were 4,396 immigrants came to this country; and if you will take the next five years, you will find that only 3,457 came to this country, or a decrease of 939 persons. Still, some hon. members of the government think they are doing wonderful work in their immigration business. Then, Sir, it cost for the first four years, from 1893 to 1896, $20,616, and from 1896 to 1901 it cost $63,238. That is a difference of $42,621 to get 939 less people. Still, notwithstanding my efforts to persuade the hon. gentleman to lessen the expenses for immigration from Ireland, he still persists, and I fear he is going to persist at a faster speed this year than heretofore. But whether he does or not, I feel it my duty to call his attention to what is being done.

In a speech I made in this House a year or two ago, I stated that I believed we could get as many immigrants from Ireland if we had no agent there, more especially when things are going as they are now. Let me take the years when we had no agent in Ireland:

1896....	886	
1897....	751, or less than in 1896 by	135
1898....	733, or less than in 1896 by	153
1899....	699, or less than in 1896 by	187
1900....	686, or less than in 1896 by	200
Decrease in 4 years with 3 agents.		675

APPROXIMATE STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURE ON IMMIGRATION FROM IRELAND FROM JULY 1, 1892, TO JUNE 30, 1901.

Year.	Number of Agents.	Number of Immigrants.	Salaries and Expenses of Agents.	Printing, Advertising, Bonus, &c.	Total cost.
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1892-3	2	1,284	4,147 79	2,000 00	6,147 79
1893-4	3	1,066	2,600 09	6,000 00	8,600 09
1894-5	1	1,160	2,368 25	2,000 00	4,368 25
1895-6	...	886	31 00	1,500 00	1,500 00
1896-7	3	751	3,431 37	2,000 00	5,431 37
1897-8	3	731	9,274 94	3,000 00	12,274 94
1898-9	3	699	10,133 74	3,000 00	13,133 74
1899-00	3	343	9,942 62	4,000 00	13,942 62
1900-01	5	933	13,955 41	4,500 00	18,455 41
Nine years	23	7,855	55,854 21	28,000 00	83,854 21

1893....	1,284	
1897....	751, or a decrease of.....	533
1898....	733, or a decrease of.....	551
1899....	699, or a decrease of.....	585
1900....	686, or a decrease of.....	598
Decrease in 4 years		2,267

I think it is time that the minister took a look around to see what is the matter. I do not wonder though when you look at the Auditor General's Report. I think the extravagance which is there disclosed is something that is beyond reconciling with common sense. Here is a clergyman—I do not know who he is, or where he lives, or anything about him. It makes no difference to me what denomination he belongs to. I say we should not pay such an extravagant price for his services. His salary is $100 a month, and he served six months making $600. His living expenses in Europe amounted to $533.63.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To whom is the hon. gentleman referring ?

Mr. WILSON. To the Rev. D. A. Twomey, whose account will be found at page L-16 of the Auditor General's Report. Cabs and transfers, $52.48 ; postage, $2.57 ; railway fares, $76.18 ; passage to Liverpool and return, $59.80 ; tips to stewards, $24 ; wharfage, $1.22 ; travel in Canada : cabs, $24 ; fares, $48.87 ; living expenses, $115.50 ; pullmans, $34.50. This makes, for six months of this gentleman's services, an outlay of $1,655.43. I think he is a pretty expensive man for us to send as an immigration agent to Ireland to try and get people to come here. I believe the figures I have given are correct. If they are not, I hope the hon. minister will correct them, because I am anxious to get at the truth of this matter. There is no object that I can see in standing up and finding fault with the administration of affairs unless you are telling the truth, because I do not think a man is worth very much who stands up and misrepresents facts. There is another gentleman, Mr. Mulvihill. He was very moderate. He was only employed three months and he only cost the country $540.85. Then, there was John Webster, whose salary was $1,200. His living expenses were quite moderate. They were only $268.75, and the total expense in connection with his office was $2,-061.62. This is not quite so bad as the case of the Rev. Mr. Twomey, whose living expenses in Canada and the old country amounted to $649.13 for six months. He must have lived pretty well, I should think. Then, we have Mr. E. O'Kelly, whose salary is $1,800, and living expenses $715.40, the total cost of this gentleman including travelling and other expenses being $3,647. There was Mr. C. R. Devlin, with a salary of $3,000, and living expenses of $515.40, the total expense in connection with him being $6,132.41. The cost of printing, advertising and bonuses in Ireland in 1901 was $4,500, making the total amount expended in Ireland in 1901 $18,455.41, and the government got for this expenditure 933 people at a cost of $19.76 per head. I think that the deputy minister, Mr. Smart, said in the committee the other day, without counting the cost in Canada, that the cost of each immigrant on the average was $6.11. I suppose this amount is given without any reference to the Canadian cost. Now, I come to a matter that I would like the hon. minister to give us some information upon. I have been of the opinion for some time that when we vote immigration salaries we should vote them in the same way as we vote anything else. Why not ? Why should we vote a lump sum ? There are only four items in the estimates for immigration. I would like to have the hon. minister tell us on whose recommendation he has raised the salaries of the agents ? It is well known that he only raises the salary of a man in his department when he gets a recommendation from his deputy minister. It is the deputy minister's business. I tried to get the deputy minister before the committee to tell us how it was done. He was as dumb as an oyster, and I hope the hon. minister will take the responsibility of telling us how this is done and why. I want to give him a list of the agents whose salaries have been raised. The list was given to the committee and it is as follows :

NAMES OF IMMIGRANT AGENTS WHOSE SALARIES WERE RAISED.

Names.	When Appointed.	Salary.	When Raised.	Present Salary.
		$		$
C. W. Speers	March, 1897....	1,500	Nov. 1, 1898....	2,000
J. C. Crear	Oct., 1897....	900	Sept., 1899....	1,200
M. V. McInnes	Feb. 1, 1897....	1,500	July, 1901 ...	1,800
James Grieve	" 10, 1897....	1,200	Feb. 1, 1900....	1,500
W. H. Rogers	Dec. 1, 1897....	900	Jan., 1901....	1,200
M. V. Bennett	" 1, 1897....	900	" 1, 1901....	1,200
W. J. White	Jan. 1, 1897....	1,800	July 1, 1901....	2,000
Rev. M. Blais	May 1, 1898....	500	Sept., 1900....	600
C. R. Devlin	Mar.15, 1897....	2,000	July 1, 1900....	3,000
John Webster	Dec., 1896....	900	Sept., 1899....	1,200
W. L. Griffith	April, 1897....	1,200	Oct., 1900....	1,800
Thomas Duncan	" 1897....	1,200	March, 1899....	1,500
		14,500		19,000

There is a total increase in the salaries of these twelve men of $4,500. My own impression is that this deserves an explanation from the hon. minister. I hope he will tell us what the conditions are under which he raised the salaries of these gentlemen, what examination they have to go through, and what the particular work is that they have to do. Is it because of the great success they had as immigration agents or for some other reason? I think he will certainly say that so far as Ireland is concerned they have not progressed very rapidly in securing immigrants. Now, I have some more tables in connection with general immigration business, and while I am satisfied they are correct as they are taken from our records, I fear that if we look at the census we will be led to believe that we have either lost the bulk of the immigrants we have received or that we have lost as many or more of our own people. I think if this is a fact it is to be deplored, because I would rather have a Canadian than any other countryman.

I shall now give you the number of immigrants reported each year to have settled in Canada from 1891 to 1901, and the total for the ten years. They are as follows:

1892	27,898
1893	29,632
1894	20,829
1895	18,790
1896	16,835
1897	20,016
1898	30,742
1899	44,506
1900	23,895
1901	49,149
Total for 10 years	282,292

It will be noticed that the number for 1900 only represents six months, and I do not know how I could get at the exact figures for the whole year unless I doubled the number for the six months, but of course I have no authority to do that, and I will let the figures go as they appear in the return brought down to this House. I have here the total expenditure on immigration for each of these years as brought down in the return I moved for. The expenditure on immigration from the 1st July, 1891 to 30th June, 1901 was as follows:

The total expenditure on immigration from 1st July, 1891, to the 30th June, 1901, was as follows:

Year.	Amount.
1891-1892	$177,604 82
1892-1893	180,677 43
1893-1894	202,235 52
1894-1895	195,652 97
1895-1896	120,199 00
1896-1897	127,438 14
1897-1898	261,194 90
1898-1899	255,878 88
1899-1900	434,562 61
1900-1901	444,729 63
	$2,400,173 90

We therefore got 282,292 immigrants during the 10 years and we spent $2,400,173.90. In the first five years of that period under the Conservative rule we spent $873,369, and in the next five years under the Liberal rule we spent $1,523,804. During the five years of the Conservative government it cost us $7.65 per head for our immigrants, and during the five years of the Liberal government it cost us $9.05 per head, or $1.40 per head more during the five years of Liberal rule than it did before. I am sorry that I could not get the figures with regard to Great Britain and Ireland complete. There is one year that I have not got the number of immigrants for. When I applied to the department they said it could not be had very handily and consequently I let it go. I shall therefore have to submit this table with regard to the immigration from Great Britain and Ireland, the number of immigrants we received from those countries, the number of agents and the cost of our immigration staff there during the years mentioned. The following is the table:

Number of Immigrants from Great Britain and Ireland; number of Agents, Salaries, Printing, &c.

Year.	Number of Agents.	Number of Immigrants.	Salaries.	Printing and other Expenses.	Total.
			$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1891-2	5	...	5,886 67	13,805 63	19,692 30
1892-3	8	20,066	7,509 26	19,033 68	26,547 90
1893-4	8	16,004	10,569 64	15,420 84	25,990 48
1894-5	7	14,956	10,638 29	8,669 02	19,338 04
1895-6	6	11,884	9,438 28	8,816 86	18,255 14
1896-7	13	11,383	12,643 41	11,091 00	23,734 41
1897-8	9	11,606	13,240 23	17,611 56	30,851 79
1898-9	9	10,623	13,203 22	18,679 23	31,882 45
1899-0	10	9,888	16,800 00	26,150 73	42,950 73
1900-1	14	13,082	19,950 00	26,931 21	46,881 21
10	89	119,492	119,879 00	116,214 72	286,124 45

The total number of immigrants we got from 1893 to 1896 was 62,910, and the total number we got from 1897 to 1900 was 43,500. I take a four years period here, as I have not the full number for one year. I therefore have to take a period of four years instead of five. The number of immigrants we got from 1893 to 1896 was 62,910, and the number from 1897 to 1900 was 43,500. In the latter period we got 19,410 less immigrants than we got in the previous four years. During the first four years we spent $90,131.56, and in the last four years we spent $129,419.79, or, we spent in the second term $39,282.22 more than we did in the first term under Conservative rule, and we got 19,410 less immigrants for that increased expenditure.

Now, Sir, I believe that these figures are correct, and if the Minister of the Interior will compare them carefully with the official documents in his department, he will find that they are correct. I have other figures here but they are not altogether what I would consider complete. It appears that for a good share of the time they have not been keeping a very correct account of the number of immigrants that come in from the continent of Europe, but I will give the table if hon. gentlemen think it desirable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. WILSON. I have here an account of the number of immigrant agents employed by the Dominion government each year on the continent of Europe, their salaries and expenses from the 1st of July, 1891 to the 30th of June, 1901 :

Number of immigrant agents employed by the Dominion government each year on the continent of Europe, their salaries and expenses from July 1, 1891, to June 30, 1901.

Year.	Number of Agents.	Salaries.	Printing and other Expenses.	Total.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1891-2.....	3	686 51	248 00	934 00
1892-3.....	2	825 00	620 80	1,445 80
1893-4.....	5	2,684 97	4,175 20	6,860 00
1894-5.....	1	1,200 00	519 05	1,719 00
1895-6.....	1	1,200 00	600 00	1,800 00
1896-7.....	3	1,976 94	963 45	2,940 00
1897-8.....	6	8,373 06	2,230 59	10,603 00
1898-9.....	7	6,209 41	2,449 81	8,659 00
1899-1900..	4	4,239 69	2,463 05	6,692 00
1900-1.....	2	1,600 00	1,934 86	3,534 00
10	34	28,999 58	16,204 87	45,204 45

I have just one more table—one relating to immigration from the United States. One reason why I am reading these tables on this occasion is that heretofore it has been very difficult to get any starting point, to ascertain how many people have come from a particular country, and at what cost; and if we start right now, I think we shall hereafter be able to get full statements of these matters. If this method is carried out, we shall have tables in which we can get the information we desire without having to peruse all the blue-books issued from year to year by the department. Before reading this table relating to the United States, I may say that this movement was started away back in 1891-92 by the late government, and that country was looked on as a fruitful field for immigration agents to work in. I think it was a wise move, and I will endorse any reasonable effort made by this government to bring immigrants of the proper character from the United States, because that country to-day gets a great many more of the right kind of immigrants than it did in former years. I am fully persuaded that if we get two or three more good crops in the North-west, we shall have a large immigration from the United States, whether we have any agents or not. I was told by a gentleman who deals in land in that country that it was the practice of speculators to go down to the northern states with maps and talk up the land, and sometimes they got capitalists to join with them, and they became immigrant agents of a very important kind. They had a great interest in making sales, because they participated in the profits. The following is the table regarding United States agents :

Approximate statement showing number of immigrant agents employed by the Dominion government each year in the United States of America, from July 1, 1891, to June 30, 1901, the total amount paid each year to the said agents for salaries, and the amount spent each year for printing and other expenses by said agents as follows :

Year.	No. of Agents	Salaries.	Printing and other Expenses.	Total.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1891-2.....	19	9,221 19	12,668 19	21,889 38
1892-3.....	41	22,052 41	31,105 45	53,157 86
1893-4.....	33	15,614 03	30,297 75	45,911 78
1894-5.....	8	5,939 81	2,508 15	8,447 96
1895-6.....	4	5,102 78	1,844 31	6,947 09
1896-7.....	12	4,880 30	6,352 09	11,232 39
1897-8.....	28	14,884 90	28,197 44	43,082 34
1898-9.....	23	16,316 35	29,277 35	45,593 70
1899-1900..	16	15,252 02	24,988 15	40,240 17
900-1.....	27	18,957 98	30,161 12	49,119 00
10	211	128,221 77	197,400 00	325,621 77

Mr. SPROULE. And commission agents besides ?

Mr. WILSON. Well, they go up into the hundreds. I did not take into account the commission agents, because I did not like to weary the House with masses of figures. I come now to what I consider most important and that is the manner in which the United States deals with its immigrants. About fifteen or twenty years ago, the United States found that crime was steadily increasing in that country, that the alms houses were being filled, and that the American people were being taxed enormously owing to their failure to give proper supervision to their immigrants. The United States government appointed a commission in 1888 to investigate, and I shall only read two or three brief extracts from the report of that commission. In the State of New York alone, the charities cost over $20,000,000, according to the sworn testimony of one of the witnesses. The commission found that in the older countries of Europe

there were not only societies established for the purpose of deporting the criminal classes, but the government even gave these societies grants from the public exchequer, and evidence was given to show that government officers in Germany opened the prison doors, brought the prisoners down to the steamers, and paid their passages to America. If the hon. gentleman wants to verify my statement from the report, I shall be glad to hand it to him. I can assure the hon. minister that he has moved altogether too slowly in this matter, and that we are being overrun by a class of immigrants, which the United States government will not allow into their country.

I was told that I should not give newspaper clippings, and I took the trouble to wait upon Mr. Watchorn, the principal inspector of the United States, whose territory reaches from St. John, N.B. to Sault Ste. Marie in Michigan. He at first told me that he had no power to give the information I required. That information, he said, was exclusively for his own government, and not for the newspapers or men who wanted to use it for their own purposes. But he told me that if I would apply to the department at Washington, I would no doubt get what I wanted. I forgot to mention that my attention was first called to this matter by the Montreal 'Star' which, in its issue of the 22nd March, had a graphic description of the kind of people rejected. If any hon. gentleman has not read this article, I would be very glad to give it to him, and I assure the House that it would be well worth any one's while to read it. The following day the 'Star' had an editorial, and people laughed at the idea of its being the truth or even near the truth. But Mr. Miller, who looked this matter up, is an energetic and a thoroughly reliable man. I wrote to Washington and was referred to Mr. Watchorn, and I got from him the following information :

United States Immigration Service,
Office of Special Immigrant Inspector,
Port of Montreal, Canada,
233 St. Antoine St.,
April 12, 1902.

Hon. Uriah Wilson,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I desire to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 11th instant, inclosing letter written to you by the Hon. T. V. Powderly, Commissioner-General of Immigration, Washington, D.C., and requesting me to furnish you as much information as possible, along the lines of your verbal inquiries, on the 4th instant.

The department rules, under which this office is working, do not admit of furnishing official information either to the public press, or to persons, such as yourself, who desire to obtain such information for their own use. However, the above mentioned inclosure, suffices to indicate that my superior officers have no objection to my giving you such information as is available here, for your purpose; I therefore make the following statement, which I believe will virtually cover the several points to which you gave prominence, in your list of questions :

The jurisdiction of this office extends from Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, to St. John, N.B. Officers are stationed at the following places :

Three at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., two at Sarnia, Ont., and Port Huron, Mich., five at Windsor, Ont., and Detroit, Mich., three at Suspension Bridge, N.Y., four at International Bridge (Fort Erie, Ont., and Black Rock, N.Y.), six at Montreal, P.Q., two at Cornwall, Ont., two at Vanceboro, Me., and one at each of the following places—Malone, N.Y., Alburg, Vt., Rouse's Point, N.Y., St. Albans, Vt., Newport, Vt., North Stratford, N.H., Hermingford, St. Armand, St. Johns, Athelstan, P.Q., St. Thomas, Port Hope, Kingston, Brockville and Prescott, Ont., Lowelltown and Calais, Maine.

In addition to the foregoing, there is a United States Commissioner of Immigration at the port of entry to Canada, who has a full complement of inspectors, interpreters, matron, and physician. All European immigrants destined to the United States are supposed to be examined by this commissioner, and if found eligible to enter the United States, are given a specially prepared certificate of admission to the United States, and it devolves upon the force of officers under my jurisdiction, to take up these certificates at the border stations (copies of certificates having been surrendered at the border inclosed) which are subsequently sent to Washington for cancellation.

Before I read any further I would like to say that, in my opinion, it would be a very easy matter for our government to make an arrangement with the United States, under which all parties, irrespective of whether they go to American or Canadian ports, should be examined. If they are paupers, crippled or insane, or have any dangerous disease, or are found to be criminals, they should be sent back. Why should we consent to admit the off-scourings of creation into this country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Would my hon friend (Mr. Wilson) send me the letter ?

Mr. WILSON. I will when I get through with it, but I have not more than started it yet.

It was thought that the establishment of a United States commission at the Canadian port of entry would suffice to reject all undesirable applicants for admission to the United States, as it is done at United States ports, but it transpired that very large numbers of immigrants intending to go to the United States, manifested themselves as Canadian passengers, and thus avoided the inspection of a United States force at a Canadian port, and subsequently resumed their journey from their temporary abode, in Canada, to their original destination. Therefore other methods had to be adopted, to cope with this phase of the situation, hence the increase of the border force from a comparatively small number of inspectors, to the present force of forty-four.

Now, that is what our laws are doing for the United States. And, indeed, they are doing a good deal worse. It is a small matter to take a man's money, but it is a very serious matter to expose him to the risks

of associating with these families and others whom he meets. Though the United States are spending $100,000 a year on that service, they are not taxing their own people for it, but are making the immigrants or the steamship companies pay all this money. They are charging one dollar a head for every immigrant that enters their country, and there is a Bill before congress to increase the head-tax to $1.50. I believe that Bill will become law. The Minister of the Interior introduced a Bill in this House last night with reference to this matter. And I would advise him—if he thinks my advice of any value—to see the Bill that is now before congress before he presses forward his own. For, if he would reach an understanding with the people on the other side of the line we would save money and also save ourselves the annoyance of getting a lot of people who are of no use to anybody. I saw a man who came to Halifax, and wanted to go to New York. He was a little bit of a fellow. He had been unfortunate and lost one eye, the other eye was badly affected with trachoma. The United States officials rejected him. But he got hold of some society, and they gave him money enough to go to Niagara, and there they sent him back. They do not mince matters when any one tries to steal into that country when he has no certificate, and who is not a proper person to be admitted. They arrested him and put him on board a ship, and if they have to pay his way back they do so. But we ought not to do that. If any ship that brings people who are not fit immigrants, to this country, that ship ought to be obliged to take them back whence they came. I may be told that that is an extreme view, but perhaps I am a little extreme in some things.

It is incumbent upon all the border inspectors to demand a certificate of admission issued by the commissioner at the port of entry, as a condition precedent to lawful admission. All alien immigrants minus said certificate of admission, are subject to detention, and rigid examination at the border, at the following places :—Sault Ste. Marie, Port Huron, Detroit, Niagara Falls and Montreal.

There are just a few places, you will notice, and, no matter where these immigrants come from they are sent to one of these places. I think Mr. Watchhorn is a first-class officer for the position. While he is courteous, he is firm, and tells them in very plain language what he thinks about them.

If an immigrant minus a certificate of admission, attempts to enter the United States at any other border station, it is imperatively necessary that the inspector on duty at such place shall return him to one or other of the aforementioned stations.

You will observe from the last report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, that only six persons were rejected along the Canadian border because they were suffering from loathsome contagious diseases. Investigations made by the Bureau in Europe, disclosed the fact that a tremenduous discrepancy was represented, in those known to have emigrated from Europe to the United States via Canada, and those actually rejected at the border.

This discrepancy led to still further investigations, which together with the above-mentioned facts, resulted in the present somewhat rigorous system of border inspection. The present system was inaugurated on September 1st, 1901, since which time, at all points of this jurisdiction, they have been rejected for various causes, more than one thousand European immigrants——

Now, these immigrants were rejected because they were not fit to be citizens of the United States. Somebody said they were not fit mentally, morally, physically, or financially. I do not think that anybody in this country wants to be hard on a poor unfortunate. But I think, at the same time, that the country that has these unfortunates is much more bound to take care of them than are we in Canada.

—and while some of them were rejected because of their total destitution, a very large majority of them have been rejected because they were suffering from loathsome contagious diseases, notably trachoma, a dangerous affection of the eye, and favus, a loathsome affection of the scalp. Both these diseases are born of filth, and yield favourably to treatment, only when taken in their earliest stages.

You will observe, on page 34 of the Commissioners General's Report, that the increase of immigration through Canada to the United States, from 1896 to 1900, has been very heavy, and is in fact very much in excess of what these figures indicate.

I think your official records will bear out the statement, that for the year ended June 30th, 1901, approximately fifty thousand immigrants arrived at Canadian seaports, twenty-four thousand destined for the United States, which leaves the inference to be drawn, that twenty-six thousand remained in Canada, but these figures are totally misleading, because of the twenty-six thousand credited to Canada, for the time specified, no less than three hundred per month were given certificates of admission to the United States, in Montreal alone, within thirty days of their arrival at a Canadian port.

I would like to know now what the minister thinks of that, or what his deputy or what the superintendent of immigration thinks of it. If within thirty days of their landing in Canada about four thousand people, of their own motion went to the United States, who had to be able to pass a most rigid examination—these people having been billed for Canada originally—what would it be if we take the whole country over ? It does seem to me that it bears out pretty well the statement that I made two years ago. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) and some other hon. members and myself, went into a careful analysis of the immigration from the various countries, and we could not satisfy ourselves that we got more than 26,000, although we were reported to have got 44,000.

Assuming that a like ratio of admissions were made at other border stations (not at all an unreasonable assumption), it will be seen that more than half of the European immigration

credited to Canada has proceeded to the United States within thirty days after arrival, and there exists no doubt in my mind but a very large proportion of the other half have likewise proceeded to the States at more or less subsequent dates.

This is what Mr. Watchorn says, and I will show you the document I saw him sign myself.

I cannot better illustrate to you the difficulties under which we are labouring than to cite to you the fact that only this very day we have had to send to New York, under a strong escort, under arrest by authority of warrants issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, fourteen immigrants suffering from favus and trachoma, who landed on the 31st of March last at St. John, N.B., all of whom are credited to Canada, but who, as you observe, are regarded as unfit for domicile in the United States (and who evidently did not wish to remain in Canada, despite their having been manifested thereto), that they are being placed on board steamers in New York harbour to-day and sent back to the country whence they came, at the expense of the United States government.

I saw the telegram saying that they had been safely put on board the steamship, and I would be very glad if the others to whom objection was made were put on board another steamship and carried back to the countries from which they came.

In addition to these fourteen sent to New York we have rejected forty-one other persons similarly afflicted who were carried on the ship at the same time, but the latter forty-one, not having surreptitiously gone over the border, have been returned to various places in Canada —notably Windsor, Hamilton, Toronto and Montreal, where, so far as I know, they now are.

I am going to read all this letter for the reason that this gentleman says he takes no part whatever in Canadian politics, and he does not want one party to make any capital out of it against another party. He had no objection to the facts being given, but he did not want it to be supposed that he wished to favour one side more than another. Therefore I want to read this last part of the letter, although it does not appear to concern the immigration business; but I am doing exactly what he expected me to do.

The same spirit that prompted me to be reluctant to comply with your request for information on the 4th instant, influences me to desire to avoid the very appearance of criticising or attempting to criticise the way in which your honorable government sees fit to conduct its affairs, and I do not wish you to construe anything herein stated as casting any reflections on any person or persons whatsoever connected with your government. I give you the information for what it is worth, and venture to express the hope that, ere long, we shall find that your government, in its wisdom, has decided to exclude from Canada all persons suffering from loathsome, contagious diseases, and who are otherwise obviously and unmistakably subjects only of charity, public or private.

It has been found in the United States that as efforts have been put forth to exclude the vicious, the diseased and the burdensome, in contrastive proportion, efforts have been increased on the part of the healthy, strong, vigorous, and desirable classes, to enter the United States.

Hoping that what I have herein stated may in some measure serve the purpose of enlightening you and others through you who desire to become more or less familiar with the subject.

I remain, yours very respectfully,

ROBERT WATCHORN,
Special Immigrant Inspector.

Now I think I have fully complied with the promise I made in the beginning, that the proofs of my statements should be as nearly as possible official. This gentleman is in a position to know all about the people who are coming in to this country, because, as I said before, he is in charge of the whole force of inspectors from St. John, New Brunswick, to Sault Ste. Marie, in the west. I hope the minister will carefully consider not only the enormous amounts of money we are spending on immigration, but whether it would not be worth while to put a head tax upon steamship companies bringing immigrants to this country. Somebody said to me a while ago: You don't have to send immigrants to the Yukon, you can hardly keep them out. And my opinion is that if we have two or three more good seasons in Manitoba and the North-west we will have very little trouble in filling up that country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The subject which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) has brought to the attention of the House will, I presume, be admitted to be of sufficient importance to justify an ample discussion, in order that the House may be as fully informed as possible respecting the work of the Immigration Department, and that the department may have an opportunity of listening to suggestions made from both sides of the House as to the manner in which the department may improve its methods. I had a good deal to do with immigration for some years. For four years before I became a member of this government I had much to do with matters relating to immigration in connection with the Manitoba government, and in many other ways, although that subject was not specially under my jurisdiction.

I have necessarily devoted a very considerable amount of attention to the subject, and I have had an opportunity of informing myself as to the method of carrying on the work to be pursued. I can find no fault with the criticisms which the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) has addressed to the House as to the conduct of the department, but, when I say that I do not say that in every respect I agree with him. I desire to find no fault either as to the method or spirit in which he has performed the task of criticising the work of the department. I am quite satisfied that an examination of the work of the department, con-

ducted in that spirit and simply with a desire of finding out and informing the House fully as to what has been done, can do the department no harm, but that, on the whole, it is calculated to bring about improvements in the conduct of the work. The House will understand, of course, that where half a million of dollars has to be expended under the direction of a minister who has a large number of public interests to look after, and of departments of one kind or another to superintend, that it is extremely difficult to keep track of everything that is done in connection with the work, and I am bound to say that I do not at all object to the officials of the Department of Immigration being aware of the fact that they are likely to be overhauled by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House before the Committee on Agriculture. Possibly that fact may have a healthy influence upon their conduct and their work and if so the government and the public generally will profit.

I suppose there will be no difference of opinion as to the importance of immigration work in Canada. It need not be discussed. The length of time which we spent in this House in discussing the census returns would indicate a general consensus of opinion that the question of population in Canada is, as it is in other new countries, one of the first importance, and I therefore think it justifies any amount of attention that hon. gentlemen feel themselves able to give to the subject. It goes without saying, Mr. Speaker, that there is perhaps no country in the civilized world to-day that will profit so largely and so immediately from a rapid increase in population as would the Dominion of Canada. We have such an enormous store of natural resources, not simply in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, where a vast extent of fertile agricultural land lies waiting for settlers, but in all the provinces of the Dominion. The northern portion of the province of Quebec where there are vast regions which have scarcely been touched as yet, the northern regions of the province of Ontario, New Brunswick, and the maritime provinces as well, with perhaps the exception of Prince Edward Island, and the western provinces all together give us enormous dormant natural resources easy to develop by an industrious and willing people, the equal of which cannot be found in the world to-day. Therefore, it becomes a question to which the wisdom of the members of this House may well be devoted to decide upon the best method of attacking and carrying on the work which is under the charge of the Department of Immigration. Now, I have no desire at all to place before the House the suggestion, or the claim, that the work which has been carried on under my supervision for the last five years has been perfectly done. I can only say that to the best of my ability I have endeavoured to see that every possible opportunity was taken to make that work successful and I may say without very much difficulty that on the whole the work has been successful and that we have done even much more than we could reasonably have been expected to have done before that work was undertaken. I desire, before going into any details in regard to the work, which I have not time to do before six o'clock, to answer in detail as far as possible a few of the criticisms which the hon. member for Lennox has brought to the attention of the House. One of the references particularly was to the personality of our agent in Ireland. Let me say in the first place, before I speak of that, that under any possible system of carrying on the work of immigration an hon. member of this House will be able at the end of four or five years to point to this place or that place and to say that the work has not been as successful as we would have liked. You cannot hope for phenomenal success everywhere. As, when firing off bullets on the battle field you cannot hope to kill with every bullet, but if you do not fire off any bullets at all, you cannot hope to kill anybody. We set our agents at work in various countries. In some places the work will turn out to be successful, while, with equally energetic and capable work in other places, it may happen that on account of adverse local circumstances the work is not successful, and you will be able at the end of a period of four or five years to lay your hand on some place where the work has not been as successful as we might have wished. As far as Mr. Devlin is concerned, I think every hon. member of this House who is acquainted with that gentleman will agree with me when I say that Mr. Devlin is a man of very extraordinary and exceptional ability. I do not think that any person who knows Mr. Devlin will dispute that fact, and if any person may be regarded as being well qualified to take charge of the work in Ireland and succeed in turning the tide of public opinion and of the people moving from Ireland in favour of Canada, Mr. Devlin would be the man likely to do it.

Mr. WILSON. I understand that Mr. Devlin, when he was appointed, was in charge of the immigration business in Ireland. Now, I understand that he has been reduced to the position of an ordinary immigration agent, that he has nothing to do with any other agent and that he has to report to Mr. Preston. Will the hon. minister tell us whether that is so ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no substantial change in the position which Mr. Devlin occupies now as compared with the position that he occupied before. The Deputy Minister of the Interior has lately been in the old country and he has made recommendations in regard to the method in which the work shall be carried on, but, to all intents and purposes, so far as the practical carrying on of the work is concerned, the work of Mr. Devlin

is just what it was before. The London office has always had general supervision of the work in Ireland and the British isles generally, and the London office will continue to supervise that work. But what I was saying was, that, so far as Mr. Devlin's personality is concerned, I do not think anybody who knows him will dispute the fact that if we were to look out for a man who would be competent to make a success of the work in Ireland, Mr. Devlin is the man that any person in this House would select for the work. I know that there are gentlemen on the other side of the House, and there are gentlemen on this side of the House too, who upon certain subjects entertain different opininons from those held by Mr. Devlin as to——

Mr. WILSON. I did not discuss Mr. Devlin's ability. So far as he was concerned I only discussed his indiscretion in giving that interview.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) must permit me to say something he did not say. My hon. friend was discussing the question of Mr. Devlin's salary, and that rendered it incumbent on me to discuss Mr. Devlin's ability to earn his salary. While we all recognize Mr. Devlin's ability and capacity—and I do not think that any one however violently prejudiced he may be against his opinions, will dispute his ability—I know it to be a fact that there are gentlemen on both sides of the House who have very violent differences of opinion with Mr. Devlin in regard to certain questions. I wish to say that so far as the question is concerned as to whether Mr. Devlin sympathizes with Mr. Redmond's political opinions or with the political opinions of Col. Saunderson the noted fire eater from Ulster who occupies a position directly opposite to that of Mr. Redmond——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister allow me to correct him, Col. Saunderson is not a fire eater, and he represents the city of Glasgow and he lives in Glasgow.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. If he is not a fire eater I beg his pardon.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Col. Saunderson is a gentleman Sir ; a most distinguished gentleman.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. Well, I will speak in general terms and I will say 'any fire eater.' However, I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) that my idea of Col. Saunderson being a fire eater arose from the fact that the last time I saw his name mentioned it was in connection with a free fight in which the two sides were represented.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Yes, and he won.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. That gave rise to a slight impression in my mind that Col. Saunderson might be a fire eater.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He stood up for his rights.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. However, that may be, what I desire to say is that so far as Mr. Devlin's opinions upon the subject of home rule for Ireland or the Nationalist question in Ireland are concerned, they do not concern either myself or the officers of the department particularly, and I am bound to say that I do not see why they should. There may be agents, and there will possibly be agents in the Department of the Interior scattered over various countries, who at times may be guilty of what may be regarded as political indiscretion which it would be quite impossible for any minister to prevent taking place. I do not know but what perhaps we might better leave Mr. Devlin to decide whether it is judicious for him to entertain opinions of a strong character upon political questions, so long as he does not do anything offensive to the government of the country in which he is doing his work. It appears to me that is the limit we ought to place upon the expression of political opinions. So long as Mr. Devlin does not make himself offensive to the government of the country in which he is working, I do not think we need concern ourselves particularly about his political views.

I venture however to say that if it were thought that Mr. Devlin was not a Nationalist in that part of the country in which he is doing his work, his usefulness would be largely gone, and therefore we cannot find fault witht him for at least allowing the people to believe that he entertains that political faith.

As to the effect of Mr. Devlin's work I shall quote a piece of testimony, and that is all I shall say on that phase of the question. I am not going to ask the House to take my own opinion or the opinion of any officer of the Department of Interior, nor even the opinion of any member of the Liberal party, but I shall quote the opinion of a gentleman who is a member of the same political party as our friends opposite, and who, I think is very competent to give an opinion on this subject. If the members of the House will look at the Ottawa 'Journal' of March 31st, they will there find a leter signed 'J. J.,' headed 'Mr. Devlin and Irish emigration.' Now 'J. J.' are the initials of the name of the writer. and I have the permission of the editor of the Ottawa 'Journal' to state what the name is. I knew the name of the writer at any rate, but I did not desire to disclose it without authority. The name of the person who wrote that letter to the Ottawa 'Journal' is Mr. James Johnson, a gentleman who corresponds in various parts of

the British Isles, for a number of Canadian newspapers.

Mr. WILSON. Who is that ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Jimmie Johnson.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. Mr. Johnson was formerly editor of the Kingston 'News' and later on the editor of the Ottawa 'Citizen.' He was an intimate friend of the late Sir John Macdonald, and an active and aggressive member of the Conservative party, so that I cannot be accused of quoting the evidence of a person who has any prejudice in favour of the present government. I shall not trouble the House by reading all of this long letter which extends over a column. It will be found in the Ottawa 'Journal' of March 31st of this year. I will read a portion of it which I think will convince the House that they must not be mislead into taking an adverse view of Mr. Devlin's course, by the separated extracts from his statements which have been placed before the House by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson). Mr. Johnson, first of all, discusses the condition of affairs in Ireland. Referring to the statement as made by Mr. Devlin that he did not urge people to leave Ireland, Mr. Johnson points out that this statement is quite consistent with Mr. Devlin doing effective work. The condition of the people of Ireland is that large numbers are emigrating. It is therefore not necessary for any one to urge people to leave Ireland and if Mr. Devlin did so it would be unpopular, and he would array against himself very influential classes of the community. Mr. Johnson points out, that knowing the fact that large numbers were certain to leave Ireland the true position for Mr. Devlin to take is to induce those who are leaving to direct their course to Canada. That is exactly what Mr. Devlin is doing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF INTERIOR. Mr. Johnson goes on to write as follows :—

Irishmen, of all classes, will emigrate ; millions have done so, and the percentage of them who regret their action is infinitesimally small. As (if I remember rightly) I remarked in a letter from Ireland some time ago, Mr. Devlin's attitude is this : He addresses the countrymen of his forefathers and says to them : 'I do not urge you to leave Ireland ; I do not want a man or woman who thinks he or she can get along well enough at home to pull up his or her stakes and to bid farewell, probably for ever, to the land of your birth, to which you are attached by so many natural ties. If, however, you have resolved upon seeking an existence in a new land—if you are determined upon trying your fortune elsewhere, I come to you as the representative of a government which can offer you terms of settlement as satisfactory as those to be obtained in any portion of the habitable globe. Canada is a country of vast extent, of unlimited personal freedom, of great possibilities—a country whose inhabitants can boast of its health-promoting and invigorating climate, of magnificent scenery, unparalleled in the world ; of great lakes and noble rivers ; of natural resources which are rich and varied and practically inexhaustible ; of a system of government unequalled in its advantages in the general interests of the people ; of educational advantages within the reach of all ; a country where, as the result of industrious perseverance and frugality of living, a man may, within a reasonably short time become, in the most absolute sense his own landlord—the owner not only of the house in which he lives, but of the land upon which it is built.' Such, I understand, is Mr. Devlin's attitude ; and can it be successfully challenged ? I do not think so. And, in my humble opinion it is perfectly consistent with the declaration, 'I do not urge Irishmen to leave Ireland.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I can offer no more satisfactory evidence than this, from a gentleman of the same political faith as our friends opposite, a correspondent of Conservative papers, who is in England at the present time, who has been all over the ground, and who feels compelled to express his opinion that Mr. Devlin's attitude cannot be successfully challenged.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman one question ? I understood him to say that he did not consider Mr. Devlin's statement, that he would never advise immigrants to leave Ireland, inconsistent with his duty as an immigration agent. Does he regard it as consistent with Mr. Devlin's duty to belong to the National Land League and to give subscriptions to it—a body which advises the people not to leave Ireland ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will answer the hon. gentleman's question after 8 o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair, at 6 o'clock, I had devoted some attention to the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) in regard to the work of Mr. Devlin in Ireland. I think I had said practically all that I desired to say on that subject, except, in reply to the hon. member who interrogated me at 6 o'clock, that I do not think it is possible or desirable for the government to attempt to make inquisitorial examination into the opinions of men in the civil service. We have Irish Catholics and Irish Protestants, French Catholics and French Protestants, English Catholics and English Protestants in the government service. They do not agree on all subjects either political or religious, and in a country like Canada I do not think it

is desirable for us to undertake to scrutinize too closely the opinions arrived at to some extent from the nationality of the individual. Our friends the Irish Catholics will entertain opinions on the subject of home rule for Ireland as long as they see fit to do it, and no opinion that may be expressed to the contrary by any other portion of the community is likely to affect those opinions. It is quite true, we have not secured a large immigration from Ireland ; but I have not thought it desirable materially to change the position there, except to withdraw one of our agents on the report of the deputy minister. We now have one agent there in addition to Mr. Devlin, the third agent, Mr. Webster, having been taken from Dublin and sent to England to be attached to the High Commissioner's office ; and he is now in this country in charge of a party of British immigrants who have lately come out.

With regard to the increase to Mr. Devlin's salary, that was made on my own motion, on Mr. Devlin's application to me, repeated several times, and I am quite prepared to take the responsibility of it ; and I do not think that the House, particularly those members who are acquainted with Mr. Devlin, will say that the salary he receives is out of proportion to his ability and the energy he brings to the work in which he is engaged.

With regard to the attitude of the hon. member for Lennox as to the number of immigrants we get from Ireland, I can only say that while it may be quite possible for him to pick out the year 1896, in which no agent was stationed in Ireland, and to say that because we got so many immigrants in that year, therefore the agents who have been stationed there have done nothing, and that we would get as many immigrants if there were no agents in Ireland, if the hon. gentleman had any acquaintance with immigration work he would know that such is not the case. We would get a certain number of immigrants from the British Isles if we had no agents there at all ; but the number would dwindle very largely. The general rule of immigration work is that we get immigrants just in proportion as our efforts are vigorous or otherwise. There is no rule more clear, as is shown by the results of the past five years, than that just as soon as you stop spending money and making efforts the number of immigrants you receive from any special section falls off. Local circumstances may control in some cases and cause a slight variation from this rule ; but the general rule unquestionably holds good.

Respecting the criticism of my hon. friend as to the form of the statements prepared by the Department of Immigration, I can only say that if my hon. friend will confer with the leader of the opposition, and take the responsibility of making any request respecting that matter, I will consider it very carefully, and do the best I can to meet the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite in that respect.

Just a few words with regard to another question which my hon. friend brought up, and which has been brought up in other places and at other times ; that is, the question which is to some extent dealt with by the Bill I had the honour of introducing yesterday—the question whether it is or is not true that Canada is being over run by immigrants of an undesirable character, persons of criminal antecedents and tendencies, and persons suffering from diseases of a malignant type. I can say at once to the House that there is no foundation whatever for that statement. It has grown out of a few trifling circumstances ; it has been magnified by a certain portion of the press ; and for reasons which interested persons entertain and are influenced by ; but as a matter of fact it is not worthy of discussion in this place. The circumstances are of the most trifling description. The position at the present time is this. A large number of the agents which the United States Immigration Department keeps in office along the line of the Canadian frontier are not kept there for the purpose of preventing people going from Canada to the United States because they are suffering from diseases or because they are undesirable immigrants.

They are kept there for the purpose of enforcing the Alien Labour law, and it might happen in an odd case that some person, diseased or deformed, who attempted to cross the boundary, might be stopped. But they are not there for that purpose, and there is no occasion of that kind sufficiently general to require any attention whatever on our part. What we do require is to keep close watch on the people coming to our shores from foreign countries. The inspection of these people is made at Quebec, Halifax and St. John. None is required at Montreal, because they are landed at Quebec and inspected before being sent forward. The United States department has officers and medical inspectors at these three places—Quebec, Halifax and St. John. Inspections are made there by the American officers, and our officials know every person who is rejected by them. It is all done within a few yards of where our officers are stationed, so that they know every person rejected. To show the wild statements made sometimes in the press, let me refer to the report, which was published not long ago, that there were over 200 diseased persons in the hospitals at Montreal who had landed there on their way to the United States and had been stopped by the American officers and thrown on our community. That was a serious statement and it received attention. I took the trouble to have an investigation, and I found that in Montreal the medical superintendent of the Notre Dame Hospital reported that in January there were two im-

migrants admitted to his hospital, in February two, and in March six. The medical superintendent of the Royal Victoria reported that there had not been a sick or diseased immigrant admitted there during the past three months. The Montreal General Hospital reported that there were not at present any diseased immigrant patients in the hospital, nor had there been any within the past three months. The Hotel Dieu reported that during the past three months there were seven patients in that hospital, some of whom might be classed as immigrants, but their diseases were of the most trifling character, and nearly all were discharged as cured. As a matter of fact, out of 25,000 people who came to Canada and landed at the three ports I have mentioned, on their way to the United States, 132 were rejected by the American commissioners, and out of these 132 there are 39 in Canada at present. Of these 39, 21 are Germans who were rejected for a most trifling and absurd reason. They were rejected because some slight disease had broken out among the people. Our medical examiner declared that there was no reason why they should not be allowed to remain in Canada, and they were sent to the North-west and are there now. They were of a fairly good class and quite desirable as immigrants. That leaves 18 out of the 39, of whom seven or eight are at St. John awaiting deportation, as soon as the Act is passed which I have introduced, so that the House will see that the wild statement I have referred to is entirely without foundation.

I have a copy of the interview with Mr. Watchorn, the special inspector of the United States government, which was given to the Montreal 'Star.' I shall not criticise that interview in detail, further than to say there is nothing in it which would cause me to qualify the statements I have made in any way. It will easily be understood that men stationed as officers along the Canadian frontier line are desirous to show their government that they have a great deal to do, as otherwise their offices would be abolished, and we may therefore look constantly for indications in the press that these gentlemen are extremely busy.

As regards the suggestion that there should be an arrangement between the two governments respecting persons unfit to be admitted to Canada, that arrangement now exists and is being carried out as completely as possible, and when the Act I have introduced is on the statute-book, we will have the power to deport unsatisfactory immigrants which we cannot well do now. The only thing necessary to enable us to carry out the arrangement with absolute perfection is the power to deport immigrants rejected alike by our American commissioners and our own officers. As soon as we have that power, it will be exercised. This question has only arisen during the past year, and only within three or four months has our attention been called to the necessity of legislation of that kind. That is all I need say upon the examination of the immigrants as they enter Canada.

I think it might be well for me to indicate the general scope of the work of the immigration branch. We spend over half a million dollars a year for the purpose of promoting this work. At present in Canada our work consists in receiving immigrants at the ocean ports. We have large accommodation sheds at Halifax, and commodious quarters at St. John and Quebec, and officers, matrons and medical attendants where necessary. In some places the quarantine officer does the medical work. At these places we receive immigrants and have every facility for making a proper examination and seeing everything is done which is required. We have also an office in Montreal, and in addition we give a grant to the immigration society in Montreal, which does a very valuable work in connection with looking after women who come out as immigrants and who are, for the time being, homeless or in need of assistance or protection. In the North-west, we have a staff at Winnipeg and officers stationed throughout the various parts of the country. The intention of the department is that every person who is shipped forward and reports at the Winnipeg office shall be taken care of as early as possible, and every effort made to keep track of that person until he is actually located on land and becomes a bona fide settler. That work differentiates our system very clearly from that followed in former years. The result of my residence for many years in the North-west convinces me that the reason for the failure of immigration work by the late government, was that when these people got to Winnipeg they were simply dumped out and left to take care of themselves. I am not adverting to that for the purpose of attacking or criticising the late government, but am simply pointing out what everybody in the west knows to be the case. One of the first things I did was to organize a staff for that purpose. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) was put in charge as immigration commissioner, and until he became a candidate for a seat in this House, he performed that work with great energy and capacity, as is universally recognized by both political parties and citizens generally in the North-west. The result of the change was that instead of poor immigrants, but well deserving enough and willing enough to work, but lacking direction and knowledge of the country, being thrown on the community, those people were looked after and provided for, and care was exercised over them the first three months, in which time they became self-sustaining, and in nearly every case settled down and became self-supporting citizens. We practically have no trouble in the west in regard to taking care of our immigrants. The system has been thor-

oughly worked out, the officers understand their business, and the work goes along with great regularity. Consequently, we are practically free from annoyances and difficulties which my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) had to contend with during the earlier years when he took charge of it.

We have in Ireland two agents, in Wales one, in England five, in Scotland one, on the continent of Europe one, and in the United States twenty. That is to say, we have in the United States twenty salaried officers and agents, besides about two hundred and fifty local agents who are paid entirely by commission. That gives the House a general idea of the scope of the work and the places where the work is done. The only material additions to that summary which I require to give is with regard to the continent of Europe. We are not allowed there to carry on openly an immigration propaganda. But we have an arrangement with what is known as the North Atlantic Transportation Company—I think that is the name, though I may not have it technically accurate—under which the bonuses formerly paid to steamship companies are paid to that company. The company is an association of steamship agents, booking agents, who have been long in the business of booking passengers from the continent of Europe, and who understand the business far better than any government officer could. We pay the bonus to them on satisfactory evidence being furnished that the immigrants have become bona fide settlers of Canada. We have had a contract with the company for the last year or two, and it has lately been renewed. They are men of wealth and substance and standing in the business they follow, and the relations of the department with them have been of an extremely satisfactory character.

Now, just a few words with regard to the results of the work. In the first place, I think hon. members who have heard the discussions that have taken place on this subject in past years will bear me out in saying I have not been excessively sanguine in the remarks I have made on this subject. I have not sought to give the House the idea that we were entitled to claim any wonderful amount of credit for the work we were doing. Nor have I sought to overdraw the success of the efforts we were making. But I have indicated to the House from time to time the great difficulty under which the work was carried on, and have tried to point out the systematic and persistent effort that is required if the work is to be successful. When I took charge some five years ago, it was admitted between the Prime Minister and myself when we discussed the subject—and time has not changed the opinion of either of us, I fancy—that the successful prosecution of the work of the immigration branch was one of the most important things, if not the most important thing the government of Canada had to deal with. It was thought and I think present circumstances indicate the truth of it, that there was no line of expenditure that would produce for the people of Canada more desirable and satisfactory results than a successful immigration propaganda, resulting in the addition to our population of a large number of people who would engage in productive agricultural operations. I have no desire to waste time in recriminating or in calling special attention to the history of this work in the past. My hon. friend from Lennox has given certain statistics, some of which, perhaps, I would have given if he had not. The information is there, and it is not necessary for me to repeat it. But I do desire to point out that, at the time when the change of government took place and when we took charge of this work of the immigration department, the work carried on by our friends of the late government had proven to be an absolute failure. They did not succeed, apparently, in taking hold of this movement and carrying it to a successful conclusion. And the best proof of that is in the fact that they had themselves voluntarily reduced the amount of money they were expending in connection with the immigration operations, they had discharged their agents in various places, and the operations that were being carried on by them during the year when the change of government took place were the reverse of vigorous and showed that no great interest was being taken in this question. We had to begin and build up the work almost from the beginning. In certain parts of the work we have been extremely successful, in other parts, perhaps, not so successful. On the whole, I can say that the money expended has been well expended; I claim that no money has been expended by the government in the past five years that has produced more desirable, substantial and satisfactory results, or that will redound more to the credit and prosperity of Canada than the money expended by the immigration branch. I do not propose to enter unnecessarily into statistics upon this question. But I may say that we had, in 1896, from all sources, 16,835 immigrants. The number has grown steadily. Last year it was, in round numbers, 50,000. I shall be very much surprised—and I am not inclined as a rule to be sanguine or to over-estimate what is going to happen—if that 50,000 does not grow to 70,000 during the present year. While, during the first two or three years of our work, the results were not so great, perhaps, as we might have hoped, it was not unreasonable that such would be the case. Let me point out some of the difficulties under which we labour. My hon. friend from Lennox has said that he would be prepared to back the government in any reasonable expenditure to get desirable immigrants from the United States. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that when we began

our work in the spring of 1897, in the states of Minnesota and Dakota, we were faced by the fact that the farmers in the southern portion of the United States did not believe that we could raise wheat in Manitoba or the North-west Territories. Their ignorance of the situation, their ignorance of our country was so dense as to be almost incredible. To overcome that, we had to adopt every means we could think of—means that, necessarily, were very expensive. The first thing we did was to send agents to the fall fairs throughout the southern portions of Minnesota and Dakota, and also in parts of Iowa and other western states, with exhibits of farm produce. These men took such things as grain in the sheaf and vegetables of all kinds and exhibited them at these fairs, advertised their exhibits in the local papers and induced people to come and see them. In this way we got many to understand what kind of a country it was we were inviting the people to come to. We found that by this means we accomplished something. But we found we had to do something more radical than that, and we adopted the following means: We found that the editors of the papers in the western states had state editorial associations, and that those associations were in the habit every year of taking pleasure trips through various parts of the country, and we utilized that fact by inviting these state editorial associations to take their pleasure trip through the western portion of Canada. We secured transportation for these associations over the Canadian Pacific Railway and took them through from Winnipeg to the Pacific coast. We did this three years in succession, and we saw while they were on the trip that they enjoyed themselves as well as possible. The expense was not very great, the visitors were accorded a hearty reception at the hands of the people along the line, and they saw the country under the most favourable circumstances. They were quite ready to accede to our request, when they went back home, that each editor should write a fair and reasonable account of what he had seen in western Canada. The House will understand that the result of that policy being followed respecting three or four of the great western states, and the distribution of literature favourable to Canada, and descriptive of western Canada, was entirely to change the sentiment of the rural classes in those states. The result is shown in the growing figures of immigration which we have received from those states. We started in the first year with an American immigration in 1897, of 712; in 1898, of 9,119; in 1899, of 11,945; in 1900, of 15,500; in 1901, of 17,987. I do not think it is possible that we should have less than from 25,000 to 30,000 this year, and gentlemen who are in a better position to make an estimate than I am put the figures considerably higher. So it will be seen that for the purpose of making known the resources, not only of western Canada, but of all Canada, through the western states where there is an agricultural class who are ideal settlers for Canada, the money we have spent and the efforts we have made have proved to be almost phenomenally successful and satisfactory.

Before I speak more upon that point, I am going to give a few figures to show the results of the policy which has been carried on. I have already said that the total number of immigrants who have gone in there rose from 16,835 in 1896, to about 50,000 last year. During the first three months of this year, to the 31st of March, we have reported over 10,000 immigrants through the Winnipeg office; the Winnipeg office keeps track of all the immigrants who go into Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Last year during the same period, from the 1st of January to the 31st of March, the number was 5,800; so that this year we have almost doubled the record of last year. The House will see that I am within the mark when I say that as against the 50,000 last year we are very likely to have not less than 70,000 this year.

The statement is also made that the immigrants we are receiving are mostly foreigners of a doubtful class, and it may be interesting to give some figures in that connection to show what the facts are. Last year, out of 49,000 immigrants that we received, 11,810 were British, 17,983 were from the United States, 1,750 were Scandinavians, 984 were Germans, the rest were miscellaneous nationalities from the continent. Now let it be remembered that all these immigrants passed through the hands of our officers, who know exactly to what class these people belong. I am therefore quite justified in saying that there is no foundation for the statement that these people are not of a class that are likely to become good settlers and good citizens of Canada. Apart altogether from that opinion which I express, the House will see that in round numbers 30,000 out of 50,000 were British and Americans.

The question of the cost of the immigrants is one respecting which the House may not have consulted the report of the department, and I will mention the figures, which can be found in the annual report. The cost of immigrants from the continent last year was $2.65 per head; the British immigrants cost $9.58 per head; the United States immigrants cost $7.96 per head; the average per capita was $6.07; including the expenditure in Canada for looking after them, the total was $8.34 per head. Now if hon. gentlemen have paid much attention to the question of populating vacant lands and colonizing generally, they will know that these figures are small. The experience of land companies in the western states, and of railway companies generally has been that on an average—I think my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), who has had a

good deal of experience in this line will confirm what I say—on an average each head of a family who has located upon railway companies' land has cost the land company about $50. As against that we are able to show that our expenditure with respect to immigrants that we have received is about $8.34 per head, or allowing four to a family, about $35 per head of a family.

Now as to the actual results which have followed in the way of settlement, I think it will be seen that they are satisfactory. During the four years which preceded 1897, the number of homestead entries made in Manitoba and the North-west Territories was 9,844 ; the number of homestead entries that were made in the succeeding four years was 27,130. Now it will be evident to any person that this growth could not happen by accident, it is simply the result of persistent work which we have carried on for the purpose of colonization. The net number of homestead entries which were granted in 1896, taking off those that were cancelled, was less than 150, in 1901 the number was 8,136. For the first three months of the year 1902, the number of homestead entries that have been granted in Manitoba and the North-west Territories amounts to 3,024, and we may confidently expect that at the end of the year we will be able to show a total of over 10,000 homestead entries in the west. I do not know that I need to go into any further details for the purpose of showing the success of the work we have carried on.

But, I may point out to the House that not only is settlement carried on by the granting of homestead entries, but settlement has progressed to the extent and the class of settlers we are getting in is improving to the extent, that, I fancy, fully one-half of the settlers that are actually located on the land in the west are located on purchased lands and have not taken up homestead at all. The division, I would say, roughly speaking, would be about one half, so that in addition to something over 8,000 homestead entries last year, there was practically an equal amount of land sold by various railways and land companies with the result that practically an equal amount of land was settled in addition to that which was settled by the taking up of homesteads, or of free grant lands. The statistics in regard to the sale of lands show very clearly what has been going on.

Let us take the case of five companies having land for sale in the North-west Territories—the Hudson's Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Manitoba and South-western Colonization Railway Company, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamship Company, and the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company, these being the companies which are the principal land owners in the North-west. The sales since 1893 have been as follows :

Year.	Acres.
1893..	120,000
1894..	68,666
1895..	114,000
1896..	108,000
1897..	222,000
1898..	448,000
1899..	462,000
1900..	648,000
1901..	621,000

And for the three months of this year these five companies have sold 443,000 acres of land. The House will see that there has been an enormous change in the position of affairs. In fact, I need not say anything to convince hon. gentlemen from the west, or hon. gentlemen who are following the state of affairs there, that a transformation has taken place in regard to the position of affairs in that western country. In 1896, it would be safe to say, that there was no progress being made. This was the position of the population of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Practically, things were at a standstill and in the great territory of Alberta, I think I am safe in saying, that the people, to some extent at least, were actually moving out of that territory. At the present time there is an enormous stream of population going into that territory and not only going into Alberta but into different portions of the Canadian North-west. As a result of the effect which our work is having we find that the inauguration of a movement of settlers from the western states to Canada has caused speculators from the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis and other western cities to go into the North-west Territories and buy up large quantities of land. We find now that the work which we as a government are doing in the western states through our agents is being enormously supplemented by the efforts of these American speculators who have bought land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories and who are endeavouring to co-operate with us in getting settlers to go upon the land which they have purchased. I might give to the House a practical indication of one result of the work which we have been doing. I had sent to me the other day a special issue of the Minneapolis 'Journal,' a paper published in the city of Minneapolis which has a very large circulation and I find, Sir, that the Minneapolis 'Journal' has actually published a special edition dealing with the resources of western Canada in which they describe the resources of our western country in as glowing terms as any government pamphlet could do. I fancy that between the time when the farmers of Minnesota would not belive that we could grow wheat north of the international boundary line and the time when we find a great Minneapolis paper making a special issue for the purpose of advertising our land, there must have been a large amount of effective work done. I find on the front page, head lines to this effect :

American Invasion of Western Canada a Peaceful Invasion.

Bumper Crops of 1901 made Western Canada Canada's Land of Rich Promise.

I simply bring this to the attention of the House to show one of the results of the work we have been doing in the western states, and that we have secured the co-operation of the most important agency that could possibly be obtained. The people who would not believe the representations of our agents and who would not read the government pamphlets will read the representations and statements of their papers, will believe these statements and will be influenced by them to a much greater extent than they would be by any other agency that could be employed. We have these land companies in Minneapolis, St. Paul and Omaha, and we have therefore co-operating agencies in these western cities of the most effective description and the result is seen in what is taking place in our western country at the present time.

I am not going to burden the discussion by quoting extracts to any extent at all, but I am going to cite, for the benefit of hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, a few remarks from papers which support them and which, therefore, cannot be accused of being unduly biased in favour of the government. There is no paper in Canada that has more violently attacked me and attacked the policy which I have pursued in regard to immigration than the Winnipeg 'Telegram.' The Winnipeg 'Telegram' in its issue of the 3rd of this month used language to this effect:

> Probably there has never been a greater movement with 'back to the land' behind it than is now going on in the province of Manitoba and the North-west. The general tendency from all quarters of the globe seems to be concentrated in the pursuit of agriculture. Settlers are coming in from all quarters of the globe, but the most notable influx of land buyers is from the republic to the south.

The Winnipeg 'Tribune' refers to this special edition and describes the influx of people in much the same terms. We have had articles in the New York 'Sun,' the Springfield 'Republican' and in the leading United States papers describing the movement, and all attributing a vigour and extent to it, which I, myself, can hardly believe to be well founded, because, if the statements which we find in these papers were correct, the numbers who would be coming would be much beyond anything we have hitherto ventured to hope for.

I have called the attention of the House to these facts for a purpose, and that purpose, Mr. Speaker, is, if possible, to enlist the sympathy of hon. members on both sides of the House in the vigorous prosecution of this work and in everything that tends to the promotion of immigration in the west. I want to say, as a responsible minister, having before me the fact that what I say is taken down and that I am likely to be judged by it in the future, that I have formed the deliberate opinion, and I entertain the deliberate opinion to-night, that Canada has, during the next two or three years, the greatest opportunity of promoting its own greatness that it has ever had since confederation.

I beg to say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that there is a gentleman in this House who fully realizes what can be done for the Dominion of Canada during the next five years by a progressive agricultural settlement in the west, if all is done that ought to be done for the purpose of promoting it and assisting it, and encouraging it. Of course things may happen which we do not anticipate. Unexpected misfortunes may check this movement, or something may occur to prevent us reaping the full benefit of it. But speaking to-night from the information I have at my command, speaking with as full knowledge of the subject as it is possible to derive from the reports of officers who are engaged in the work; I believe I am safe in saying that we have inaugurated a movement of population towards western Canada much larger than that which existed in 1881 and 1882, when the first movement of population went there, and moreover, the present movement is coming from the outside and not from within Canada herself. The movement, in fact, is adding the very best class of people of the western states, by thousands, to our British population.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not mentioning this for the purpose of getting any special credit for myself. The work has been carried on to the best of the ability of the men in whose hands it has been placed. I do not agree with my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) when he says that a good crop or two would do the work and bring in settlers to fill up the country. I have lived there for a good many years. I have seen good crops, and I have seen good prices; I have seen bad crops and I have seen bad prices; but I never saw this immigration movement from the western states until the work was done there which got into the minds of the people of that country a full and complete knowledge of the resources of Canada. When that was done, and only when that was done, did we begin to reap the results of our work. If the House will consider for a few moments the possible effects of what is going on now, hon. gentlemen will realize its vast importance to the whole Dominion of Canada. Last year the production of Manitoba and the North-west Territories was enormous considering the size of the population. It must be remembered that out of the total population, perhaps not more than two-thirds contributed to that crop. Out of the population of 450,000 (or nearly 500,000 now), about one-third were persons who had come in within the last three years,

and it is not until a settler has been in the country three or four years that he is able to produce to any considerable extent or to add appreciably to the general production. Therefore, only about two-thirds of the population of the west contributed to last year's crop. When you consider the enormous production of last year coming from certainly not more than 300,000 producers, you have only to reflect for a moment to realize what the production will be when we have from 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 upon these fertile prairies.

What I desire to impress upon the House is this: That while we have been talking in past years about having a large population upon our western prairies, we have been talking about a thing that did not appear to be in sight; a thing that was in the future; a thing that might come, but as to which we had no evidence that it was likely to come in the near future. I want to tell the House now, that if we can get several thousand settlers into the Territories, this year, and increase that again next year, then in six or seven years we will have such a producing population as will be of untold benefit to the whole Dominion of Canada. When we talk now about peopling the prairies, we are talking about something that is present; something that is tangible; something that we can all unite on no matter what our political predilections may be.

I do not plead this in order to escape criticism, because I perfectly understand that the work of the Department of Immigration, like the work of any other department of government is a matter for political criticism, and I expect to get my share as do other members of the government. But I desire to say, that so far as the result is concerned, we must all agree that the result is most desirable and if matters are carried on as they ought to be, that result is almost within our grasp.

While I am upon this subject, I want to say a word or two more upon the necessities of the situation in the west. The House will pardon me for departing a little from the question immediately before the House, but perhaps there will be no discussion in this House again in respect to which it will be as opportune as it is now. What I want to say is this: Many gentlemen who represent constituencies in eastern Canada are unable to understand the importunity of our western people in regard to railroads. They are apt to think, and not without apparent reason, that our people are sometimes unreasonable in their demands for railway accommodation, which would seem to be far in excess of that which older portions of the eastern provinces possess. I want to call the attention of the House to a fact known to persons who are familiar with the western country. In the first place, that is a wheat raising country; in many sections it is almost exclusively a wheat-raising country, and the conditions are different from what they are in any other portions of Canada. The farmer from the western states who has been accustomed to live in a wheat-raising state, will not go anywhere that he does not think he is going to be within twenty miles of a railway. He simply won't go. He will go 200 miles or 500 miles away if he has reason to believe that there will be a railway there within a few years, but he will not settle down with the idea that he is going to be thirty or forty miles from a railway, because he knows from experience that no man can raise wheat and haul it that distance to a railway station and make it pay. The enormous labour of hauling large crops of wheat a long distance has proven by experience to be such that wheat growing cannot be successfully carried on under such conditions. Our people have learned that lesson by experience. The result is that if there is a section of the country thirty or forty miles away from any railway that is projected, and the people get the idea that there is not going to be a railway there within a reasonable time, they will simply get out and go to some other part of the country which is favourably situated, and which is likely to get a railway soon. My object in making this reference is to commend to the favourable consideration of the House the idea of a liberal policy in respect to the construction of colonization railways through the Northwest. I am satisfied that if parliament desires to reap to the fullest extent possible the benefit which can be reaped from the position in which we stand to-day in respect to immigration, parliament will have to face this railway question in the Northwest. Without being too sanguine, I think I can say to the House: That we practically have got over the hill upon the immigration question; we have surmounted the principal difficulties, and we may now hope for a pretty rapid return for the money which we have been expending in past years.

Just a word or two in regard to the work of the department in Great Britain. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) mentioned that changes have been made in Great Britain. Members of the House will remember that two years ago I stated that I was not altogether satisfied with the way in which the work in Great Britain was being conducted, and that an attempt was being made to improve the character of the work there. The work in other places had been brought under the direct control of the department, and for the last year Mr. Preston, the inspector in England, had been devoting his attention largely to continental immigration, with a considerable degree of success. I stated to the House last year that the work in London had been placed under the High Commissioner, but practically, as to its actual superintendence, in charge of Mr. Preston. That was the result of a conference which I had with

Lord Strathcona when I was in London, and when I discussed the subject very fully with him. When Lord Strathcona came to Canada some time ago, I again discussed it with him, with the result that the work was put more decidedly under the charge of the department and separated from the other work of the High Commissioner's office. While it was to remain under Lord Strathcona's direction as High Commissioner, the reports were to be sent direct to the head office here, and the officers were to receive instructions directly from us as to how the work should be carried on. I was not satisfied that that arrangement would be carried out successfully without some supervision here, and therefore I sent over to England Mr. Smart, the deputy minister, who has given special attention to the subject of immigration during the time he has been in charge of the department, and who is thoroughly competent to deal with any question in connection with it. Under Mr. Smart the change was made, and I think that those who follow the English papers will admit that the amount of attention he received from the English press was extremely gratifying, and the practical results, as far as immigration is concerned, have been still more gratifying; because the work of the office has assumed larger proportions from the time the change was made and a different method of carrying on the work was inaugurated. One thing that was done when Mr. Smart was in England I may mention to the House as an illustration of the difference in methods applied, and the result of it. While Mr. Smart and Mr. White, the press agent of the department, were in London, they conceived the idea of getting out an issue of a newspaper devoted specially to Canada. They got out the paper, had 500,000 copies printed, from an advertising agency got lists of names of agricultural labourers and farmers, to whom they thought it desirable to send the paper, and had the 500,000 copies distributed to them through the mails. The result was that the department received an enormous amount of inquiries from parts of the country from which no inquiries had been received before, showing that the change in method by which direct communication was had with the class of people whom it was desired to reach, did have very satisfactory results. It is intended to follow in Great Britain more largely the method which has been followed successfully in the United States, that is, to relieve the agents largely of the work of lecturing, and to trust more to advertising and literature to bring about a desire on the part of immigrants to move. This, particularly advertising in the regular press, is the best method of calling attention to the resources of the country, and inducing people to make up their minds to come. I do not know that there is anything else to which I desire at the present moment to draw attention; but if, in the course of the discussion on the estimates any other information is desired, I shall be very happy to give it.

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

Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $110,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think it might be satisfactory to the House if I stated in general terms how the vote was expended in 1900-1901. Salaries of agents and employees on the immigration staff, $109,590.44. Salaries of extra clerks at the head office, $4,757.72. Travelling and office expenses—in Canada, $23,-724,90; in the United States, $31,185.62; in England, $11,696; in Ireland, $6,804.05; in Scotland, $5,119.88; on the continent, $4,-065.99; total, $82,696.45. Miscellaneous expenses in the High Commissioner's office in London, $4,704.77. Postage at the head office, $4,827. Commissions and bonuses—in the United States, $11,879.67; to children, $2,716; British and continental, $28,-136.19; total, $42,418.47. Services for land guides in the west and interpreters, $8,-701.20. Advertising and printing—in Great Britain, $74,429.50; on the continent, $2,-238.86. The last item is very small, the explanation being that under our arrangement with the North Atlantic Company, they paid for the advertising and all the expenses in that respect. The general expenses for immigration were as follows: On medical expense we spent $3,424; on laundry and miscellaneous $700; on supplies, &c., $735; on uniforms and equipment, $5,215; on collections of exhibits, $2,150; on literature and expenses of delegates, $2,781. Then we provided some medals for competition in the British schools so as to encourage the children in acquiring knowledge of Canada. For those medals we paid $614.14. We gave a special grant to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, which we have been in the habit of giving some years, that being a railway company which has done a good deal to promote settlement and colonization in the neighbourhood of Lake St. John. We have given that company $8,000. We are giving a colonization society which works amongst the French Canadians in the eastern states and locates them in the neighbourhood of Lake St. John, $2,400. We have spent on hospitals, $3,696; on a colonization society at Algoma, $250; and on exhibits at Winnipeg Industrial Exhibition, $1,000. A good many people from Dakota and Minnesota visited this exhibition. Then we paid a gratuity to one of our officers of $200; miscellaneous expenditure, $1,696; the Workingmen's National Immigration Society, $1,-000; the Girl's Home at London, $1,000; the Girl's Home at Winnipeg, which takes care of young women who have no home, several hundred dollars; making a total expenditure of $447,739. That was the expenditure in 1900-1. and will give a fair

idea of the manner in which the money is distributed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can you give us an idea of how the $100,000 for agents and employees in the three countries mentioned is distributed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is distributed as follows : Salaries of agents in Canada, $60,312.50 ; United States, $27,250 ; Great Britain and Ireland, $20,100 ; the continent, $3,400.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does the amount expended in Canada cover ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That pays all the officers of the department, including those who have charge of the buildings at Halifax, St. John and Quebec, our staff in the North-west and Winnipeg, and all over the country, as well as some extra clerks here.

Mr. PUTTEE. I understand that the principal office in Liverpool has been moved to Birmingham. Why has that been done ? It seems to me that Liverpool is the proper place to have a head office.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The office has not been changed from Liverpool, but when the deputy minister was there he came to the conclusion that the staff might be better distributed. He is leaving one of the officers in Liverpool, who had been working there, Mr. Jury, and the other officer named Mitchell—a very excellent officer, with whom I am personally acquainted—has been sent to Birmingham, so that the office at Liverpool is not closed, but we are sending one of the officers to Birmingham.

Mr. PUTTEE. Is Birmingham to be the principal station ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Liverpool must be the principal station because it is the shipping port.

Mr. PUTTEE. I can hardly see what is the object of having an office in the city of Birmingham. It is hardly likely you are going to procure agriculturists from that district. You might as well expect to find them in Whitechapel. The labour interests of the country, in years past and this year, have approached the different governments and Ministers of the Interior, and have always pointed out their opposition to state aided immigration to labourers, and the reply has always been that the policy of the government was only to encourage people coming into the country who are going to settle on our lands. I was on a deputation only last month, which waited on the First Minister, and he then reiterated that policy. He told the deputation that he would have instructions sent to the agents instructing them that they were not to go out of their way to induce mechanics, labourers, wage-earners to come to Canada, and the next thing I heard was that the office was being moved from Liverpool to Birmingham.

There is another matter to which I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister. Last August, just when the western crop was ready, there were not only large excursions inaugurated in eastern Canada, but also in Great Britain, and circulars were sent out from the High Commissioner's office in London, stating that nine shillings and ten shillings a day, with board, was being paid harvesters in western Canada. That was not true. Harvesters were not being paid $2.25 or $2.50 a day, with board, in the west. The result was that during the third week of August quite a large number left England and arrived in the west about the first week of September, only to find that they had been practically misled. This caused a great deal of dissatisfaction, and those who could do so returned straight to England, and no doubt that offset, to some extent, the work which our agents are doing over there. We should be very careful not to publish statements so much overdrawn when the facts can be ascertained. I believe that the lack of proper direction in the importing and distributing of the excursionists was the means of driving a great many British citizens across the line to the United States, and I mention this in order that it may be avoided in the future.

The thing was done in this way. In England, and also in the east here, there was a good deal of publicity given to the very true statement that there was a tremendous crop to be gathered, and that 20,000 harvesters were needed. About 18,000 came up, nearly as many as were wanted. The country had to get them. There was so little planing, so little ordering of this movement, that it was left mostly to the railway companies ; and I submit that a railway company does not go into these things thoroughly enough, and is not the proper authority to trust in such matters. The result was that large numbers of men were gathered together in small towns, sometimes after the market had been fully supplied. Unfortunately, at that time we were struck by a wet season there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When did that occur ?

Mr. PUTTEE. From about the 4th of September. It is true, that after the men got there the local government bestirred itself and tried to relieve the situation. But it was too late then, arrangements should have been made two weeks before. There was a lack of proper handling of these men, and they suffered seriously in consequence. And we suffered also as a country. At that time the harvest to the south, in Minnesota and Dakota was not finished and numbers of our people were so disgusted with the treatment they had

received that they crossed the line. They blamed the railway company, or the government or anybody they pleased, but they blamed somebody, because they found themselves there and no provision made to look after their interests. Though no figures can be got upon these matters, I am justified in saying that hundreds, probably thousands, drifted across the line into the two states I have mentioned. These were our own Canadian people mainly, people from Ontario, and from all the country east as far as Prince Edward Island, just the people we want to keep in that country. And it does seem to me that, when we are going so deeply into expenditure in immigration matters, we should, at least, not drive our own people out. I am not opposed to immigration. I am glad to say that at last we begin to see the west fill up as we expected it to. At the same time it is not good policy and it is not sound business to give all our attention and spend all our money to bring in people from other countries and not take even ordinary precautions to keep our own people. We should, at all events, make it easier for these people. If this matter had been handled properly no complaint would have been made. But there were hundreds, and I do not know that I should be wrong if I said thousands who were driven across the boundary. In case of another crop such as that, if the country has to appeal for help, thorough and early action should be taken by this government and the local government and all interested in transportation, in settling the country and in getting out the crop. I think it is only right to bring this to the attention of the minister, in order that similar difficulties may be avoided in the future.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has not, for many years, been the policy of the department, either under the late government or under this government, to make any attempt to induce mechanics or wage earners to come to Canada. The committee will see that, of course, it will be impossible for us in our immigration work to say that we will induce nobody to come except persons who have been farmers or farm labourers in the old land. Many of our best and most successful settlers were not farmers in their own country. The test we have tried to apply is this: Does the person intending to come to Canada intend to become an agriculturist? If he does, we encourage him to come and give him every assistance we can. But we give no encouragement whatever to persons to come here to work for wages as a rule, and we give no encouragement under any circumstances to persons desirous of coming out to get clerical situations of any kind, the view being that we have enough persons to fill all situations of that sort. I think I can say that every officer of the department understands this and persistently tries to carry it out. There will be little mistakes made sometimes, but I do not think there will be any substantial violation of that rule.

As to what happened last year, I think I have a fairly good knowledge of the facts, though I was not west at the time. And I think that what happened is what would have happened in spite of the existence of any government or any effort that might have been made. The general idea on the part of the public seems to be that the officers of the department can make the people go where they like and do what they want them to. That is a mistake. It takes a great deal of tact to handle four or five hundred people when they land on the wharf at Halifax, Quebec or St. John. Very few men are qualified to do it. Great difficulty arises in inducing these people to go to the places we know they ought to go to, and to do the things we know they ought to do. Last fall the local government made an honest effort to cope with the labour situation, which was of the most extraordinary character. Sixty-five millions of bushels of wheat had to be harvested and there was not nearly enough help in sight to do the work. Men who have not lived in a wheat country do not understand the situation that arises when an enormous crop develops suddenly. I think that the local government made an honest effort to grapple with the situation, and so did we; and I think we assisted materially in saving millions of bushels of wheat that would otherwise have been lost. We induced labourers to go there and thought that was a good thing to do, because going out there with the idea that they would be farm labourers for a time they would probably become settlers, and they are the class of people who make the best settlers. But, in many cases, these people going in congregated at the larger places. The result was that there was congestion at such places as Brandon, Virden, Portage la Prairie and others, yet farmers outside were without help and were unable to get it. The officers of the local government and the members of the government also, knowing the situation did what they could to meet it. The Dominion officers also did their best, and, after a little while the congestion was overcome. But there was some little damage before it was overcome. That, however, was not due to any fault of ours, or, I believe, to any fault on the part of the local government. It was due simply to the fact that the men who came refused to take the advice of the officers of the department and go where they wanted them to go. So far as the general policy of the department is concerned, the hon. gentleman may rest assured that there is no substantial departure from the rule, no violation that would not occur under any circumstances, under any minister or with any officer. We seek not to bring persons

to Canada except persons who intend to become settlers.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps the greatest difficulty about the men who went out to the west on the harvest excursions last fall was that they were men entirely unaccustomed to that kind of work. Whether the government or those who invited the harvesters to go out took the precaution of warning them of the peculiar kind of labour that would be required of them, I do not know. Certainly there was a mistake made somewhere. I am informed on the very best of authority—that is by a gentleman who was on the ground—that it was not an unusual thing for the farmer to drive into town and take out a load of men to his farm in the morning and drive them back at night, because they were utterly useless for his purpose, and, to use a common expression on the farm, became 'bushed' before night. No doubt, a great many more went out than could get work at certain points. But I believe that the men who were capable of doing the work were able to obtain employment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where did the persons come from the hon. gentleman mentions ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I would say from every where in Ontario. There is no question that many of these people who went out there were not accustomed to farm work. They had been following occupations that did not harden them sufficiently to work in the harvest field and perform the labour that was required of them either in driving the reapers or in stooking. That perhaps is one of the hardest parts of harvest work. I think if the government had anything to do with the invitation to labourers to go to Manitoba, they should specially have warned the young men not to go out there with the idea that they were going to have a holiday, as many of them no doubt did last summer. They found it a very different thing. Many were dissatisfied and disappointed, and compelled to return. That is the only point I desire to make, that whilst a general invitation is extended to farm hands to go west during the summer, caution should be given them that they will be required to do a heavy day's work.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I desire to say to my hon. friend that so far as the movement of people from Ontario to the west is concerned, this government has nothing whatever to do with it, we keep absolutely clear of that. We do not conceive it in our business to move people from one part of Canada to the other. That is the principle adopted by the late government, and we have followed it. The invitation that was extended must either have been by the local government of Manitoba or by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, I think perhaps they co-operated to get labourers to go up there. My hon. friend will see that it would be a difficult matter for them to make any distinction in the persons who accepted the invitation.

Mr. TAYLOR. In 1895-6 the late government brought down immigration estimates amounting to $21,500 ; the hon. gentleman is now asking for $110,000, a very large increase indeed. I am satisfied there is no gentleman on this side of the House who objects to a judicious expenditure of money to promote immigration. In 1895-6, the late government had agencies in England and foreign countries, and in the United States. They brought large numbers of farmers from the United States, and took them on tours through the western country. A good many people settled there coming from the old country, besides the Galicians and Doukhobours, and I think we brought as many immigrants for the $21,500, in proportion, as this government has been bringing in, and more from Ireland, as the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) has shown. We all remember the attacks that were made on the late government by the hon. gentlemen who are now occupying the Treasury benches, for even that expenditure of $21,500, and they declared that it was a waste of money to maintain agencies in the United States. What do we find now ? If the hon. gentlemen will turn to the Auditor General's Report, L-12, he will find T. O. Currie was paid $2,993 for services and expenses last year. T. O. Currie was the leader of the Patron movement, and he is paid the sum of $1,200 a year salary, and $712 for his board and lodgings, and other incidental expenses, bring the total up to $2,993. I would like to know what benefit we are getting from Mr. Currie for that sum of money. He is only one of twenty or thirty agents that are over there.

Then we have a sum of money paid Reid Bros., London, $4,060 for 101,500 copy books, at four cents a piece. I would like to know why he pays Reid Bros. of London for printing copy books. Then we have on L-16 an account that my hon. friend from Lennox referred to to-day, the Rev. D. A. Twomey, paid $1,572 simply for a pleasure trip across the ocean and back, and for travelling here in Canada. He got $600 for six months up to February 28 ; living expenses, $533.63 ; cabs and transfers, $52.48 ; postage, $2.57 ; railway fare, $76.18 ; passage to Liverpool and return, $59.80 ; tips to stewards, $24 ; wharfage, $1.22 ; travel in Canada : Cabs, $24 ; fares, $48.87 ; living expenses, $115.50 ; pullmans, $34.50, total, $1,572. Then I find that the hon. gentleman went over to Chicago, and he paid Rand, McNally & Co., $30,594 for printing, all of which ought to have been done in Canada and the money spent here. There was nothing done there but what might

have been done here just as well and better. These are the items of the account:

Concise atlases, 48,625, $2,985.33; concise maps, 100 M. at $4.50; Dominion maps, 100 M. at $10.50; Norwegian pamphlets, 20 M. at $52.50; school atlases, 200 M. at $42.55, 775 for $47.58; Western Canada atlases, English, 260 M. at $43.69; French, 10 M., $433.05; German, 10 M., $407.60; Swedish, 10 M., $406.75; Danish, 10 M., $409.30; readers, flexible, 50 M., $3,069.75; printing on back and folding maps, 20 M. at $5.50, 40 M. at $4.10; binding in cloth, 1,000 Western Canada atlases, $140.40; small items, $1.17.

The money collected from the taxpayers of Canada is sent over to the United States to pay for printing that should have been done in Canada. Now I think there is much wasteful extravagance in that expenditure of $110,000. Providence has done more to help immigration, by the magnificent crops we have had for the last year or two in the west, than all the efforts of the hon. gentleman, assisted by his Curries and Twomeys. Providence has blest that country with a bountiful harvest, and pioneers have been going in there for a number of years, induced by one or two Canadian agents who went through the United States under the late government, and brought in farmers to view the land, many of whom settled there. These men have written to their friends, and the seed then sown, along with the bountiful crops for the last year or two, have done as much or more than Mr. Currie and the other fifteen or twenty agents who are now employed. I see one gentleman in Detroit draws $5,545.33 in salary and expenses, Mr. McInnes, and so they go. I suppose Mr. McInnes is, like Mr. Currie, another political friend. In my opinion, one-half of that $110,000 has just been spent in jobs of that kind.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is a political friend of your own.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not care who he is; this is too much money. Because he is a political friend of our own this additional salary has been granted to buy him up and in the same way Mr. Currie was bought up from being a Patron.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to the fact that the offices of the different immigration agents are unfit for a country like Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Which offices?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I mean all the different offices, and I will refer to each one. In the city of London, for instance, the High Commissioner, of course, has his offices, but, as the hon. minister knows, he has simply taken off a small room for Mr. Preston. That is perhaps large enough for Mr. Preston, but, what I claim is that we should have a nicely fitted up office so that when intending immigrants do come in it will have the appearance of showing that there is some backbone to this country. I would like the hon. minister to provide a proper office in the city of London for this purpose. In the city of Paris I asked Mr. Fabre, who is the agent there, why he had not a better office and he complained that he had only got the office he now has a short time ago. You have to go through a back alley and away up stairs, and it is an impossibility to find out where our offices are, so much so that very few Canadians register there. Then, again, in Liverpool, I could scarcely find out where the office was. The same is true in the different offices that I visited to register, as every Canadian likes to do. Then, coming to this country, we have an office in the city of Montreal. The minister, I suppose, has visited the immigration office where Mr. Hoolahan is the agent. It is situated in a little side street off St. James street. I have been there two or three times, and I think it is a disgrace to this country to have an office of that kind.

Something has been said about the salaries of the different agents. I believe that any man who undertakes the position of head immigration agent in the city of Dublin, or Liverpool, or in any other place, leaves this country, takes his family over there, settles down, assumes that office, pays his living expenses, rental, &c., and accepts $1,200 a year, is not qualified to fill the position. I believe that a man who has the ability to fill the position of immigration agent in Liverpool, will never leave this country and go over there for $1,200 a year. I inquired what rents and living expenses were. I did that in Dublin—I may say I happened to be where Mr. Devlin was—and taking into consideration the amount that any gentleman would have to pay to keep up his position as commercial agent there, it is evident that he cannot live in Dublin on $1,200 a year and do his duty. Therefore, I claim that these men who are over there and who are accepting $1,200 a year are not qualified for their positions. Mr. Jury, who is in Liverpool, gets $1,200 a year, and I would like to know what he does. I made inquiries about him specially and he is not looked upon as a man of ability or as a man possessing the qualifications necessary to discharge the duties of the office. So far as Mr. Preston is concerned, of course, there was no person that I could get information from, but, when I went to Victoria street and looked at the immigration office, I thought it was a disgrace to have an office of that kind. Therefore, I believe that either a sufficient amount should be taken out of the $110,000 to give the immigration agents respectable offices, or the necessary amount should be added to the vote so as to place us upon an equal basis with other countries that have offices which are very much superior to those of Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. With some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) I quite agree, although with other things that he said I cannot entirely agree. I may say that when Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, went over early this year for the purpose of overhauling the work there, he was instructed to endeavour to find a suitable location for a first-class office in London. That was one matter to which he specially directed his attention. The High Commissioner has lately secured an addition to his offices. I do not know whether he had done so when the hon. gentleman was there or not, but the offices occupied by the High Commissioner and which were occupied by him the last time I was there, was doubled, by procuring the other half of the building and which is now occupied by the immigration branch of our work under the High Commissioner. We are satisfied that it is not a suitable office, and the recommendation of the deputy minister was that suitable quarters shoud be procured on Trafalgar Square, in the neighbourhood of Charing Cross station. That is the very best place in the city of London that we could get.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, that is the very best place.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is considering the idea of having a commercial office in the same quarter as the immigration office, where his department could directly communicate with an agent for the purpose of assisting in connection with commercial matters. Whether that project should materialize or not it is the intention to have a suitable office, to have it in the very best place in the city of London, and have it properly equipped. When we have established our new office, I think the hon. gentleman will find it satisfactory. But, where the department has had quarters before we have not seen fit to disturb them. The Liverpool office is in the same place in which it has been located since Mr. John Dyke went there many years ago, and the same may be said of the city of Montreal. At Quebec, St. John and Halifax, the quarters are very good. So far as the city of London is concerned, I quite agree with Mr. Reid, and I think I can promise that within the year we will be able to have quarters of a creditable character. In respect to the question of salaries, and particularly in respect to Mr. Jury, I can only say that I knew something of Mr. Jury before he was appointed, and I think that if the hon. gentleman knew him personally he would not say that he was not a man of ability. There are differences of opinion in regard to Mr. Jury's character, his opinions and qualifications, but, I think that if the hon. gentleman were acquainted with him he would say that he was a man of good capacity. His work has been in the line of lecturing at agricultural fairs in the west of England particularly, and I think he has done a good and useful work. Under the present arrangement, he having been there for some years, and understanding the work very well, has been put in charge of the Liverpool office, and I believe the work which is required to be done there will be satisfactorily done. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that our salaries are not too high, and being personally acquainted with the agents we have in Great Britain and Ireland, I think I can say that without exception they are men who are thoroughly qualified for their work.

I knew Mr. Webster for many years, and any person who knows him would say that he is thoroughly qualified. He is a capable, educated man with a good knowledge of Canada and of the country he is working in. I know Mr. Duncan well, and I can say that he is a man of unusual ability. His work is very satisfactory. On the whole our agents are pretty well qualified and the work which they are doing is I think satisfactory. I have said to the House a couple of times that I was not satisfied with the progress of the work in Great Britain formerly. I think, however, that any lack of success there was not due to the agents themselves, but rather to the manner in which they were directed. For that reason we have made a change. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) spoke about the purchase of the atlases. I agree with him that where it is possible to buy anything in Canada it ought to be bought in Canada. I would go further than that and say that I would rather pay a little more for a thing in Canada than I would in a foreign country. But in the case of the atlases there was such an enormous difference in the price that I felt constrained to purchase them from Rand & McNally. Some members of the House have taken the trouble to examine the atlas, and I think they all agree that it is a very creditable publication. The cost is remarkably small. My deputy minister informs me that the cost of the first edition of the atlas, which is a very creditable production indeed, is less than 8 cents each. I discussed the matter with publishers in Canada, and they told me that they could not get out this publication for less than 20 cents a number. In an issue of 200,000 or 300,000, the difference between 8 cents and 20 cents was so large that I felt it my duty to buy from Rand & McNally. That is perhaps the greatest map publishing firm in the world. They have facilities which render it wholly impossible for any one to compete with them in price. They produce these things in enormous numbers, buy their paper at the very lowest price, and practically all we pay for them is the cost of paper and press work. Such atlases intended for free distribution in enormous numbers, must be got at rock bottom prices or else we could not

distribute them at all. No firm in Canada could begin to do the work at such a low price.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was it the larger atlas or the small atlas that cost 8 cents.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not speaking of the smaller one. It is the large publication with a lot of maps in it that cost 8 cents.

Mr. BOURASSA. I have no desire to criticise the minister for not purchasing these things in Canada when there is a very special advantage to be derived by purchasing them elsewhere. However, this summer, while pasing through the different agencies in England, Ireland and Scotland, I gathered a number of pamphlets that are printed in London, by McCorquodale & Co. for the government of Canada. Possibly some of these pamphlets may be purchased at a much cheaper price in London than here. I notice, however, that some of them are very ordinary printing. Much better work could have been turned out in Canada, and if they can be purchased here in the future it would be better to do so. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to one matter which no doubt has escaped his notice. Here is a small map distributed by the government of Canada and published by the same firm of McCorquodale & Company of London. I find from this map that the richest part of the province of Quebec has been annexed to the United States ; that the city of Montreal is put on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, just on the borders of the United States ; that the counties of Chateauguay, Beauharnois, Huntingdon, St. John, Iberville, Laprairie, and even the county of the Minister of Agriculture are already annexed to the State of New York and the state of Vermont.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not surprised in view of this, than when an alderman of the city of Montreal went in to a London telegraph office last summer to cable home, he was asked by the agent : in what state of the American Union Montreal was. Of course I do not suppose that people who want to get accurate information as to Canada would rely upon this small map, but at the same time it is a pity that a map issued by the government of Canada in 1901, should contain such a mistake. I hope the minister will see that these maps are withdrawn from distribution, and that a map will be substituted which will show that the province of Quebec still belongs to Canadians and not to the Americans.

Mr. GOURLEY. I was loath to make any remarks on this question, because I am opposed to this whole grant in regard to immigration, not because I would not vote this sum or double the sum if I believed there was an earnest desire to get people into this country, but because I do not believe that the appropriation is properly expended. I am in accord with the minister in his statement, that immigration is the great need of Canada. I listened with pleasure, when he told us, that 50,000 people had come into this country, but I have listened to that kind of statement so often, when my own party was in power and since, and I have so often been disappointed in its accuracy, that I have learned to be very cautious. Whenever the census, comes around, we find, that such statements are not true, and I venture to say that at the end of ten years more, the 50,000 immigrants, announced by the hon. Minister of the Interior, will not be found on Canadian soil. I desire to attack this whole vote because the system of expenditure must be unscientific and unsystematic from beginning to end. If it be true, as stated by my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid), that a number of the friends of the hon. Minister of the Interior, occupy high positions and receive large salaries, in these offices, and if this grant of money, is used simply for the general purpose of giving offices to the friends of the hon. Minister of the Interior, then I can quite understand why the results have been so unsatisfactory. It is a lovely thing for the Minister of the Interior to be generous. It was counted a beautiful thing in the old times for a feudal chief to settle all his retainers in homes where they could acquire a living. If the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sifton) is to use this grant, as a feudal chief, for the purpose of giving all his retainers offices, then if these officers, recognize only that the gift of the office is simply a grant of favour, from the Minister of the Interior, I can understand why the immigration service is so unsatisfactory to this country.

I want to assist the Minister of the Interior to bring immigrants to this country, and before I sit down, I think, I shall be able to suggest, one or two, practical ways in which that can be done. I think we should recast, the whole system of expenditure, in this country, for immigration purposes. I do not defend the old system ; I know very little about it. I presume that the Minister of the Interior, like his colleagues in the cabinet, has put on the old clothes of the Conservative party ; but the old clothes of the Conservative party may be worn out, and not fitted to clothe the new ministry in these days, and in this particular instance, the policy of the Conservative party, if the hon. gentleman has followed it, was not a wise policy. But there is an excuse, for the Conservative party. It had to grapple with the building of the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway ; it had to create a nation out of a few scattered fragments ; it had to frame a national policy. It was engaged in occupations which would draw its attention away from a question like immigration, which were not

as dominant as the questions to which I have referred. Now, however, the policy of the country is settled; all the great lines of transportation have been established; and hon. gentlemen opposite have nothing to do but to look after the mere details of their respective offices. Therefore, I advocate a recasting of our immigration policy, on lines which will be conducive to the prosperity of Canada. I was struck with the remarks of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) with regard to the people of England, and I understand why the real results of immigration to Canada are so meagre and unsatisfactory. If a prominent map-publishing firm in England, which publishes maps of every country in the world, can so utterly misrepresent the geography of an old country like Canada, we can have some realization, of the ignorance of Canada, that exists in that country. We must look, largely to England, for our immigration. We must look largely to England, to give the cue to the old world, as to the most desirable country, on this continent for immigrants to come to, and any minister who desires to create a wise immigration policy, must direct his efforts, to convincing England, that Canada is that country, else his policy will fail. If Englishmen, who are our kin and blood, will not, come to our shores, who will ? I see that during the past year some 450,000 people have gone to the United States, a great many of them from the British isles, and a great many from countries, which are dominated, in public sentiment and commerce, by England. Why is it that these immigrants, go to the United States, instead of Canada ? There is just one explanation : The Minister of the Interior, has not made Canada well known in the old land. If that is true—if that map is published, in the way, it is said to be, with Montreal, the commercial capital of Canada, which should be as well known as the commercial capital of the United States, as New York or Boston—if Montreal can be placed in the United States, by an English geographer, then I say, the first duty, which we must perform, before we can expect much British immigration to this country, is to educate the people of England, and make them aware of our position on the map, and of the immense possibilities of Canada. I think that is the whole solution of this problem. This attempt to waste half a million dollars, by employing uneducated people, who perhaps could not earn a living here or anywhere, to go to the old country, and attempt to divert immigration, to this country, is folly of the most striking character. We all know, that the people of England, are influenced by caste, by social distinctions ; and there should be three or four men of high social position employed in England to take charge of our immigration, in order to give a character, and in order to tell the people who are about to immigrate, that Canada is the country to which they ought to go. Unless we do this, I can understand that the people of England, who are so much influenced by caste, by social position, more perhaps than any other people, might easily say : 'This Canada is an unknown country ; I have heard very little about it ; I will go to the United States, about which I have heard so much, and which fills the eye of the world to the exclusion of Canada.' The point I wish to make is this, that the first duty of this government, this year, is to sit down with the English cabinet, or with that portion of it, which may be charged, with considering the welfare of the colonies, and discuss this question of immigration with them from beginning to end ; for I am persuaded that until you can get the government of England, with its vast ramifications, of power, and its official importance, and influence, to take hold of this question, and to make it, its business, to assist this country—and it ought to be the pride and pleasure of Englishmen to do that —the results of our immigration policy will be disappointing and not what they ought to be. Our ministers should say to the government of England : 'The greatest export you have to-day, the greatest capital you have to distribute to the world, are the strong, healthy men and women, who go out from your shores ; and you could not confer on the United States a greater gift than to send them every year 100,000 or 150,000 of these strong men and women ; but if you are looking to the colonies for aid, if you expect them to stand by you in the hour of stress, and difficulty, what you ought to do, is to help us to increase the population of Canada, which is a country, of splendid climate and great resources ; then in a few years we shall build you a nation, of fifteen or perhaps thirty million of people, and after that is accomplished, England, need not fear, the world in arms, against her. The government of Canada, is to-day, largely, a matter of administration. Hon. gentlemen, on the Treasury benches, occupy the happy position, of being the inheritors of eighteen years of the most distinguished statesmanship the world has ever witnessed. They are, I may say, the unworthy inheritors of this good fortune, because if they were honourable, respectful heirs, they would be on their feet, every day, declaring that they were grateful, to such distinguished men as Sir Charles Tupper and Sir John Macdonald, who provided the magnificent inheritance which they enjoy. Is it not a most extraordinary thing, that hon. gentlemen opposite, enjoy an inheritance which they never worked to create, for to-day the government of Canada is the easiest government in the world to administer. Everything has been prepared and since the government of Canada, has come to be largely, a mere matter of administration, this question of immigration is a most important one, and I think the government is censurable, in not having ad-

dressed themselves, to an attempt, to mould, the public opinion of England upon that question. The lack of information, in England, about Canada, is notorious. Talk with a gentleman from England or Scotland, about Canada, and it is painful, to find how little he knows, about Britain's most important colony. If he knows anything about the American continent, his knowledge is confined, to the United States. He is familiar with New York, Boston or Chicago, but is completely at sea with regard to Canadian cities. That no doubt, is largely the fault of the Canadian people themselves, but of course, it ought properly be attributed, in a great measure, to hon. gentlemen opposite. I was struck, with one remark of the Minister of the Interior. Speaking of immigration, he said we had crossed the hill. I hope we have. Though in opposition, and a strong supporter of the Conservative party, and of the administration of the late government, I hope I shall never be induced to follow the example of hon. gentlemen opposite, when on this side of the House and utter a word against the interests of Canada. In the last campaign, when my opponent, and a very generous opponent, brought up the question of Canada's prosperity, I immediately removed it from the arena of discussion. I said I hoped that this country was prosperous, that it ought to be prosperous, for it had within itself every element of prosperity and greatness, and I did all that I could to spread that belief, in order to do my share, in promoting that Canadian national spirit, which we ought to have, and the lack of which is our great weakness. Having no national spirit, the ambitions of our people have been depressed, and they have been allured by the splendour of the United States. You never find, an American, letting up for a moment in lauding his country. Every man, in the United States, is convinced, that he belongs to a superior, dominant race, and that his country is the greatest aggregation of men on earth. But unfortunately, we have had men in this country—and able and accomplished men, such as the Finance Minister, and the Minister of the Interior, and others, espousing the same cause—who went over the length and breadth of Canada, instilling into the minds of the people, that this was a worthless country, which men ought to leave. And I am delighted, to hear, from these hon. gentlemen, that in six years, they have been able to undo the injury, they had done in eighteen years, and that we had now crossed the hill. I would not have supposed, that they could, in six years, have corrected the errors they have been committing, during eighteen, but if they have succeeded, in doing so, they are to be congratulated. However, I do not wish to dwell on past errors. What we want, now, is to deal, not with the past, but with the present, and the future. We should endeavour, to get, into the heads, of the people of the old country, that this is a great country, and that we are a great people. At present, according to to the evidence before us this evening, even educated people among them, do not know, that Montreal is in Canada. They think it is in the United States. If that be the case, with leading people, in England, what under Heaven must be the idea of the man in the street. The man in the street cannot be reached by an agency, with quarters such as we have heard described to-day—a little office in a little alley-way—which it would require a guide to discover. Can such an establishment, as that, impress any one, with the vastness and prosperity, of this new country ? What we must do, first and foremost, is to create a strong, dominant national sentiment in our own country. We require to imbue, our people, with the idea, that Canada, is the greatest country, in the world. Our people, should be ready, at all times, to give expression, to that conviction. Of course, it is very difficult, for gentlemen, who have been belittling the country, for eighteen long years, to turn around, and say now, that it is a great country, but we will forgive them, their past eighteen year's defamation, if they will turn around now honestly and say, let us forget the past ; it is a splendid country ; and though we have been wrong during the eighteen years, we will do better in the future. We require also, to change public opinion in England, and there is only one way of doing it. We must interest the British government in the matter. We must educate English public opinion, no matter what it may cost. I would be more prepared to vote a million and a half, or two million dollars, to carry out, our immigration policy, upon a scientific basis, than to spend, only half a million to satisfy, the debts, which are due, by the hon. Minister of the Interior, to those, worthy retainers of his, all over the globe. The proper system, would be, to approach, the minister in charge of colonial affairs in London, and say to him : You have in Britain, an extraordinary wealth, which we want in Canada —a wealth in bone and sinew and intelligence, that is now finding its way to a foreign country. How can that be diverted to Canada ? It cannot be, unless we can catch the public eye, of the people, of the British Isles—unless we can get the common people of England, to know Canada, as well as they do, the city of London. I am persuaded, that, that could be accomplished—not easily perhaps—but in two or three years, and in accomplishing that result, we would do more for immigration than has ever been done before, even if we did not get fifty immigrants in the meantime. We would accomplish more, by putting our immigration policy, on a sound basis, than by peddling out these little sums, as we are doing to-day. Let the representatives of this government go to the Colonial Secretary in London and say to him, and show him, that the whole press of England, know

nothing about Canada. I see in that press, the most extraordinary statements, about this country, and I cannot imagine, how intelligent educated men, in England—men who command such splendid salaries, in connection with the press—can possibly know so little about this great dependency of the Crown. We have been helped, a little, by sending the contingents, but we have not yet touched, the dense ignorance, that exists, in the old country, with reference to Canada. Let us get the government of England, to give us its assistance. Suppose that government were to call a meeting of the representatives, of the English press, in London, and have a representative of the Canadian government, discuss the situation with these men, and get their co-operation, in having that large population, which is yearly leaving the shores of England, Scotland and Ireland—a most desirable population—diverted from the United States to Canada. The newspaper men, in England, like most Englishmen, seem to take the word, of the leading men in their government, as final and conclusive, upon all subjects, and if Mr. Chamberlain could be convinced, as I have no doubt he is, that Canada is a most desirable country for immigrants, he could say to the press of England : We want each of the great papers of England, to devote one member of its staff, to a study of the conditions of Canada, and to visit the country in order to become thoroughly conversant with all its capabilities. Even, if the whole press of England, had to send a delegation to remain in Canada six months, it would pay this country to meet the cost of the delegation, or let the English press send a representative to Canada to stay here a year or two, and if necessary let the government of Canada pay him a salary. Let him go over the country and familiarize himself thoroughly with it, so that when he returned home he could write intelligently from personal observation. I would even advise the government of England, to revive a law, that existed a hundred years ago—and there were many wise laws passed in the olden days—which are now obsolete. Let England adopt the system which was in force at one time, when she needed the services of every man she had, and under which, no man, woman or child, was allowed, to leave England, without reporting three months ahead to the government, when he proposed to leave, where he was going, and what was the object of his going. England, would then have three months' notice, that so many of her citizens, were about to leave. The Colonial Secretary, could then communicate with the government of Canada, and some system be devised, for taking charge of these people, and bringing them to this country. There people, constitute a most valuable property, better than the gold and sovereigns of England, and if they were landed in the British colonies, England would then be irresistible at home and abroad, because every man, woman and child belonging to her would stay in her empire. That is a scientific and sensible policy. It would require the expenditure of some money, but the money would be expended intelligently. Every man desiring to leave England could easily report three months ahead, and the British government might well afford to spend £100,000 or £200,000 on such a sound policy, because she would then be serving her own interests, by increasing her strength in the colonies.

The empire needs the assistance of every man, woman and child of British birth. It would be well, to have them in colonies, with strong national feeling. Therefore, it is the duty of England, to carry out that policy. The government of this country ought to tell the statesmen of England : If you expect us to have national feeling, you must reciprocate, you must awake from your lethargy, you must treat your colonies, as great, independent, growing and giant nations. I have stood by England, even at times when they did not treat us, with the sympathy and good will, that we deserved. But I make every allowance ; for the statesmen of England during the past five years have had many great questions, pressing upon their attention. There has never been any question, however, which could engage their attention of more importance, than that, of directing population, to their own colonies. What, we want, is a complete and organized system. Let us have done, with these small questions, that have been debated in former times ; let the dead past bury its dead ; and let the minister devise some system adequate to the work in hand. If he is going to England, with his fellow ministers, let him take steps, to cause, the English government, to regard, this outgoing population, which is a great weakness to England, as a means of building up the empire, by adding strength, to this country. What made the United States? England created it. I do not fear, that the United States, can beat England down in commerce ; I believe that with the new spirit we are creating, we shall conquer and triumphantly lead the world. But should the United States even, be in a position, to prove successful in that contest, it will be because England has unwittingly contributed to build up that country. England, has given millions, to the population of the United States—never trying to send them to her own colonies—and millions to develop the United States lines of transportation. Between 1860 and 1870, the United States built sixty thousand miles of railways, and it took nine billions of pounds sterling for the work. What did England contribute of that enormous sum ? Eight billions sterling out of the nine billions required. In this country, hon. gentlemen opposite, were frightened out of their wits, when we undertook, to build three thousand miles of

railway, while the United States, in ten years, built sixty thousand miles. They have in the vicinity two hundred thousand miles of railway—as much as all the rest of the world put together. That is why the United States became great and dominant. They had great men, men of ambition, men of ideas, men of strong imagination. One of the newspapers said the other day that I had imagination. No man is fit to be in parliament, or to attempt to do anything for Canada, unless he has imagination. Too many of our public men have not this part of a statesman's equipment. Blake had no imagination, when he made that historic speech, about the Canadian Pacific Railway, not being able to earn its axle grease. That was the trouble with the man—lack of imagination—and he went to the wall. We need, here, men of imagination, men of heart and feeling and sympathy. If we had, had, men of that kind, during the last sixty years, Canada would have been an equal competitor with the United States. We had Sir John Macdonald. He was a great lion, but, unfortunately, he could not exercise his magnificent powers, because there were thousands, of small men, attacking him on every side. But, in spite, of all they could do, he did achieve extraordinary things for Canada. But, what could he not have done, had he been backed, by an enthusiastic and generous parliament in his great imaginative schemes ? What I urge, upon hon. gentlemen opposite, is to imitate Sir John—at a reverent distance, for they can never approach him in statesmanship. If they do that, I will applaud them, and say : You have done the best, that God, ever fitted you to do. I urge them to go to Mr. Chamberlain, and lay, the case before him. Let them sit down with Lord Salisbury, and urge him to be informed, with regard to Canada. Tell him that by reason of the splendid position he occupies in England, if he will, he can, lend Canada powerful aid. He makes speeches, at the Mansion House, and elsewhere, on every subject, except the colonies. Let them induce him to go to the Mansion House, and make a speech about Canada. If you are to attract, the attention, of the people of England, to Canada, you must have speeches made about Canada, by the men, to whom Englishmen, are accustomed to look, for direction in public affairs. And, without that, all that our ministers and others can do, will have but little result. Let these gentlemen, ask Mr. Chamberlain, to devote six months, to the question of upbuilding Canada, and assure him, the people of Canada, will heartily reciprocate, by adding to the strength of the empire. I think the Finance Minister, would be a good representative for such work, for his diplomatic ways in Nova Scotia are well known. Besides, I think, there is an ingenuity about the Nova Scotian, that always, stands him in good stead. I urge attention, to broad and far-reaching purposes. We debate little twopenny-ha'penny questions about men getting ten cents a pound for sugar and so much for bacon——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOURLEY. All that is very important, and it shows that even little things do not escape the attention of the opposition, but I would rather that the government would indulge in these little peculations undiscovered ; that these men should make two or three hundred thousand dollars improperly, than that they should refuse to engage in a great and comprehensive system of immigration, by which we can get the surplus population of the British Islands. Everybody in Canada would support the government in this policy. This government has a splendid opportunity—they have a loyal and patriotic opposition to assist them. We, on the other hand, always had an opposition, that seemed to be opposed, to the country. We join with the government, and if a man comes to this country, he will hear every Conservative from Nova Scotia to British Columbia praising Canada. Let them bring the people here, and the opposition, will undertake to fill them, with the most patriotic notions of Canada, so that they will never leave. Therefore, this government have a chance, that they never gave us, when we were in power. But, so far as I am concerned, I will not find fault with them further, if only they will do better. To err is human, and these hon. gentlemen opposite know it well. Let them take up this great question with the statesmen of Great Britain. Let them stop these petty salaries to these favourites, and devise a system, based upon the recognition, by the statesmen of England, of the fact, that they ought to help us. Instead of sending five or six agents to England, whose work must be practically useless, let them tell the men who have England's affairs in charge : If you will help us in immigration matters, it will cement this country to you, more than anything else that you can do in a decade of years.

Holding these views, I undertake to say, that the immigration estimate after this will form an occasion for a field fight, unless a new system is adopted. I am here only in the interests of Canada, I have no other object on earth while here to serve. I like my own country, better than I like myself, and my own interests, and I desire only to serve my country. I would like to help this country along, I want to see it the grandest country on earth, because I expect to live forty or fifty years longer, coming as I do from a strong and healthy breed ; and I expect to see this country the dominant power on this continent. If Enggland will help us, if she will take advantage of the present national feeling, if she will take Canada by the hand and give us her emigration, we shall go on conquering and to conquer.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I am afraid that the member for Colchester (Mr. Gourlay) is too pessimistic altogether. The member for Colchester ought to know that the greatest and most intelligent minds in England know nearly everything about Canada. Some of the best men in England have been governors of this country, such as Earl Dufferin, Lord Aberdeen, the Marquis of Lorne. Earl of Derby and others, who have advertised this country, and are doing it still. I think the member for Colchester has not been properly informed if he thinks that one example of an illiterate topographer who made a mistake in that map shown by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), represents the ignorance of the English people with regard to Canada. I know that the people of England generally are well acquainted with the map of British North America. The reason why Englishmen do not come to Canada in greater numbers is because England has such immense territories to fill up in other parts of the world. She has colonized Australia within the last fifty years, she has colonized New Zealand, she is colonizing South Africa. Wherever the sun shines, wherever there is money to be made, Englishmen are always ready to go. If we will wait our time England will fill up this country the same as she is filling up others. I think the immigration office is doing its duty. A few days ago I saw in a newspaper published in the Midland counties of England a letter written by Lord Strathcona, the Canadian High Commissioner, setting forth reasons why the English peasantry should emigrate to Canada. I know that Lord Strathcona has bought at his own expense a great number of maps and distributed them among the schools of England, and the immigration department also has sent descriptive maps to the rural schools of England. I think it is only a question of time when the people of the British Isles will find that Canada is an excellent field for emigrants.

But there is another point to which I wish to call attention. We should be very careful whom we send there to represent us. If we send men there of the stamp and enthusiasm of the member for Colchester, they will bring out immigrants in multitudes ; there will not be enough vessels in England to bring the people that will want to come after they hear the member for Colchester speak. But if we send men like the individual we have heard about to-day, who says that he is making no effort to bring Irishmen to this country, that he does not urge them to come, that he would rather they stayed at home, then we cannot expect the British people to come here. We have got to be very careful whom we send. We must send men who are loyal to our country and are loyal to Great Britain. I am sorry indeed to learn that this government selected as immigration agent a man who is not loyal to our country.

I think this government should take steps to bring out the best class of people that can be found. We heard last session from the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) that the class of people they were bringing out were very indifferent. We know that the class of people we are sprung from are not indifferent, and we must make an effort to bring more of them here. There is one good reason why immigration from the British Isles is at a low ebb just now. For the last two or three years a great many of their young men have been required to fill up the ranks in order to keep the empire together. We know too that the county councils, the township councils, the urban councils in England have gone into works of public improvement such as sewage work, the supply of towns with water, and these works afford employment to a great many men. Very few men will leave their home when they can get a fair living. I think that the immigration department are making an effort to fill up the vast territories we have in the west. The last year's crop has well advertised our country and the men who are already settled there are writing letters back to their friends in the old country, and these letters will do far more to bring out people than the immigration department are doing.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to inform my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) that he is labouring under a mistake if he thinks Mr. Jury is serving his time in Liverpool for $1,200 a year. If he wil turn to the Auditor General's Report, L-15, he will find that Mr. Jury gets a salary of $1,800 a year. and $897 for his board, and that he draws in perquisites $10,265.16 for maintaining that little office on a back street. I also want to tell the minister that we on this side of the House are pretty well acquainted with Mr. Jury. The hon. minister said that if we knew him as well as he did we would know him to be a man of ability. I think he is just as well known to most of us as he is to the minister, because, previous to the advent to power of hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Jury, who was a Toronto tailor and a Liberal agitator, travelled through this country speaking in the interests of hon. gentlemen opposite. We know pretty well who Mr. Jury is. He came into my county and into my town and stumped against me during my first or second election—I forget which. We are pretty well acquainted with Mr. Jury and we do not think he has the qualifications of a good immigration agent, although he is good on the platform as a lecturer. I do not think, being a Toronto tailor, that he would be able to enlighten the farmers very much on the question of how to farm. The hon. minister did not reply to the inquiry I made as to what he wanted with these 101,500

copy books at four cents apiece. He paid $4,060 to his friends in London, the Reid Bros. for these copy books. I want to know in what way they were used to assist immigration.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We conceived the idea of having a number of copy books prepared and circulated in the schools of Great Britain in which the head lines were statements in regard to Canada, and in which the facts respecting the geography, resources and that sort of thing were briefly summarized. We had these prepared and circulated in the schools so that the children using these copy books would acquire a knowledge of Canada. We had replies from a large number of people connected with these schools of a very complimentary character, and I am quite satisfied that this has proved a very effective means of disseminating knowledge and of giving practical information to the school children of Great Britain.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the hon. minister should supply each member of the opposition with a copy of all these productions.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I should be most happy to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not seen a copy of it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Now that my attention is drawn to that I may say that when there is anything of special importance got out I generally direct that copies be sent to every member of the House but, this being a small thing published in Great Britain, no attention was paid to it.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Chairman, before this item is adopted, I would like to offer a few remarks, realizing more especially the great importance of this subject, and if there has been any doubt upon that question there surely cannot be any doubt now after the eloquent speeches we have heard from our hon. friends on the other side of the House and especially from the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley). The committee, I am sure, listened to-night, with a great deal of attenton to the eloquent statement made by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton). Immigration is, I believe, of all questions, one which should not be considered from a party point of view. It is the infusion of new blood into this country. Immigration is, as has been truly said, the most important question with which this country has to deal, and if in the past all Canadians, regardless of origin or nationality, witnessed with pain the exodus which existed in this country for so many long years, the exodus which resulted in 2,000,000 Canadians leaving our country and settling in the United States and who to-day are citizens under the American flag, it is certainly a source of gratification to learn that at the present moment, while the exodus has not been entirely stopped, there is a change in the tide and that immigration is coming towards our country. I have the honour of representing a county in one of the older provinces of Canada. The province of Quebec contributed their share, as I believe the province of Ontario did also, towards acquiring, building up and opening up our great western country. The province of Ontario and the province of Quebec paid out millions upon millions of dollars to make the North-west country what it is today, and to create, if possible, there, a granary for the world. The progress which is being made in Manitoba and the North-west Territories surely is satisfactory to all citizens of Canada regardless of province because the greatness of the North-west Territories means the greatness of Canada. But, Mr. Chairman, satisfactory as has been the progress of western Canada, satisfactory as may be this immigration from the British isles, and the continent of Europe and from the United States, satisfactory as I believe have been the efforts of the present hon. Minister of the Interior and his officials in bringing about the present state of affairs, there is a kindred subject to immigration which I think should not be overlooked and which, in the province of Quebec, we consider to be on a par of importance. That is colonization. The province of Quebec has for many years past given a great deal of attention to this subject and only during the last session of our provincial legislature a special commission was appointed to inquire into the cause and if possible to bring about a remedy for this state of affairs. This commission is to be composed of men of both political parties and they are to endeavour to solve if possible once and for all this problem of the exodus of the citizens of Quebec to the United States. I am glad to know that the efforts that the Department of the Interior have put forth in the past are to be continued in the future. This very morning I had the satisfaction of attending a deputation which called upon the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of the Interior, composed of the leading citizens of the city of Quebec, men of both political parties, men occupying positions of importance in politics, in the public life, and in the business life of the province, who came and asked the Dominion government not to give up altogether the work of colonization in the older provinces. Colonization is one of the very few subjects, which, under the British North America Act comes within the jurisdiction and scope of both the federal and provincial governments. We have, therefore, in the province of Quebec, reason to expect that the Dominion government, while carrying on the vigorous policy of immigration towards the North-west Territories, while if possible peopling that immense territory with citizens of our own blood and gaining other citizens from the

United States who will easily become adapted to our Canadian institutions, will not overlook this all important fact that it is more important to keep one Canadian in the country than to bring in two strangers. We have in the province of Quebec a peculiar condition of affairs which calls for the attention of the minister and of his staff. We have a population which doubles in twenty-seven years. If the province of Quebec had not lost by the emigration of French Canadians who have gone to the United States that province to-day would have been the first province in Canada in the matter of population, and in the very last census it is the only province which has shown a satisfactory increase in population. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is important that the Dominion government should not over look this subject of colonization. We have the assistance of the local government and we have in the districts of Montreal and in the districts of Quebec the co-operation of men headed by the Roman Catholic clergy who give close attention to this class of colonization. In the city of Quebec we have the Lake St. John Colonization Society, and in the city of Montreal la Société Générale de Colonisation et de Répatriement de la province de Québec. During the last five or six years the Lake St. John district has made wonderful progress in colonization. The official report of the society, which devotes itself to the welfare of that region, shows that since 1898, no less than 6,977 bona fide settlers have taken up land there. Mark you, these are Canadians or the descendants of Canadians who have returned from the United States to settle in their native land. The report also shows that in the year 1900, 922 Canadians returned from the United States and took up land in that district, and in the year 1901 the number was 1,013. We have also the evidence that in 1900, 788 fathers of families living in the cities and in different parts of the province, went into the Lake St. John district, instead of as in former years emigrating to the United States. In the year 1901, 872 settlers of a similar character also took up homes in that region. This morning we had the evidence of Mr. Scott, the manager of the Lake St. John Railway, who gave us a partial idea of the immense resources of that vast region ; its great lakes ; its immense water powers ; its grand rivers and the unlimited field which it opens up for the pulp industry, and which when developed will enable Canada to lead in the vanguard of Norway and Sweden, the countries which in the past have supplied Europe with pulp for the manufacture of paper. There are other matters connected with this question to which I wish to call the attention of the minister and of the hon. members of this House. I shall speak more particularly for the province of Quebec, because I know there are other hon. gentlemen who will speak for Ontario and the other provinces. Let us look at what the Canadian Pacific Railway did when it opened up its line from Ottawa to the west. Leaving the district of Ottawa it passed through a barren tract up to Lake Superior, but the company looking for settlers turned its eyes towards the French Canadian population of the province of Quebec. The Canadian Pacific Railway people knew that the French Canadian is a hardy tiller of the soil ; that he will work in the forest for twelve and fifteen hours a day and endure cheerfully all those hardships of pioneer life which other men fear to undertake. The Canadian Pacific Railway encouraged the French Canadian people to settle in that territory and in less than ten years that district of Nipissing and a portion of Algoma, became prosperous and productive. Cannot the Department of the Interior take its cue from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. We have in the province of Quebec the Metapedia Valley, extending from Ste. Flavie to the borders of New Brunswick, through which the Intercolonial Railway runs for 100 miles, and which is now comparatively unpopulated. If the Department of the Interior would apply the same policy to that region as the Canadian Pacific Railway did to the northern part of what is to-day the New Ontario, then in a few years the Metapedia Valley would be settled by a thriving population. There are in the Metapedia Valley to-day a dozen or more thriving parishes, but there is room there for 50 parishes. The climate is probably the mildest in the entire province. Its proximity to the Ocean makes its climate at least twelve degrees warmer than that of any portion of the province of Quebec. I would ask the Minister of the Interior in his colonization work, to pay special attention to that region. There is one very strong reason why the government should do this. We know that the receipts from the Intercolonial Railway are not as satisfactory as they might be and we know that that particular part of the road hardly pays working expenses. From the standpoint of the Dominion Exchequer it would, therefore, be sound policy for this government to encourage colonization in that district, because it goes without saying that the more people you have there the more the Intercolonial Railway will earn. But there is a more patriotic reason still. There is the patriotic object of keeping Canadians in their own land. Every day French Canadian farmers and artisans from different parts of the province apply to the colonization society in Montreal to be directed towards new spheres of labour. If these people are not taken in hand and pointed to a new opening in life the chances are that they will drift to the United States to become white slaves in the factories of New England, as unfortunately thousands and thousands of their fellow countrymen have done before them. The French Canadian

priests in the province of Quebec are strenuous in their endeavours to keep Canadians at home ; but when these people make up their minds that life is no longer possible upon the old homestead in the old parish, they flock into the cities of the province, or else they leave for a foreign land. This colonization society warned in advance can extend its helping hand to these men and can point them to a new lease of life in the undeveloped fields of their native land, rather than to exile. There is no family in the province of Quebec which would not infinitely prefer life in the fatherland, to exile abroad. These colonization societies have received in the past some help from this government, as also from the provincial government, but I would like to see the Department of the Interior extend its work in this direction and encourage the societies to a still greater extent than at present. There are no more suitable men on the face of the earth to undertake pioneer work in a country like the Metapedia Valley, rich in natural resources, than are the people of the province of Quebec. I am a Liberal; I come from Liberal stock; I respect the religion of every man, but at the same time the foreigners who settle in this country, are nothing to me as compared with my own countymen, the descendants of the pioneers of Canadian civilization. These are the men I would infinitely prefer to see retained in Canada. It is to their retention in their native land I would rather see our resources directed, than towards the encouragement of immigration from foreign lands. I submit that the best way to keep our people at home is to encourage these colonization societies. I earnestly commend that view to the Minister of the Interior. I have spoken more particularly of the Metapedia Valley because I represent that district. I must say that the Intercolonial Railway management has already recognized the importance of this region as a field for settlement by granting during the last six months, the low rates to the settlers which have prevailed on the Canadian Pacific Railway for years past. At the present time a large excursion of 400 or 500 people is being organized in the French Canadian centres of the United States to visit that district, and I would like the government here to make a special effort to bring about happy results from that and similar movements. Before closing I would point out that it is not only the colonization societies who are directing their efforts towards the possibilities of developing that region, but I notice that the capitalists are also paying their attention to Gaspesia, which comprises Bonaventure and Gaspé counties. We received to-day a prospectus from the Atlantic Pulp and Paper Company, which has a capital of $3,000,000, and of which the president is the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards). That company proposes to start three mills in that district : a paper mill with a daily capacity of 54 tons ; a ground wood pulp mill with a daily capacity of 50 tons and a sulphide pulp mill with a daily capacity of 40 tons. We have heard a great deal of Sault Ste Marie, and of its great natural resources. But this fact must not be overlooked, that the whole resources of Canada do not lie in the western part of Canada—that the old provinces also have resources which should be husbanded. We have had evidences of that in the last few years, in the district of Three Rivers, where Shawinigan and Grand Mere have risen as if by enchantment, and are to-day attracting attention in the industrial world ; and we have the developments down by the sea. Therefore, while the colonization department of this Dominion is devoting its best efforts to bringing immigrants from Europe, especially Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen and Welshmen, who have done so much for this Dominion, with whom we descendants of the French Canadian race have entered into a compact, sealed in former years by the blood of heroes for the building up of this Dominion, we all learn with satisfaction, regardless of party and regardless of origin, that that department is first and above all determined to keep in this country the sons of the soil, and help them to live and bring up their families to become good citizens of Canada.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I need not add anything to what the hon. gentleman for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) has so eloquently expressed. I also represent a county in another part of the province of Quebec where this work of immigration is going on. I wish to emphasize the fact that we are too much inclined to forget the burdens which the older provinces have placed on their shoulders in connection with these matters of immigration and colonization. Not only have they placed upon themselves an enormous debt for the building of a railroad through the North-west country, but they have also assumed the whole burden of the expenses connected with the colonization of their own territories. Some of our people are alarmed in the province of Quebec at the amount of debt which we have put on our shoulders, though we are not alarmed as a rule. Nine-tenths of that debt has been incurred in order to keep our people in our own province. When I find by the census, though the result is not entirely satisfactory, that the province of Quebec is the only province which has succeeded in keeping its rural population, and that it shows a little increase in that direction, I do not regret the money we have spent. I quite agree with what the hon. member for Bonaventure has said as to the means that should be taken by this government to help the colonization work of the provincial governments, the government of Ontario and the government of Quebec especially. We must not forget that increased population adds no revenue or very little to the provinces,

while it increases the number of consumers and therefore adds to the revenue of the Dominion.

Another point on which I agree entirely with the hon. member for Bonaventure is that we French Canadians have no objection at all to the policy of the hon. Minister of the Interior, who, I think, will admit that he has had no more straight supporters than the representatives from the province of Quebec, especially on this side of the House, for his policy in sending so many agents abroad to bring people to this country. We are so exclusively Canadian that we hope that the people who come to this country will become as good Canadians as we are. We have no objection to people coming, especially from the British Isles, who have not the same language or education as we have, but in these respects resemble our fellow-Canadians of English origin. I hope therefore that a report of certain remarks of the deputy minister of the Interior which has been sent to me is not a correct report. I find in a paper which has nothing to do with Canadian politics, and has no interest in one party more than the other, the 'North Express' of Liverpool, dated the 10th of February, the following :

> The Hon. J. A. Smart, Deputy Minister of the Interior for Canada, and Mr. T. R. Preston, immigration agent-general for the Dominion, arrive in Liverpool to-day from London and Glasgow to arrange a gigantic system of British emigration to Canada.

It then goes on to give the details of the project, after which follows a little paragraph of which I am sure the hon. Minister of the Interior will be happy to give an explanation, and tell us that there must be some mistake in the report. It is entitled 'British blood needed,' and says :

> The present, therefore, is deemed a favourable moment to turn the attention of British emigrants to Canada, which has been neglected by them in the past, and is now in crying need of population to till her soil and develop her great mineral riches. More British blood is also needed to be infused into the veins of the Dominion, if Canada is not to be Frenchified by the rapid growth of the French population.

If that had reference to immigration from France, I would quite agree with the gentleman that an overflow of immigration from France, stronger than British immigration, would not be agreeable to the loyal feelings of this country; but if the gentleman meant—which if this report is correct he must have meant—that the rapid increase of French Canadians was a danger to Canada, I hope the minister will take this occasion to say that there is no danger in the increase of the French Canadian population. The past is a proof that the French Canadians are no danger to this country from any point of view, whether industrial, agricultural, material or intellectual. They have done their duty not only by themselves, but by their neighbours in this country, and by the British crown ; and I think it is a great mistake that it should go abroad in the old country that there is a certain element in Canada the natural increase of which might be regarded as a danger to this country or a danger to the British crown.

Mr. GOURLEY. Nobody believes it.

Mr. BOURASSA. I hope not. I am simply making this point—not that I believe the deputy minister, certainly not with the assent of the Minister of the Interior, made any remarks like these, intending to be offensive to the French Canadians—but we know, from articles published in certain newspapers in this country, that the attention of the British people is always called to the fact that the French Canadian people are growing more rapidly than others, and that there is a danger of this country being Frenchified. So far as the rapid increase of the French Canadian population is concerned, I admit it, though I am not one of the responsible parties ; but I am sure that is not a crime that should be charged against the French Canadians. What I am objecting to is the statement that by the rapid increase of the French Canadian population, this country is being Frenchified.

We are French by origin and are proud of it, and certainly have no reason not to be. There is one fact which cannot fail to impress itself upon all those who have any knowledge of the different provinces of the Dominion, and that is that of all the elements that compose our population, there is not one more attached to the Canadian soil than the Canadians of French origin. It is an attachment based on common sense. The French Canadian has no attachment other than to Canadian soil and to Canadian institutions, and the more rapidly we grow, the more French Canadians we bring back from the New England towns in the eastern states, the better will be the result as regards Canadian institutions and allegiance to Britain. British allegiance is not a question of blood with us but of loyalty and common sense. If I have brought up this matter, it is not with the object of casting any reflections on the minister in charge of the department ; but it is to be regretted that statements of this kind should appear in the British press as well as in the English press of Canada, and it is for that reason that I ask for an explanation by the hon. minister. I would conclude, as I have begun, by assuring my hon. friend that he will never find a more faithful supporter of his immigration policy than myself. But I want to insist that in all our immigration policy, we should have an eye solely for the benefit of Canada and not be actuated by any idea of preventing French Canadians from gaining influence in this country, or from enjoying that influence which is due to the position they occupy ; and should that position become stronger in the future, let the

hon. minister's mind be at rest, for even if we should become a majority in this country, it will be as safe in the hands of the French Canadian majority as it would be in the hands of any of the other races which compose our population at present.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. With reference to the printing of some of the books in London, to which my hon. friend has referred, the facts are explained in this way : Some of the printing was done under the direction of the officials in the High Commissioner's office, and the particular literature referred to was issued without direct communication with the department here. I may say that we have made a change with regard to the issuing of literature, and have concluded that it is better it should be prepared here instead of being prepared and printed in London. It will therefore in future be prepared at the head office here, and any maps that may be issued will first pass through the hands of the geographer of this department, which I am sure will be a guarantee to my hon. friend that they will be correct. I must call the attention of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to the fact that the paper he cited does not exactly purport to give the statement printed as an interview, and no doubt he has noted that distinction. I think, however, that he himself must know the deputy minister of the department too well not to be satisfied that he did not make any statement of the kind. I inquired of my deputy whether he was responsible for any such statement, and he said he was not, and attributed it to the enthusiasm of this British reporter. As to the general question of colonization in Quebec and elsewhere, the committee will appreciate the difficulty which the department meets when called upon to incur expenditure for the purpose of transplanting people from one part of the country to another. While avowedly we do not engage in work of that kind, the importance of which my hon. friend has so eloquently referred to, when the machinery of the department can be used for that purpose, we have not hesitated to make use of it, even if it entails some additional expense; and as my hon. friend from Bonaventure will admit, we have done a considerable amount of work in that direction. As regards the Lake St. John district, we have paid out a considerable amount of money to the Lake St. John Railway Company to aid it in conducting this work, which it has done through its own officials. We have also paid something to the repatriation society. The application to which my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) refers, will receive careful consideration, and I think that the department will be well sustained, if I can judge by the feeling of the committee, in allowing its machinery to be made use of to the fullest possible extent for the purpose of assisting the natural movement of our population from the older portions of the eastern provinces to our newer territories. We are doing the same thing in Ontario. Our officers assist very largely in the movement of the population of that province from the older to the newer portion, and wherever they can contribute to the success of any such movement, they are only too ready to do so.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Does the hon. minister say that he assists the movement of people from the older parts of one province to the newer parts of the same province ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. From one part of Canada to another.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, I understood him to say that he encourages his officers to assist the people moving from the older part of one province to its newer part.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We do not make any distinction between one province and another. We take the country as a whole, and assist the movement from one part of it to another.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to impress on the minister the fact that people who want to move from the maritime provinces to-day to settle in the great Canadian North-west, cannot do it as advantageously as if they came from the New England States. In fact they find it cheaper to go to the New England States first and then go to the North-west, as they can get lower rates on the railways. It is cheaper for them to go to Boston and ship from there rather than go direct over our own Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is worse than that. It would pay a man to go from Boston to Liverpool and then go to Winnipeg than to go direct from Boston to Winnipeg. So far the department has been utterly powerless to grapple with that difficulty. We have that difficulty, the people of eastern Canada have that difficulty, and it is one that, so far, the department has been utterly powerless to grapple with. We have tried all sorts of schemes to get over it. A plan that has been suggested time and again, is that we get the railways to combine and offer for, say a month in the year, a special rate to intending settlers. But there are two difficulties in the way. In the first place, it is impossible to get the railways to agree to it, and, in the second place our good friends of the eastern provinces do not like it. They say that it is encouraging people to move away who otherwise would stay at home, and, probably, do well. Whether there is anything in that, it is hard to say. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) will recognize the difficulty in the situation.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do recognize it, and my object in bringing it forward is

that the minister may have the officers of the department consider it, so that, if there is any way of having the boys from the maritime provinces who go to Boston and elsewhere in the United States and take labouring jobs, become settlers in the Canadian North-west, it may be done. That is an important object. There is another point to which I will take the liberty of directing the attention of the committee. I address myself particularly to my good friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) for I wish to make him happy. He spoke of my good friend the Deputy Minister of the Interior referring to the danger of this country being Frenchified through colonization schemes. It was my priviledge to visit two settlements in the Canadian North-west made up almost wholly of French people from old France. These settlements are illustrations of the fact that it is not necessary to get the old country farmer to become a farmer in Canada. My own theory is that the old country farmers do not adapt themselves as readily to farming in this country as do the old country mechanics. One of the best farms that it has been my privilege to see in the North-west—that is, for only three or four years of settlement—is managed by a former London pastry-cook, who had never been in the country in his life in England, but had his first experience of life outside the city when he came to Canada. The French settlements to which I refer are made up almost entirely of people who have never been on farms in their lives until they came to this country. One fine-looking lady had been manager of a large millinery store, and her husband had been a watchmaker in Paris. These people have been doing well in our North-west. And I want to tell my good friend from Labelle that they are readily adapting themselves to the ways of the country. They have only been in these settlements two years, yet they have made very rapid progress, adding a knowledge of English to that of their own beautiful mother tongue. I may be a little prejudiced in favour of immigration. It has been my privilege to meet the Doukhobors, the Galicians, and, of course, the Mennonites, and all that class of immigrants who have come in from continental Europe. And I want to tell this committee and this country that we owe to these people one thing at all events—they have taught Canadians to value their own country. These people, in many cases, are living on tracts that Canadians would not have thought of colonizing. Take, for instance, the Snipe Hills, a locality that my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) must know well. People from Ontario would never think of settling such a country. I wish to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that among those hills to-night are hundreds of as happy homes—that is, as comfortable-looking homes, and comfort usually brings happiness—as in any part of Canada. And these people have been there only a few years. The verdict of the English-speaking people in that region, people from Carleton and Renfrew counties in Ontario, is that they want no finer neighbours than these people. But, I am free to say that they are of the better class of European immigrants. West of that, around Beaver lake, there is a settlement that does not meet with the approval of the hon. member for Alberta, and I must confess that some are rather an indolent and doless class of people, taken, I presume, from a poor settlement in the old country But, as I say, these people from the continent of Europe have taught us that we have a country in the North-west that is illimitable in its capacity for the production of wealth and in the opportunities it offers for the making of homes by harvest settlers.

It may not be amiss to point out a few of the reasons why our great North-west has possibilities which we down in the eastern provinces are apt to underestimate. It is often said that this territory is away north, and therefore is not habitable. Let us place before ourselves a map of the world, and consider the latitude of the finest parts of England and compare it with our own Canadian North-west. Go far north of Edmonton, and you find you are only in the latitude of the northern part of England. Even the Peace River region is in about the same latitude as the south of Scotland. Another glance at the map and you see the Rocky Mountain range running down from Canada into the United States. From Mount Sherman, the highest peak in the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific in the United States is about 1,250 miles. Until you get near the coast, not a foot of that is less than five or six thousand feet high. And there is not a pass through those mountains in the United States from the 49th parallel to the plains of New Mexico that is less than seven thousand nine hundred feet high. Therefore, the warm air current from the ocean which seek to reach the plains of the western United States must traverse a mountain range varying from 5,000 to 8,000 feet high throughout its entire area, while the point of crossing the plains would be not less than 7,900 feet. Further, what do we find in the United States ? I happened to be in Texas and Kansas in January last. The temperature there varied from nine to seventeen degrees below zero. There was a penetrating wind that chilled one to the marrow and froze the cattle in great numbers. The people of those regions are realizing that these raw winds are intolerable. And, besides, they have drawbacks in the summer in the way of malaria and hot winds.

Mr. GOURLEY. They should come to Canada.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). They are coming to Canada in thousands. When you come into our North-west the first pass is the Crow's Nest, 4,000 feet high. Then,

the Canadian Pacific Railway passes through the Kicking Horse at 5,400 feet. North of that, is the Yellow Head Pass, 3,700 feet high, and then the Pine River Pass from 2,400 to 2,800 feet high, and, still further north, the Peace River Pass 2,000 feet high. Beyond that the passes in the Rocky Mountains are even lower, though the Cascade or Coast Range may be higher. The passes anywhere in Canada are from 5,000 down to 2,000 feet high. A glance at the map will show that the distance from the plains to the coast, instead of being 1,200 miles is only from 250 to 300 miles, and, in the southern part, 400 miles. Therefore the warm winds from the Japanese current—crossing the ocean they follow the same law that regulates the currents—pass rapidly through the low passes in the Canadian ranges and spread themselves over the plains, bringing fertility to the soil and establishing conditions most favourable to agricultural development.

Another point that it may be worth while to state here—because the members of this House should be the exponents of the advantage of our country—is that, the northern Atlantic ocean opens into the Arctic ocean without let or hindrance, and the icebergs from the Arctic region pass into the Atlantic ocean untrammelled. Of course there are other cold currents flowing. But the northern Pacific ocean is closed, practically speaking, Behring Straits is very narrow, and we find the northern Pacific ocean is not subjected to the great icebergs and ice floes that exercise such a chilling influence upon the eastern coast of Canada. Any one who has crossed the ocean knows when he is approaching an iceberg. An ice floe can be experienced hours and hours before one sees it, the chill in the atmosphere is so great. This is all spread into the northern Atlantic ocean, because of the narrow entrance from the Arctic into the northern Pacific.

Moreover our great Canadian North-west reaps a benefit from the warm winds coming from eastern Asia which cross the western coast of North America, you may say in general terms, from the boundary of the United States, northward to Alaska. I may point out in passing that the temperature at the island of Sitka, in Alaska, has fallen to zero only once in the last 45 years. There is another reason. The northern regions away up in Athabasca, northern Alberta and Saskatchewan, vary from 500 to 2,000 feet lower than do the plains, even along the Canadian border on the 49th parallel, or away down in Montana or Dakota. The altitude is much lower, and the scientific rule for altitudes affecting heat, I believe, is that it varies about one degree for every 200 feet of altitude ; that is, if you descend 200 feet the temperature decreases one degree, other things being equal. I may also point out that the vast lakes in our great Canadian North-west, while possibly retarding the early opening of spring, nevertheless more than counterbalance the lateness of the spring by the lateness of the fall. The water in these lakes, which are more or less shallow, become warmed during the summer and retain their heat in the fall. Accordingly, take the east and south-east side, and the southern side of any great lake in the Canadian North-west, and you will find the crops along those lakes have never been frozen as early as they have in the open parts where they have not the benefit of these waters. Another point. The sun is north of the equator about 170 or 180 hours more than it is south of the equator, in a year. Figure that up, and it amounts to six or seven days of extra sunlight in the northern hemisphere. Northern latitudes have very long days in summer. I have not made the scientific calculation, but if you figure it up you will find the extra sunlight these remote northern regions get over regions even in our own latitude here, about 45 degrees, or away up anywhere north of the 52nd, 53rd, 54th or 55th parallels of latitude, and you will find in those regions an average of fully a day or two extra sunlight in the year over what we have here.

There is another reason why we should have high hopes for our magnificent Canadian North-west. Those of you who have heard Dr. Saunders before the committee from time to time lecturing on our great North-west, have heard him point out that the barren region upon which trees do not grow lies from a point away down in the United States extending north into Canada say to the 52nd parallel. Now why does the prairie land not extend far beyond the 52nd parallel towards the north ? Simply this, that once you pass the 52nd and 53rd degree of north latitude, you come to a point that scientists term the region of calms. Any one familiar with the mathamatical geography of the earth knows that the winds blow very strongly in southern parts ; any one who has travelled through Dakota, Montana, and the southern part of Manitoba and Assiniboia, knows right well that there is scarcely a day of summer or of winter when strong winds do not prevail in those regions. Go into more northern latitudes, and strong winds are not found to anything like the same extent. So scientists term the northern regions the regions of calms.

The fertility of the soil is undoubted. Those who have visited that region have seen oats, and wheat and farm products of every description, raised as successfully and, I believe, more successfully, than in any portion of the province of Ontario. Prof. Macoun states that at Battleford, where there is nothing but a narrow sand plain, which in Ontario would not be farmed at all, he has nevertheless seen a field immediately adjoining the town that had excellent wheat upon it each year in succession for 20 years ; and he claims there must be something in the character of the soil, whether it is that the frost remains in the

ground in the spring and keeps the roots cool and moist, or whether it is owing to the extra quality of the ground, he does not pretend to say; but he points out that in those regions, even in arid regions, grain is grown much more successfully than in the province of Ontario. That district has a future. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see our Canadian boys going up there to settle, I care not whether they are French Canadian or English Canadian, whether they come from Ontario, Quebec or the maritime provinces. I do not want to see our boys becoming ditchers and carters in the city of Boston. I want to see them move up to our own North-west and take up farms there. At Wetaskawin you will find a magnificent colony from Prince Edward Island, a splendid lot of young people who moved there from Prince Edward Island, and are doing well. I trust our maritime province members will take this matter in hand, and that gentlemen like the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), the member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), the member for Colchester (Mr. Gourley), and the member for Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) will take pains to influence these young men, if they want to go anywhere, to go to our own Canadian North-west. But in case we cannot fill our country with our own people, let us do our best to get settlers from the old mother land, that mother of nations; let us get as many people as we possibly can from Great Britain and Ireland.

And here I must say, in passing, that I disagree with some remarks that have fallen from the Minister of the Interior this afternoon in relation to the necessity existing for Canadian immigration agents in Ireland, bowing, or pandering, or actually believing in the doctrine of home rule. It is not necessary to be a home ruler in Ireland in order to get immigrants to Canada. Sir, I have great faith in the Irish people. I never yet met a people, whether Irish, French, Scotch or English, who, when they are properly educated, when the facts are placed before them, will not seize a truth. I resent the idea that the people of Ireland are all home rulers, that they are all anti-British. When an immigration agent, sent from this country, paid by this country, says there is no use in his doing anything to encourage the Irish people to come to Canada because they are all anti-British, I tell him that is not true.

I care not what part of Ireland you go to you will find home rulers and yelpers, but from Connemara to Dublin and from Londonderry to the coast of Cork you will find that 90 per cent of the people are true at heart to the British empire, and if there are home rulers it is merely because they have been pandered to by the kind of talk that the immigration agent sent from Canada has indulged in and they have been pandered to for political purposes, besides which they have not been educated in the proper way. I have faith in the Irishmen, too much faith to believe that they are the kind of men that this immigration agent would have us believe they are. Then, in case we shall have filled up our country, I have this faith, Sir, that by educating the people instead of cringing to their bad habits, to understand and appreciate our institutions and our civil and religious liberties and by establishing our school system properly amongst them, I have faith that whether we have a Galician colony or a Doukhobor district, or a settlement of people from Roumania or Transylvania or from any other European country, the Canadian national spirit and the Canadian national life is so strong and vigorous that we can make good Canadian citizens of them in a generation or two. It is not long since the Icelanders in thousands were brought to Canada. Our good friends now on the government side of the House who were then in opposition placarded this country from one end of it to the other, as I am sorry to see both sides are now doing in regard to the Galicians and Doukhobors, and said that they would not be any use to the Dominion of Canada, that they were seal eaters and fish eaters and that sort of thing. Ask the officials of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, ask the people of Winnipeg and of the North-west Territories who are the finest men to work, who are the finest women to work and they will tell you that they are the people belonging to this same race of Icelanders. The children of these Icelanders who have been born in Canada are as fine a looking race as you will find anywhere. Unfortunately it is the custom in this country and it will be for a time to come to form little race cliques and coteries and to pander to them for political purposes and we have evidence of this from time to time, but I believe, Sir, that that will soon pass away. Those who have studied the history of England know that for hundreds of years there was a struggle, and it has not altogether passed away yet, between the various old counties, each representing settlements from continental Europe, and to this hour you can distinguish the dialects that have been in existence in England for hundreds of years. We can all remember reading about the old Robin Hood days. These were incidents of the struggle between races, but these contentions have now passed away and we have to-day a fusion in that country of the best blood the world can produce. After the lapse of time—it will not come in our day—but the day will come in Canada when each nationality, while preserving its own peculiar characteristics, brought up in the broad, strong, national life of Canada, educated to understand our constitution, educated to understand free institutions and responsible government in the broadest sense, educated in tolerant national schools,

will combine to form the grandest race that the continent of North America or the world has yet produced.

Mr. A. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). Translation.) Mr. Chairman, at this advanced stage of the debate, I do not intend to take up at length the time of this House; and even did I feel so inclined, I do not think I should feel equal to the task, after what has fallen from the mouth of the hon. member (Mr. J. Hughes) who has just addressed the House. As a matter of fact, his description of icebergs and ice floes from the Arctic Ocean, and of the cold currents which spread themselves even through the beautiful river St. Lawrence, in my own province, has exercised such a chilling influence upon me that, as I said, I feel unequal to the task of taking part in the debate at any great length.

Under those circumstances, I shall confine myself to one subject, and it is in connection with the demand made by the deputation of the Colonization Society of the province of Quebec, which waited this morning upon the Minister of the Interior, to report about their operations.

Last year, the province of Quebec, through the agency of that society, obtained a grant of three thousand dollars. With this grant, they have been enabled to place upon the vacant lands of the province one thousand immigrants. And to-day, they have pressed upon the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior, when the estimates of his department are up for discussion, the desirability of doubling the appropriation, which would enable them to bring back to Canada three times as many immigrants as they did last year.

Mr. Chairman, there is one thing which is a matter of deep regret to us, French Canadians, from the province of Quebec : it is the lamentable exodus that has taken away such a large number of our fellow-countrymen, from the province of Quebec, within the last twenty-five or thirty years, who have annually found their way over the border, in the hope of bettering their position. But a great change has come over the country, and now our exiled fellow-countrymen of French extraction are willing to come back to the homes of their fathers. What we press upon the attention of the government is this, that they should bring as much energy to the prosecution of immigration work in the New England States as they are devoting to missionary work in the western states, so as to bring back to their native soil immigrants which are as desirable a class of settlers as any immigrants that can be induced to settle in the western states.

I should like to urge upon the hon. Minister of the Interior the desirability of sending out some of his agents to canvass in the New England States. I feel confident that the hon. minister will not turn a deaf ear to my prayer and that he will respond to my earnest appeal, by directing his agents to carry on in the New England States a similar work to that which is now being pursued in the western states of the Union ; for the purpose of repatriating French Canadians who have gone from the province of Quebec to the United States. I appeal to the hon. minister in favour of granting to the Immigration and Colonization Society of the province of Quebec—a society which numbers eight hundred members—the increase for which they are applying. This is, it is true, a matter of public expenditure, but I do not think public money could be put to a better use than bringing back to this country as desirable a class of settlers as those who are induced to settle in the western states, and a better class, I dare say, than the immigrants coming from the different countries of Europe.

It is by no means a parish policy that I am now advocating ; for, whether those immigrants be directed towards the Metapedia valley, as stated by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) ; or whether they be settled in the north, as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) would have it ; whether again they be directed towards the North-west Territories or to Manitoba, is perfectly indifferent to me, so long as those French Canadians who are willing to come back to their native soil are given the same inducements and offered the same advantages as those given to immigrants from foreign countries.

We have thousands and thousands of French Canadians who are longing to come back to the land of their fathers. Those Canadians are scattered through the New England States and throughout the country to the west of the Mississippi. What I most earnestly desire, and it is a consummation devoutly to be wished for, is that the Department of the Interior should take the necessary steps to repatriate those of our fellow-countrymen who live in the United States ; and that they be given by the department every possible assistance and all desirable facilities of transportation.

As I said a moment ago, the conditions are quite different from what they were when the stream of immigration set in the direction of the neighbouring republic ; and when our fellow-countrymen began to drift towards the New England States, to become white slaves in the American factories. A great change has come over the country, and nowadays Canada is attracting the attention of the whole world.

On these several grounds, I hope the hon. Minister of the Interior will see his way clear to comply with the wishes and views of the Immigration and Colonization Society of the province of Quebec, as set forth by the delegation which waited upon the hon. minister, this very morning ; the more so, as their demands are by no means ex-

aggerated and that they are conducive to the promotion of colonization and the development of the country.

Contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign agencies, and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $333,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This was included in the statement that the hon. gentleman has already given.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say a word on a subject that has already been mentioned, namely: whether or not the efforts of the department might not be with advantage directed to persons who are emigrating from Canada, and more particularly from the eastern provinces. The hon. gentleman stated that no effort was made to retain such people here except by giving them information. I recognize the difficulty of dealing with that matter, but it does seem to me that the question of immigration into this country and the question of emigration from this country, are very intimately connected. I do not know that the difficulties are so great as the Minister of the Interior suggests. For example, the hon. gentleman apparently acquiesces in the position which Mr. Devlin takes in Ireland, that he can do effective immigration work there although he does not urge the people to leave that country. I am not mentioning that for the purpose of criticising it at present, as it has been dealt with by other speakers. But, might not the same idea be carried out with regard to the eastern provinces. The minister says that there is the objection that the older provinces do not want their population depleted. Well, if you put an agent in the eastern provinces who would act upon exactly the same principles as these which have the approval of the minister with regard to Mr. Devlin, I do not think there could be any objection. What I mean is: That without urging them to leave the eastern provinces you might go among these people who are leaving, and try to induce them to go to the North-west. In that way you might induce some of the people who are now going to the United States to settle in our western country, especially if you gave them some of the assistance which you are now offording to people from other countries to come to Canada. I am not sufficiently familiar with the subject to say that there is anything in the suggestion I offer, but it does seem to me that when with one hand we are spending money very lavishly to induce people to come to this country, and on the other hand we are making no efforts to direct the people who are leaving the older provinces towards the North-west, we are possibly not doing all we might in regard to that particular matter. I am quite in accord with these gentlemen who have said that it is quite as important, indeed possibly more important, to direct our efforts towards keeping our own people in our own country, than towards inducing people from Europe to come here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite recognize the force of what the hon. leader of the opposition has said. My own personal inclinations have been much in that direction, but I have been restrained from doing more than I have done, largely from the fear that my efforts in that respect might not meet with the approval of the House. I have so far confined the efforts of the department largely to co-operation with the colonization societies and provincial governments, and to giving information. In addition to that, in some cases we have advertised the free grants of land and the homestead conditions in different parts of Canada. So far as the province of Ontario is concerned, I would suppose that the information with regard to the west is very complete, but in the province of Quebec, I think, perhaps, something could be done, and possibly in the maritime provinces more could be done than anywhere else, because being so far from Western Canada they are not brought into contact with our literature, and the difficulty and expense of transportation are so great that unless there is some counteracting influence, the natural movement will be to the United States. I shall give the whole subject the best consideration I can, and if any practical suggestion should be made I shall be happy to consider it.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 18, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY—THE EXPORT OF NICKEL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Before you leave the Chair, I desire to refer briefly to a matter of some importance to the country. I shall do so without making any motion in reference to the subject. I refer to the export of nickel from Canada.

This country, for fifteen years, has been the chief source of supply of nickel for the world. The business has been managed by our American friends in such a way that they have derived nearly all the advantages that could be obtained from the extensive and lucrative business of refining nickel and converting it into finished products. The American policy as regards the nickel industry is to admit the matte or refined ore free of duty, and to impose a very heavy duty upon the refined nickel, that duty amounting to $120 per ton. The result has been that our nickel deposits have been worked by the companies owning the mines in Canada, and the matte has been exported to the United States and refined there, giving to that country a very lucrative business. But the policy we have permitted the United States to pursue towards us in this matter is one that certainly has not been conducive to our own interests. The use of nickel promises to be increased, and therefore the control of the industry will be one of much greater importance in the near future than it has been up to the present. The manufacture of nickeliferous—pig iron will play a very important part in the manufacturing operations in connection with nickel in the very near future. Nickel is not only essential in the manufacture of armour plate, but it can be used to great advantage in material for bridges, in material for building, in fact for material for structural purposes generally; and the control of the business will be a matter of great importance to whatever country obtains it. The United States capitalists and business men are quite wide awake to the advantages to be derived from the control of this business, and, within a few days a great nickel company has been formed in the United States entitled the International Nickel Company which is operating in connection with, and is largely controlled by the American Steel Corporation, commonly known as the Steel Trust. This new company I see by the 'Engineering and Mining Journal' of April 5, was incorporated in the week of that issue of the 'Journal.' I will read one or two paragraphs from the article on this subject:

> The International Nickel Company, which was organized this week in New Jersey, is the result of the plans to consolidate and control the nickel production of the world, to which reference has been made in our columns heretofore. The plan was originated by Colonel R. M. Thompson, president of the Orford Copper Company, and has been carried through chiefly by his efforts, that he has had recently the aid of Mr. Schwab, of the United States Steel Corporation and Colonel J. R. De Le Mar.
>
> The purchase of the stock of the Nickel Corporation, Limited, from its London owners was one of the steps towards the present consolidation. The case of that company, which owns valuable concessions in New Caledonia, has already been discussed in the 'Journal.'
>
> The International Nickel Company will issue $12,000,000 in common stock; $12,000,000 in preferred stock, carrying six per cent dividends, non-cumulative, and $10,000,000 in five per cent bonds having 30 years to run. Of the authorized capital stock $9,000,000 common and $9,000,000 preferred will be issued at once to acquire the properties named below. The remaining stock will be reserved for future use. . . .
>
> The properties in which the new company will own a controlling interest—if not, the whole—are those of the Canadian Copper Company in Canada and the United States; the Orford Copper Company, with extensive reduction works at Bayonne, N.J.; the Anglo-American Iron Company and the Vermillion Manufacturing Company in Canada; the American Nickel Works of Joseph Wharton in Camden, N.J.; the Nickel Corporation, Limited, and the Societe Miniere Caledonienne in New Caledonia.
>
> The Societe Le Nickel, with its extensive properties in New Caledonia and its reduction works in France, is not included in the combination. It is intimated, however, that the International Nickel Company has already a full understanding with the French Company. It is believed that a community-of-interest plan has been arranged which will regulate production, prices and a division of the markets.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we see here not a proposed but an actual formation of a great nickel trust, with a capital of $24,000,000, with bonds of $12,000,000, associated with the Steel Trust of the United States with a capital of $1,000,000,000, the avowed purpose of which is to acquire the nickel properties and control the nickel business of the world. Now the question is whether Canada is advancing its own interests in promoting the continuance of the policy which has hitherto prevailed with regard to the nickel industry. The question is whether it is in the interest of Canada to promote the exportation of nickel in its lowest prepared form, that is, in concentrated ore, to be refined in the United States, and to submit to the policy of the United States which imposes an enormous import duty upon refined nickel and admits the matte free. The result of this policy has been that we have never refined a ton of nickel in Canada. This great company has purchased the Copper Cliff property for $4,375,000, payable in stock partly, and partly in cash; it has purchased other properties in Canada on conditions of a similar character.

The significance of the launching of this scheme, the significance of the formation of this trust, the fact that a great nickel iron company, in concert with the great Steel Trust of the United States, has been formed, is one which I think the government of the day is called upon to take into careful consideration. We have an interest in this matter, England has an interest in this matter. If the plans of this great international nickel corporation can be consummated and carried into effect, it will have a very serious influence upon England's interest in the matter of acquiring armour plate; it will have a very serious influence upon England's interest and upon our own in the

matter of nickeliferous pig iron and the manufacture of nickel steel for the various purposes that that metal is adapted to. Our interest in this matter, the interest of England in this matter, the scope and character of this combination or corporation, are matters to which, in my opinion, we are called to give careful consideration. I do not see, Mr. Speaker, why it is not possible to refine the nickel that is mined in our own country; I do not see why, with the adoption of a proper policy, Canada cannot only control practically the nickel supply of ore, but also the nickel supply of the refined article. The government has in its own hands power to deal with this question, and it is unnecessary to introduce legislation. We have in the statutes, 60 and 61 Victoria, chapter 17, powers given with reference to the imposition of export duties which will enable the government, by a simple Order in Council, to meet the policy of the Americans by the imposition of an export duty upon nickel matte that will give us a chance to secure at least our share of the business of refining this metal in Canada.

In connection with this matter, while I am on my feet, there is another one which I wish to refer to, another case in which our respected and highly esteemed Uncle Samuel is a little too smart for us. When the United States acquired the Philippine Islands, I believe there was an explicit understanding or agreement with the English government that the policy of the United States with reference to the Philippines should not discriminate against other countries. I see that this matter has been made, the day before yesterday, the subject of a parliamentary inquiry in the British House of Commons. Now, Sir, there was, during the Spanish occupancy of the Philippines, an export duty levied upon manilla of $7.50 a ton, or 37 cents per hundred weight. The imposition of this export duty has been continued by the Philippine government, and the tariff which embodies this provision among its other provisions, has received the sanction of the United States government. Manilla, under this tariff, pays this export duty of $7.50 per ton, and when it is imported into the United States, that export duty is remitted, and this provision places the American manufacturer of cordage in a position where he has the advantage over the manufacturers of cordage in other countries; it is practically giving him a bonus of $7.50 per ton upon the cost of his raw material. Now the United States government are debarred by constitutional limitations from the imposition of an export duty, but they have taken a course which enables them to avail themselves of this export duty levied in the Philippine Islands as efficiently and completely as if it were levied by the United States government. The Canadian importer of manilla cannot go to the United States and purchase manilla without having it subject to the export duty, he has got to pay an export duty, whether he buys manilla in the Philippine Islands and imports it direct, or whether he buys it in the United States of the American importer; and paying this export duty he is placed at a disadvantage with his American competitor in the sale of cordage in our own market.

Then with reference to manilla binder twine, this is admitted free. Now the Canadian producer of binder twine cannot compete with the American producer, because the American producer has the advantage at the outset of $7.50 per ton in the cost of the raw article. It has been supposed that there is reciprocity between the two countries in the exportation and importation of binder twine; but an examination of the American tariff will show that the binder twine we can export to the United States free of duty must not contain manilla fibre, and if it does contain manilla fibre, then it goes under the head of unenumerated articles and pays 20 per cent. Now this is the condition in respect to this article, where we are placed at an unfair disadvantage. The imposition of export duties which are made to serve the purpose of the United States manufacturer by reducing the cost of his raw material to the extent of the export duty as compared with the cost of the raw material to all other countries, is a matter which, in my opinion, requires the attention of the government; and this thing can only be met by countervailing duties. If we were to impose a specific duty of half a cent a pound upon cordage and upon binder twine, then we would equalize the conditions, and put our manufacturer upon the same footing with the American manufacturer. But unless we do this, the American manufacturer has the Canadian manufacturer at a disadvantage, and I hold, Mr. Speaker, that it is the duty of the government so far as it is able to do this, to protect our own interests. I place those facts with regard to these industries; with regard to the nickel industries and with regard to the manufacturer of cordage and twine before the government for its consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has called attention to two matters of importance, both of which have somewhat engaged the attention of the government. With regard to the export of nickel, the House is aware that several years ago the government took power in the Customs Act to levy export duties on nickel, but after very full consideration of the question it was not deemed to be in the best interests of the mineral development of Canada that these export duties should at the time be imposed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) represents that some new conditions have arisen through the creation of a great monopoly in the nickel industry, and so far as that presents any new aspect of the case the government would be bound of course to give it due consideration and will do so.

The other question to which my hon. friend has referred was brought before us recently both through notice in the public press and through representations made during the past few days by gentlemen interested in the business affected. It is a very curious condition of affairs ; I think unlike anything in connection with our tariff matters which has ever been presented to the House before.

Mr. CHARLTON. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All I can say for the present is, that the matter is engaging the attention of the government. Whether or not it is an evil which needs a remedy is a matter which will have to be determined at an early date, and I trust my hon. friend will not expect me to say more than that at the present stage.

MANITOBA SCHOOL LAND SALES.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior if he will lay on the Table at an early date the report of the commission that was appointed to inquire into the irregularities in regard to school lands sales ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Was a return ordered by the House ?

Mr. BOYD. I do not think so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman desires, I will have it brought down.

Mr. BOYD. I hope it will not take too long.

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

Civil government : Department of Indian Affairs, including J. D. McLean at $2,400, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $55,167.50.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The net increase here is $4.097.50, of which $3,200 is for the appointment of a deputy superintendent general of Indian affairs. There are 33 statutory increases of $50 each ; one at $25, and one at $12.50 ; increase of the salary of the secretary, $100, making a total of $5,027.50. There is a reduction caused by the removal of a first-class clerk and the appointment of a second-class clerk in his place, leaving a saving of $400. There is the difference between a third-class clerk who got $1,000 and who has been superannuated owing to ill health, and a new junior second-class clerk at $600, giving a saving of $400. A clerk now deceased got $750, and the clerk appointed in his place gets $600, giving a saving of $150. This leaves a total saving of $950, which deducted from the gross increase of $5,027.50, leaves the net increase $4,097.70. Respecting the appointment of a deputy superintendent general of Indian affairs ; we have not had for the last five years a separate officer occupying that position. The deputy minister of the Interior discharges the duties of the office. If the work of the Department of the Interior had remained in the condition in which it was when I took office it would be quite possible to go on without making this appointment ; but the increase in the work of the department has been so enormous that it is absolutely impossible for the deputy minister of the Interior to give all the attention to that work which it should receive. There are many important matters in the Indian Department which ought to receive that attention which it is impossible for myself or for Mr. Smart to give them, for the reason that they are matters which would necessarily take considerable time in considering to deal with properly. I refer more particularly to disputed questions between the Department of Indian Affairs and the various provinces. There is no department of the government which comes in conflict so often with the provinces as does the Indian Department. There are questions constantly arising with regard to land and minerals which require a great deal of attention, and I have not been able to give as much attention to these subjects as I would like. That is one reason why we feel that in the public interest we ought to have an officer who would be competent to give all his attention to the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. Who discharges the duties of this office now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. Smart, the deputy minister of the Interior.

Mr. SPROULE. You abolished this office a few years ago, and you then claimed there was no need for it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the work had remained the same it would be quite possible to have carried on the work with one deputy. If the hon. gentleman looks at the returns of the Department of the Interior, he will see that the work of that department has multiplied three or four times during the last five years, and the correspondence alone has increased three times at least. I am satisfied that the making of this appointment is absolutely in the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that the present occupant, Mr. Smart, is to be the deputy superintendent general of Indian Affairs, or is he the deputy minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is both.

Mr. SPROULE. The question I asked was : Who is to fill the office in future ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say that to the hon. gentleman because I have not come to a conclusion yet. No appointment can be made however until the salary is voted.

Mr. SPROULE. This is another illustration of the failure of hon. gentlemen to keep their promise that wonderful changes would be made when they came into office. They kept it for a short time until they got rid of the incumbent of the office, and thus made a vacancy, and in a little while they re-established the office for the purpose of putting in one of their own friends. It seems to me that this is one of the main objects in view at the present time.

Department of Indian Affairs—clerical and other assistance, $3,130.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is an increase of $150 which is made up as follows: There are five clerks who are paid out of this vote and two messengers. The statutory increases to these clerks amount to $210. There is a saving effected by the difference between the salary of Miss Garfoote, who has resigned and who was receiving $460, and the salary of the clerk who has been appointed since in her place and who gets the minimum salary of $400, thereby effecting a saving of $60. Taking $60 from $210 makes a net increase of $150.

Ontario and Quebec—relief, medical attendance and medicine, Quebec, $5,600.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is an increase in the item of relief, medical attendance and medicine for Quebec of $2,000. What is the explanation of that?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The total increase in these two amounts is $1,000, but there is in reality an increase of $2,900 in the item for relief, medical attendance and medicine in Quebec and Ontario, $2,000 in Quebec and $900 in Ontario, making $2,900. We have dropped the vote of $200 which has appeared in the estimates before to provide for the removal of Indians from Oka to the township of Gibson and we have dropped the vote of $1,700 for the repairs to the mission house at Caughnawaga. That makes $1,900 and it leaves a net increase of $1,000. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in reality there is an increase of $2,900. It is for relief, medical attendance and medicine in Quebec and Ontario. As I have explained to the committee on various occasions the department of Indian Affairs has had very great difficulty in dealing with this question. They have endeavoured to keep the amount of expenditure down to the lowest possible figure, but they have always had to come before the House and ask for a supplementary vote. The officials inform me that they have asked for this increased amount because they believe it will cover the expenditure for the year and that they will not then have to ask for a supplementary vote.

Mr. SPROULE. But, your old item in your last estimates included the supplementary vote of last year?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman understands that we have supplementary estimates for the current year as well as for the next year and for these particular items we have found it necessary towards the end of the year to bring in a supplementary estimate for the current year. We are voting this amount for this particular year and the hon. gentleman will perceive that in the supplementary estimates to be laid on the Table there will be a supplementary amount for this year. We have now increased the main vote so as to avoid the necessity of taking a supplementary vote again.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is a much better principle and it enables us to understand it more easily. I understand the hon. minister to say that he has dropped out of this vote the amount which has been voted every year for the transfer of Oka Indians to Muskoka. Have they all died, or has he transferred the last one of them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They will not go.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister gave us no statement in regard to the Indians on the island near Cornwall with whom the department had some trouble. Is there any change in the situation?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The difficulty which we had at St. Regis was of a very serious and trying character. When I took charge of the department I found that some of the Indians there had made up their minds to defy the authority of the department, and the first attempt that was made to enforce the authority of the department was met by a state of turbulence on the reserve which was very alarming. I do not think the difficulty would have arisen or would have continued to the extent it did, if it had not been for the fact that immediately opposite the reserve is a place where a lot of American Indians reside, and the line between them is only an imaginary one. The Canadian Indians and the American Indians passed freely backwards and forwards, and the American Indians unquestionably excited the Canadian Indians to turbulence and a disregard of the law. The House will remember that a couple of years ago we had a very serious difficulty on the reserve, and sent down the chief of the Dominion police to quell it, and

a very serious attack was made upon him which resulted in one of the Indians being shot, and his death resulted from the wound. A number of Indians were brought to trial for this affray, and after their trial were allowed to go on suspended sentence. After consulting with the late member for Huntingdon, Mr. Scriver, a man in whose judgment I had considerable confidence, and who was well acquainted with the circumstances, and after consulting with the officers of the law of the province of Quebec in that neighbourhood, and getting all the information I could, as well as having an inspection by one of the inspectors of the department, I came to the conclusion that the ends of justice would be best served by allowing the Indians to go on suspended sentence. They were allowed to go, and for a time matters were quiet, and it was thought that the trouble was at an end. A little while afterwards signs of disturbance again manifested themselves, and I came to the conclusion that undue lenience to the Indians would rather give them the impression that the government was afraid of them, and that they could do as they pleased. The next outbreak was due to a dispute about the lease of a number of islands in the St. Lawrence. I need not trouble the committee by giving a full account of the whole matter, because it is very complicated. A number of the islands in the St. Lawrence were held under leases, which had been assented to by the Indians fifty or sixty years ago, and from time to time a number of these leases had fallen in. Some years ago the department decided that, although these leases were renewable under their strict terms, they would not allow them to be renewed, but would let the islands revert to the Indians whenever the leases fell in. After the leases of several islands had fallen in and the Indians were getting the use of the land of these islands, they conceived the idea that they could force matters, and insist on some of the islands on which the leases had not terminated being also turned over to them. In order to bring the matter to a head, they arranged to put an Indian with his family on one of these islands, and in that way take possession of it. The department was notified of the fact by persons who had built summer cottages on the island, who were in the habit of going there in the summer, and who were afraid to go for fear of violence from the Indians. I gave the matter the best consideration I could, and came to the conclusion that anything in the nature of extreme leniency, or allowing the Indians to have their way in violating the law, would be a mistake. Consequently I determined to take hold of the matter with a firm hand. I caused the chief of police of the town of Cornwall to go there and make an examination of all the facts of the case, and under the authority of the Indian Act the Indian who was there with his family was taken off and put out of possession of the island. As soon as this was done, the Indians determined that they would put this man back again; and as often as he was removed they would put him back and put others along with him, with the object of intimidating persons who went on the island. When I ascertained this, I proceeded under the terms of the Indian Act, and had the man arrested and put in jail for violating the order that had been made, and the Indians were notified of the fact. The result was that they gave up the fight, and since that time we have had peace, and I do not anticipate any more difficulty in connection with the matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister said that when the supplementary estimates for this year came down he would ask for an additional amount. We have these supplementary estimates before us, and in them $2,800 is asked for to pay the balance of the expenses in connection with the Indians in the province of Quebec. Last year the sum asked for was $3,600. If my hon. friend will refer to the last estimates of the late Conservative government, brought down in 1895, he will find that the amount then asked for, which included the entire service, was $3,500, included in which was an amount for seed grain, for which I do not see anything included in this vote. Why is this vote increased by $2,100 in five years? There are no more Indians, but there are less, because some have moved away. This whole increase is for medical attendance.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increase seems to be due to the fact that the department has taken over a certain amount of work in connection with the Indians on the lower part of the River St. Lawrence. Under the existing conditions, we have a considerable amount of expense in connection with the increased quarantine work, which has had to be undertaken by the Department of Indian Affairs. I quite understand that the expenditure in connection with this branch of the service ought to be as low as possible, and there is a continual struggle on the part of the department for the purpose of keeping down this expenditure on Indian affairs, and my hon. friend can rest assured that there is no money expended except in cases where actual services are rendered. So far as the medical attendance is concerned, there is always the possibility of an increase. When an Indian gets medicine one day, he imagines he cannot get along unless he gets more the next, and there are bound to be increases from time to time, but we are doing the best we can to keep down the expenditure. The epidemic of small-pox, which has prevailed in all parts of the country, has called for more medical work, particularly among the Indians. The Department of Agriculture makes this expenditure among the Indians of the North-west, but in

the lower provinces the work has to be done by our medical officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. We know that this is a growing time, but the Indians are not growing in the province of Quebec, but rather decreasing. The hon. gentleman is asking for an increase over the money expended by the late government. In the supplementaries he is asking for $2,800 more this year. If there was an extra expenditure on account of vaccination last year, there ought not to be any this year, but yet this year he is asking for a still larger amount to carry on this work. How many Indians are there in the province of Quebec, and how many medical men are employed to treat them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are 17,000 Indians, and I cannot say exactly how many medical men are employed. There are only three or four paid salaries. Most of the work is done by physicians in the neighbourhood who just send in their accounts. It is much more satisfactory when we can get physicians to do the work on salary, because where we have to pay separate accounts, there is endless difficulty.

Mr. TAYLOR. No doubt a lot of the hon. gentleman's friends have to be considered and given employment treating the Indians.

Relief medical attendance and medicine, Ontario, $2,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item shows an increase of $900 since 1895-6. The work was done then for $1,100.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increase is caused by the fact that we have undertaken to do some work for the Indians on the north shore of Lake Superior, which was not done before. We are also providing $200 for the salaries of the medical attendant at Mattawa, who attends the Indians that come from the northern posts, north of the Mattawa, and who is at the call of the department for cases among the Indians in that neighbourhood. We used to have complaints frequently from the people there that no provision was made for the care of sick Indians, and we found it necessary to provide for this service.

Mr. SPROULE. This, I take it, includes the Indians on the Manitoulin Islands ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. What doctors are employed there now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Carruthers, Dr. Johnson and Dr. McIntosh. They are all paid out of the band fund.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are they located?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Carruthers, at South Bay, Dr. Johnson, West Bay, and Dr. McIntosh, at Manitowaning. They are paid out of the Indian fund.

Mr. SPROULE. They are paid by salary, I presume ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. Dr. Carruther's salary is $600; Dr. Johnson's salary is $250, and Dr. McIntosh's, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is exclusive of medicines, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That includes medicines.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the minister's order with regard to vaccination ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The rule is that the physicians on the reserves where at all possible are supposed to keep the children vaccinated. That, like a good many of the rules in connection with the Indian reserves must be carried out with some discretion and cannot always be executed with the same exactness as in a civilized community. I may say that within the last year we have had a great deal of difficulty, because the physicians claim where there was a very large amount of vaccination to be done, that they were entitled to extra fees for it. I do not think we have paid any extra fees as yet, but that question has come up lately. The rule, as I say, is that, where possible, they are to keep the children vaccinated, but they are not bound to vaccinate the adults.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the minister a return of the vaccinations year by year among the Indians ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It is not given in the report ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, but we can furnish it if the hon. gentleman desires.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the Indians were much averse to vaccination ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are in some places. But not much more than among white people. You come across some who object, but as a rule they do not make much difficulty over it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that these doctors are paid out of the Indian fund. Will the hon. minister tell us who are paid out of this vote on Manitoulin Island ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Indian bands have their funds——

Mr. SPROULE. But, if the doctors are paid out of the Indian funds, what is this

vote for ? Are there Indian bands which have no fund ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have to make a virtue of necessity and, where the Indians have no funds, we vote the money that is absolutely necessary for the service.

Mr. SPROULE. But this cannot be an unusual matter, because this money is voted year after year. Where are the Indians located for whom this vote is made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I can give the hon. gentleman the names of persons who are employed in this way where salaries are paid them, but, at present I cannot give the names of those who are paid by fees. I fancy they are scattered all over the country, and we have not a list of the names in the report. The following are paid salaries voted by parliament : Dr. J. W. Evans, $100, attending the Indians between Chapleau and Pogamasing ; Dr. M. James, Mattawa, $200 a year, attending the Algonquin Indians north of Mattawa ; Dr. James A. McEwan, $300 a year, attending the Oneidas of the Thames.

Mr. INGRAM. What about Dr. McIntosh on Manitoulin Island ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He is paid out of the Indian fund.

Mr. TAYLOR. At page J-156 of the Auditor General's Report I find a charge of $184.08 as paid to Dr. McIntosh, Manitoulin Island. Why is that not paid out of the Indian fund ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a service rendered to a band on Manitoulin Island that has no fund of its own. There are a number of Indians who are entitled to participate in the funds of what is generally known as the Manitoulin band.

Mr. SPROULE. The amounts given by the hon. minister represent a total of only about $600, while this vote is $2,000. There must be others the hon. minister has not given.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page J-7 of the Auditor General's Report, he will find an account of the manner in which the money was expended last year.

Indian Affairs—Ontario and Quebec—schools, Ontario, Quebec and maritime provinces, $42,-190.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell us where these schools are and also why this vote has crept up to the present amount from the $8,000 or so that was spent some years ago ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say that a good deal of my time with the Indian Department is spent in resisting demands made on behalf of these schools. If the hon. gentleman desires I will give the particulars in regard to the schools. In Ontario there are 72 day schools and 6 industrial and boarding schools. The aggregate number of pupils enrolled in the day schools in 2,201 ; the aggregate number in the industrial schools is 466. The average attendance in the day schools is 1,036, and in the industrial schools 423. We have found by experience in connection with Indian education that the average attendance at day schools bears a very small proportion, much smaller than it ought, to the total number of enrolled children ; whereas at boarding schools or industrial schools, the average attendance is very much greater. Of these 78 schools, 42 are either wholly or in part provided for by government grant, the remainder from the funds of the bands themselves. There are 2 schools at Caradoc, 1 at Manitoulin Island, 3 at Fort William, 1 at Garden River, 1 at Golden Lake, 1 at Georgiana Island, 1 at Hiawatha, 1 at Jack Fish Island, 1 at Nepigon Lake, 1 at Nepigon River, 1 at Lower Muncey, 1 at Mattawa, 1 at Michipicoten, 1 at Henvey Inlet, 1 at Mississauga River, the Mohawk institute with 91 pupils, the Mount Elgin institute, with 100 pupils, 2 schools at Oneida, 1 at Pic River, 1 at Port Arthur, 1 at Pays Plat, 1 at Rama, 1 at Spanish River, 1 at Serpent River, 1 at South Bay, Manitoulin Island, 1 at Shawanaga, 1 at Six Nations, 1 at Spanish River, 1 at Shingwauk Home, 1 at Wallpole Island, 1 on the Watha reserve, 1 at White Fish Lake, 1 at White Fish River, 1 at Wikwenikongsing, 3 at Wikwemikong, and 1 at Thessalon. Total grants for schools in Ontario, $31,660.

In Quebec the total number of day schools is 18 ; aggregate number of pupils on roll 763 ; average attendance, 731. Of these schools, 13 are provided for by government grant, the remainder from the funds of the bands themselves. There is one school at Becancour, 3 at Caughnawaga, 1 at Lorette, 1 at Oka Village, 1 at Restigouche River, 2 at Temiscamingue, 1 at Maria, 1 at Lake St. John, 2 at Lake St. Francais, and 1 at Betsiamits. Total grant for Quebec, $3,480.

In Nova Scotia, the number of day schools is 10 ; aggregate number on roll, 205 ; aggregate average attendance, 89. All are provided for by government grant. 1 school is at Bear River, Digby, 1 at Cow Bay, Cape Breton, 1 at Eskasoni, Cape Breton, 1 at Middle River, Victoria, 1 at New Germany, Queen's, 1 at Salmon River, Richmond, 1 at Whycocomagh, Inverness, 1 at Shubenacadie, Hants, 1 at Indian Cove, Pictou, 1 at Millbrook, Colchester. Total grant for Nova Scotia, $2,500.

In New Brunswick the number of day schools is 6 ; aggregate number on roll, 143 ; aggregate average attentance, 74. All are provided for by government grant. 1 school is at Burnt Church, Northumberland, 1 at Eel Ground, Northumberland, 1 at

King's Clear, York, 1 at St. Mary's, York, 1 at Tobique, Victoria, 1 at Big Cove, Kent. Total grant for New Brunswick, $1,400.

In Prince Edward Island the number of day schools is 1; number on roll, 21; average attendance, 11. This school is at Lennox Island. Total grant for Prince Edward Island, $300.

Then there is an item for total general expenses of $2,850, made up as follows: To provide for cost of inspection, rent, fuel, cleaning, and repairing outbuildings, and erecting outbuildings (including $725 for accommodation and furniture for teachers of Roman Catholic schools. Lakes Huron and Superior), $2,725; to provide scholarships for the Mohawk institute, to pay fees at the Collegiate institute, Brantford, $125. The total expenditure for all the provinces is $42,190.

Mr. SPROULE. What standard of education must your teachers possess to qualify them?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are required to have the usual certificates, a third class certificate. In the province of Ontario the schools are inspected by the public school inspectors.

Mr. FRASER. I know about one of these schools in our own county, conducted by a Miss Connelly. She has transformed the character of the Indian children at Pictou Landing. She has not only instructed them in school work but she has instructed them in their homes, she has gone to their homes and taught them habits of cleanliness, and has made such a change in them that I do not know any better expenditure this government has made than for the Indian schools in our own county.

Mr. SPROULE. What progress generally are the children making in those schools? We hear it said frequently that they are not making much progress.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no foundation for the idea that no progress is being made, or that the money is being wasted. Our position with reference to the Indians is this: We have them with us, and we have to deal with them as wards of the country. There is no question that the method we have adopted of spending money to educate them is the best possible method of bringing these people to an improved state. I can speak from my own knowledge in the North-west, and generally speaking there is a vast difference between the Indians who have passed through the day school and are now adults or becoming adults, and the Indians who have not had that advantage. There is the difference between the savage and a person who has become civilized, though perhaps not of a high type. I do not think any great improvement can be made in the work which is being carried on; we have to have inspection just as we would if we were dealing with day schools. You cannot have exactly the same degree of efficiency. You cannot press the Indian children as you can the children of white people, you cannot require so much from them. In Ontario we do not have very much difficulty because the schools are inspected by the public school inspectors, but in the other provinces we have to pay a little closer attention to detail. In outlying places there is difficulty in getting competent teachers. When you pay $300 a year and send a young woman, or a young man, out to a lonesome place where there are no social advantanges it is very difficult to get a competent teacher under those circumstances. We can only do the best we can from time to time, and if we find that a teacher is not competent on the inspector's report, we try to make a change as quickly as possible.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that the hon. minister is asking for $42,190 for schools in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. I turn to the Auditor General's Report at J—156, and I find that the expenditure for schools in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces amounted to $12,331.59. The Auditor General gives the names of all the teachers. I do not find the name of the one that has been mentioned.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will turn to J—8 he will find the expenditure there.

Mr. TAYLOR. In connection with the schools, the Auditor General gives all the names of the teachers and the expenditure, which amounts to $12,331.59. I turn to the next page, J—157, and I find the following:

H. Jacques, M.D., physician, King's county	$ 50 00
F. H. Kelly, M.D, physician, Queen's and Lunenburg	50 00
J. F. Macaulay, M.D., physician, Inverness county	75 00
D. Macdonald, M.D., physician, Inverness county	12 50
H. N. Macdonald, M.D., physician, Victoria county	62 50
H. A. March, M.D., physician, Lunenburg county	75 00
Daniel McDonald, M.D., physician, Victoria county	225 00
D. K. McIntyre, M.D., physician, Sydney, C.B.	250 00

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend is not referring to the expenditure in connection with this vote.

Mr. TAYLOR (reading):

J. C. McKinnon, M.D., physician, Antigonish county	$150 00
E. D. McLean, M.D., physician, Hants county	150 00
R. Withers, M.D., physician, Annapolis county	50 00
F. S. Yorkston, M.D., physician, Colchester county	150 00
J. S. Benson, M.D., physician	100 00
J. F. Desmond, M.D., physician, Newcastle	179 17
A. G. Ferguson, M.D., physician	25 00

And so they go on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Is that at page 157 ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is at page 157. I would like to know how many Indians there are down there, and how many doctors are required to look after them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will look at J—8 he will find the expenditure under this vote—schools, Ontario, and Quebec, and maritime provinces. He will find that it was $38,827.83.

Mr. McLENNAN. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the expenditures in Inverness county for these schools and for medical attendance, I beg to say that the sum of $150 has been set aside to pay for medical attendance. There are two Indian reserves in the county of Inverness. One of these physicians attend the Indians on each reserve, and $150, at my suggestion, has been divided between them. Hence it is that so many names appear as receiving money from this government for medical services in Inverness. The whole amount does not exceed $150. I do not know how it is in other counties, but that is what holds true in the county of Inverness. With regard to the schools, I can only say that the government, at my suggestion also, built a very fine school there at an expenditure of $700 or so, and I may say, as the hon. minister said in regard to the schools in Ontario, the public inspector visits the Indian school just as regularly, and is bound to do so, as he visits any other school in the county of Inverness. The teacher also must be licensed, holding a provincial license, as the gentleman in charge of the Indian school now does. Sometimes I regret that the young Indians in that school are making such progress that they are very greatly adding to my correspondence. While I am up here they write to me and make known their wants like ordinary mortals in that county.

Mr. SPROULE. They know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) is controlling the patronage. I was going to ask the hon. minister what books they use for the instruction of the children. Are they taught in various languages or are they required to be taught in any other language than English ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are taught in English.

Mr. SPROULE. English only ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There may be a few teachers who know the native Indian language, but it is not required. They are taught in English.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, we are to understand that the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) is responsible for the extra medical attendance down there ?

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. McLENNAN. I do not hear the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister tells us that the children are making satisfactory progress. I hope they are. He says that these schools meet with his approval and on looking over his report I do not doubt but that they do. Looking over the report, I take up the Elkhorn school, and I see that one of the principal items in connection with that school is as follows :

The event of the year was the visit of the Hon. Mr. Sifton, with regard to which the Manitoba 'Free Press' of October 29, says : 'Mr. Sifton visited the industrial school in Elkhorn on Saturday, and after receiving a most cordial reception from the staff and pupils, he was presented with a kindly worded address, accompanied by a bouquet.

He should have had the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) there. I wonder if he paid for the bouquet himself.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know whether it was paid for out of the Indian vote or not.

Mr. SPROULE. Or was it paid for out of the Indian vote ?

The hon. gentleman spoke nicely to the children in reply, thanking them for their tokens of esteem and encouraging them to prosecute their studies diligently.

Did the hon. gentleman speak in Indian or in English ?

He was highly pleased with the work being accomplished there.

I suppose he would be, as that address was presented to him there.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilson entertained him at lunch after the inspection was completed. The school is an admirably equipped institution.

This was the event of the year at this Indian school, and of course, the hon. gentleman is highly pleased with the progress which is being made. I do not wonder he would be, as he got that bouquet. Will he present it to the House and lay it on the Table ?

Grant for the agricultural society—Munceys of the Thames, $90.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). Is that all that is granted to the Muncey Indians ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We give them a little medical attendance and I think they share in some other grants, but not much more. These Indians are highly advanced as the hon. gentleman knows, and this is merely a gratuity to their agricultural society.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). The Muncey Indians have an excellent institution on the Thames. They have a splendid school presided over by a very able gentleman, and to meet the Indian children on the roads you would see that they are as well dressed and fully as refined and cultured as most of our

farmer's sons in that neighbourhood. The institution is a credit.

To assist in the suppression of the liquor traffic among Indians belonging to bands in the older provinces, which have no funds of their own, $500.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this money spent ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When reports come in that liquor is being sold to the Indians in any particular place, we send out special instructions and sometimes we send down a special detective.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you require this in Ontario, where they have license inspectors, whose duty it is to see that the law is enforced ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They do not consider it their business to do anything special in connection with the Indians.

Mr. SPROULE. They don't consider it their business to prevent liquor being illegally sold. That is a sad reflection on the license inspector in the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the provincial officers find an Indian drunk of course they will lock him up as they would any other man, but they will not make any special exertion to ascertain who sold the liquor. The sale of liquor to an Indian is in contravention of Dominion legislation, and none of the provincial authorities consider it their business to look specially after the violations of the Indian Act. In one case, I sent a special detective three times to the same place and he entirely failed to find evidence to secure a conviction.

Mr. SPROULE. I always understood that liquor could not be sold to an Indian under a penalty of $200. Surely it is the duty of the provincial inspector to see that punishment is meted out when the law is broken. Would the provincial inspectors not consider it their duty to prosecute if they were informed that liquor had been sold in contravention of the law, to the Indians ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a great difficulty in this case, because the men who sell liquor to the Indians are very unscrupulous and they are well posted in all the tricks to avoid detection. Sometimes they corrupt a member of the band of Indians, and as a rule the Indians are extremely loath to give evidence. We find it necessary to have a special officer to look after this work occasionally.

Mr. LANCASTER. I see that $194.30 of this vote last year went to Mr. J. D. Leduc for legal services. Who is this Mr. Leduc, and what does he do ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not that information, but I will get it at the evening sitting.

Mr. INGRAM. Where did these prosecutions take place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Principally at Restigouche and Bersimis. The details are on page 10.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no detail there as to whether these things occurred in Quebec or in Ontario. It is important for us to know that, because the license laws in Ontario are supposed to be enforced by the inspectors.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will give the hon. gentleman the exact information to-night.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is J. B. White, license inspector ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will include that in the information which I will give to-night.

Indians, Nova Scotia, $7,650.

Mr. INGRAM. We want some explanation in regard to seed-grain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount of seed-grain which it is actually necessary to distribute is worked out by the agents in each county, and the grain is purchased by the agent at the lowest possible rate and distributed, the vouchers being sent to the department. The transactions are very small.

Mr. INGRAM. At whose request are these amounts expended ? Is it at the request of the gentleman representing the constituency ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Practically the agent has it altogether in his own hands. We find it impracticable to do it in any other way.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the same rule apply as in the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, not at all. There the supplies are very large in quantity and in most cases are purchased by tender by the department here. Printed schedules are issued every year, and the contracts are awarded to the lowest tenderers. Where there are some small supplies required in the immediate neighbourhood of a reserve, they are purchased under the direction of the Indian Commissioner at Winnipeg. He sends his estimates of the quantity and price to the department, and after these are checked over, he is authorized to buy them. In the North-west Territories, where the supplies are very large it is possible to follow a system, which is not possible in the case of small supplies in the maritime provinces, where, if we attempted to follow any system, it would cost more than the goods.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister is asking $3,700 for medical attendance and medicines,

whereas in 1896 the amount was $2,000. I would like him to explain this increase.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The actual expenditure last year was $3,768.58.

Mr. KENDALL. The minister at my request in one or two instances has increased the expenditure, and I am going to make the request that it be increased still further, because the appropriations which we have made hitherto for the Indians have been simply criminal. We have not taken charge of these wards of the nation as we should have done.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us whether the Indians in Nova Scotia are troubled with disease, and if so, what class of disease ?

Mr. KENDALL. The Indians there are subject to the same diseases as Indians in other parts of the world. Indians who are not supplied with proper food and clothing are more apt to be ill than other people, and I say that our appropriation has not been adequate to the needs of these people.

Mr. LANCASTER. How many are there?

Mr. KENDALL. I do not know.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then, how do you know that the appropriation is not adequate ?

Mr. KENDALL. I am a medical man, and have had a great deal to do with them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The Indian population of Nova Scotia is 2,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman has not favoured us with the reason of this extraordinary increase.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman must realize that we are taking care of the Indians a little better than before, that is all.

Mr. INGRAM. According to the statement made by the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Kendall), that is not the case. He stated that owing to bad food or something of that character, it was necessary to increase the fees for medical attendance. Why should that be done ? Do they not get sufficient food, or are they not properly clothed or housed ?

Mr. KENDALL. Yes, I can say that they are not properly fed, clothed or housed.

Mr. INGRAM. How long has that been going on ?

Mr. KENDALL. Ever since we have had possession of the country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are considerably better taken care of than before. My hon. friend asks whether a band of Indians on one of the maritime province reserves are properly housed or clothed. He asks a question which cannot be answered categorically. It depends on what we consider to be properly housed and clothed. If the hon. gentleman refers to the kind of clothing and houses that white people have in the county in which he lives, then they are not properly housed and clothed by a long way. There is always plenty of room for increasing the expenditure largely for the Indians, and leaving a large margin.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the increase is for want of food and clothing why is it not put down as such, instead of medical attendance, which is misleading to the country ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N. S.) The doctors who attend these Indians may live perhaps thirty miles from them. There are no doctors in close proximity to the Indian reserves in different parts of the Island of Cape Breton. The doctors have to travel long distances to visit the Indians whenever there is any sickness prevailing among them. As a rule there is more sickness among the Indians than among the white people who are better fed and better clothed.

Department of Indian Affairs, N.B.—Medical attendance and medicines, $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot understand why the increase in connection with the Indians in New Brunswick should be all in medical attendance. In 1895-6, it was $1,295 ; now it is $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will find the details on page J-12 of the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. INGRAM. There must be some particular reason why this item is increased. I could understand an increase in clothing and food, but the increased cost of medical attendance I cannot understand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are constantly trying to keep the expenditure down but it constantly shows a tendency to rise. Continual applications are made to us by members representing the different counties, on the ground that the Indians have not the medical attendance they require, and we feel that perhaps they were not as well looked after by the late government as they should have been. We are told that the Indians are not sufficiently looked after from a medical standpoint, and that more expenditure is required, and we increased the expenditure a little in each case for reasons which certainly can be justified on the ground of humanity. I think my hon. friend can rely upon this, that the Indians are getting the medical attendance we are paying for.

Mr. INGRAM. We have not objected to the expenditures on salaries and relief and seed grain, but the increase in medical expenditure seems unaccountable.

Mr. KENDALL. $3,000 would not provide them with coffins in the spring of the year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are simply meeting the demands made upon us as far as we can. We do not send out word that we want to pay so much more for medical attendance, but we are simply meeting the demands made upon us.

Medical attendance and medicine, Indians, P.E.I., $650.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to ask the minister the reason for this increase of nearly 100 per cent.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that the expenses for the next year will be substantially any more than there were last year on the whole.

Mr. HACKETT. If the Indians required the medical attendance, I would have no objection to the item, but I would like to know who asked for it? Was it the Indian agents or the doctors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When the Indians become sick and there is a medical attendant in the locality, who is paid a salary, he is obliged to attend them, but where there is none, a medical man attends them and then sends in his bill, just as he would in the case of a white man, and the department has to exercise its own judgment as to the correctness of the charge. In the case of an account coming from a reserve or a district, as is the case in Prince Edward Island, the account has to be certified by the agent.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many Indians on Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Three hundred and fifteen.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the hon. gentleman is asking for $300 more for medical attendance and medicines than was spent in 1895-6. We have here the names of a dozen doctors to whom various amounts were paid, does that list include all the doctors in Prince Edward Island of the political belief of my hon. friends opposite?

Mr. HACKETT. I must say that the minister has not been very partial to his own side in that respect. The list of doctors includes men of the different political creeds. The principal doctor, Dr. Long, who resides at Port Hill, and attends the Indians on Lennox Island, is a neutral in politics, I believe. Being the nearest to where the principal body of Indians is situated, he has the most of this work to do. The Indian being nomadic in his habits, ranges about the island in the summer, and is attended by different doctors. So far as this list shows, the minister has not discriminated against the Tories very much.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the custom in Prince Edward Island, that when an Indian takes sick that the nearest doctor is called upon to attend him and the bill charged to this fund? That is not the case in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The bill has to be certified by the agent, then it comes here and is passed upon by the secretary of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. But if you sent such a bill to an agent in Ontario, I understand, he would refuse to certify it. I speak from personal experience to this extent, that I have at different times attended Indians but never had a bill against the Indian fund. I have always done it for nothing and supplied the medicine myself.

Indian Affairs—Manitoba and North-west Territories—agricultural implements, $11,647.

Mr. SPROULE. What success are the Indians achieving in agricultural pursuits?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Their progress is proportionate to the capacity and energy of the farm instructor. The position of the Indians is much improved, and it has been shown that great advance can be made where attention is paid to the matter by a competent man. We have had such striking illustrations of that, that we have made some changes within the last year or two with a view to getting more competent men in charge of the farming work on the reserves. As hon. members will readily understand, a man may be competent as a clerk or overseer on the reserve, yet not have the faculty of teaching the Indians how to succeed in farming. The department can learn only by experience, and we have endeavoured to put in these positions men who are qualified for the work. On what was formerly called the File Hills reserve, now the Qu'Appelle agency, we have a gentleman named Graham, who has been in charge of that reserve for some years, and the progress made by the Indians under his direction has been simply remarkable. Two years ago I visited the neighbourhood of the reserve and the Indian school not far from it, and got full particulars regarding progress made. That fall the Indians on the reserve had over ten thousand bushels of first-class wheat, and also a considerable number of cattle. With a view of improving matters there, we put this Indian agent in charge of three reserves, because of the capacity he has shown for the work. It requires a peculiar combination of faculties to succeed in this work, and it is impossible to know in advance just how a man chosen for it will turn out. Some men whom we expected to succeed have failed and some of whom we expected but little have succeeded. On the whole, the committee may be satisfied that substantial progress has been made and, instead of having a horde of savages in the North-west, as we had a few years

ago, we shall soon have an orderly, fairly educated population, capable of sustaining themselves. They are taking much greater interest in cattle-raising than in other lines of agriculture. They apply themselves to it more readily and show better capacity for it. The Blackfeet and the Bloods, not far from Calgary are the reserves upon which ordinary agriculture has made, possibly the least progress. But the Indians there have lately manifested a desire to conform themselves to what they see on other reserves, and I think we may look for progress there. They do a good deal already in the way of raising horses and cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the minister to refer to the Pine Creek reserve. His report shows that the Indians there have not made satisfactory progress in agricultural pursuits. 'Grain growing on these reserves, so far as it has been tried, has not proved successful.' The present statement of the minister does not seem to be in accordance with his own report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was speaking of the File Hills reserve, not the Pine Creek reserve.

Mr. SPROULE. In the case I referred to it seems that the Indians have not been successful in grain-growing—though a little more successful not very much—in cattle-raising. The report says:

> Thoroughbred shorthorn bulls were supplied this year to Ebb and Flow, Lake St. Martin and Lake Manitoba reserves; but as they were only yearlings, it is hardly probable that much benefit will be derived from them for another year. The Indians take fairly good care of their stock, and no loss has occurred from neglect during the past year. As the young men grow up, I think they will take more interest in cattle than their parents.

I have noticed in former reports that, on some of the reserves the Indians used to leave their agricultural machinery out of doors, and, as for their cattle, when they got hungry they killed an animal for food.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend has exercised considerable ingenuity on picking out the case of a reserve in northern Manitoba where we have not accomplished a great deal as yet. But if he will read the report of Mr. Graham, beginning page 153, of the Report of the Department of Indian Affairs, he will get a fair, unbiased statement of the position of affairs on the various reserves referred to. As I have already said, Mr. Graham is one of our most successful agents in inducing the Indians to settle down and take care of themselves. Mr. Graham has been about 15 years in the service, and is still in the prime of life. It is only on account of his capacity that he has been put in charge of an additional amount of work. There always have been one or two places where the work has not been satisfactory. That arises from the effect of local circumstances, or because the agent or officer has not turned out as well as we expected.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here of $1,455 for agricultural implements. Is that due to the increased number who are going into agriculture?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been a necessity for providing threshing machines on three agencies.

Field and garden seeds, $1,845.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Where operations are extensive there is always a certain number of requisitions coming in for seed. Of course this sum does not by any means provide all the seed required on the Indian reserves, that is just for a little sorting up that is required from the various agencies.

Supplies for destitute and working Indians, $193,557.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This estimate is made up on the basis of an exact statement which has been prepared by the Indian commissioner in Winnipeg, stating the goods that are actually required, and the cost. His report to me is that the increase in this item, which amounts to $4,690, is due almost entirely to the increased price of goods in the classes that are required.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are they all bought by tender?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. The general rule in regard to these purchases is the same as has prevailed for many years in the department. An advertisement is published in the papers saying that tenders will be called for, and the schedule can be seen here. The lowest tenderer gets the contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. I used to be furnished with a copy of these schedules, but I have not received any this year.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I shall be glad to send a schedule to any member of the committee who desires it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I always forward them to the Rathbun Company, who generally tender for flour and other supplies.

Sioux Indians, $5,545.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These Sioux Indians came over from the state of Minnesota at the time of the Minnesota massacres, 30 years ago, and settled, most of them, in the neighbourhood of Crooked Lake, 30 miles west of Brandon. They have a reserve there, and are getting along fairly well. We changed the instructor a couple of years ago; the instructor we have at present is getting along very well, and the Indians are making satisfactory progress.

Grist and saw-mills, $948.

Mr. SPROULE. How many of these mills have you now for the Indians in Manitoba and the North-west, and how do you run them ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are five altogether. We get, for instance, an estimate from the Carleton agency of what they will require for their mill, mentioning the articles, such as oil, tools, furniture, &c. The commissioner sends us his bill, and it is passed by an officer of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the mills under their own control, or do you put a man in charge of each mill and pay him a salary ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have a man in some cases who is called a farm instructor. But there is some particular officer of the department on each reserve who has charge of the mill.

General expenses, $149,369.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is a large increase in this item. Since 1895-6, the item for general expenses has increased by $35,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will understand that within the last five years the work of the Indian Department in the North-west has very largely increased. We have recently made a treaty known as Treaty No. 8 in which a very large territory is involved, necessitating a considerable amount of expenses. We have to send a man up to that territory specially each year. This officer has to travel north of Edmonton to the Great Slave Lake, and a special party has to be equipped for the purpose of taking him up there. This year the officers who went up were accompanied by a couple of mounted police and the expense of travelling, where a special party has to be organized and equipped, is very great. The expense last year was not as great as the year before, owing to the better knowledge of the department as to how to go about it and do it in the least expensive way possible. If there has been any increase in the cost of looking after the Indians in the last five years it has been in the direction of furnishing live stock to the Indians.

Mr. TAYLOR. In 1893-94 we furnished $12,000 worth of live stock, the same as now, and in 1893-94 the expenditure was $799,000. Next year the amount asked for was $770,000. The late Sir John Macdonald stated that the Indians were getting more self-sustaining and that this vote would be every year a decreasing one, but, I find that his words have not been verified, because neither he nor his successors have had charge of the administration of the department, and I find that under the hon. gentleman that instead of it being a decreasing expenditure it is an increasing one.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The vote this year is $11,000 less than last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. But it is not less than it was in 1893-94 or 1894-95.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend will look at the method in which the money was voted in former years, he will find that there were two items, farm wages, and maintenance of farms, that were voted separately, and which are now voted in connection with the general expenditure. It is now put into one vote. Speaking from recollection, I am quite safe in saying that there has been no increase in the vote so far as Indians are concerned. There was a reduction of $20,000 or $25,000 for the first two or three years after I took charge. I think now the expenditure is about the same as it was before.

British Columbia—Medical attendance and medicines, $11,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is an increase of $2,500 for medical attendance and medicines that ought to be explained.

Mr. EARLE. Before that item is passed, the hon. minister might explain the increase in the vote for medical attendance and medicines.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The position is simply this: In British Columbia we are having the experience that comes from the white people coming into contact with the Indians. As the white population spreads the Indians, who formerly did not bother the department very much, make demands upon us, and we have pressure put upon us continually for an increase in the expenditure. The work in connection with British Columbia is practically altogether under the control of Mr. Vowell, the superintendent.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the request for an increased expenditure for medical attendance comes from the superintendent, Mr. Vowell, or from some other source ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The increased expenditure is altogether upon the report of Mr. Vowell. There is nothing done in that connection except on his recommendation, and if in any case I should be asked for an increased expenditure, for instance, by one of the party in his constituency, the course adopted would be that the secretary of the department would at once send the request to Mr. Vowell, and he would be asked to report upon it. I have not had a great deal of personal acquaintance with Mr. Vowell, but I may say that he is one of the officers of the department in whom I have the greatest confidence as to his ability and integrity, and I am quite sure if there was any possible

way of getting this expenditure down he would get it down. It is not being allowed to grow unnecessarily.

Mr. EARLE. I have every confidence, myself, in Mr. Vowell, but as this expenditure seems to have taken place through all the provinces, on the recommendation of somebody other than the agent, I would like to know whether the same is the case in British Columbia.

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been no increase in the expenditure for medical attendance except upon the recommendation of Mr. Vowell. I can give the hon. gentleman the exact words Mr. Vowell uses in his report upon the question if he so desires.

Mr. EARLE. No, it is all right.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. minister give us an explanation in regard to the payments of Dr. G. E. Drew and Dr. W. A. D. Jack, one of whom received $585 and the other $501 for medical attendance? Where are these medical men located?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are simply medical men who are paid by fee according to the amount of work they do.

Mr. INGRAM. Where are they located?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Dr. Jack is at Vancouver, and I cannot tell where Dr. Drew is at the present time.

British Columbia industrial and boarding schools, $77,250.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are receiving more pressure from British Columbia for expenditure at the present time in connection with Indian education, than from any other part of the country. I want to warn the committee that this increase of $8,200 does not represent all we will be asked to vote this year, because there will be some items in the supplementary estimates. Last year the mission buildings were burned at Metlakahtla on the north-west coast, and this $8,200 represents our contribution to the erection of the industrial school. That is the only Indian school on the north-west coast and it has been most successful.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the increased vote for the purpose of increasing the number of schools?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will be for new schools.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this $8,200 to cover the cost of the new building?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nearly all of these Indian schools are in charge of one church or another, and this particular one is in charge of the Church of England. The $8,200 is the estimate of the church authorities. They are rebuilding all the mission buildings, but we make this contributed only towards the school. The estimate has been checked over by our officer.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister spoke frequently of pressure being brought upon the the department, and he said there is special pressure from British Columbia. What is the nature of that pressure? Has it anything to do with votes?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The pressure comes from the different ecclesiastical bodies of the Dominion. There is constant communication between the various churches and the Department of Indian Affairs. I suppose the Indians bring their pressure to bear upon the church, and the church brings its pressure to bear upon the department.

Mr. LENNOX. It is perfectly legitimate I presume.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Ecclesiastical pressure ought to be legitimate if anything is.

Inspector of Indian agencies and reserves, $1,800.

Mr. INGRAM. Who are these inspectors?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Mr. McCrae and Mr. Chitty. They have both been in the department for a considerable number of years.

Mr. LENNOX. Does that $1,800 include all that was paid to Mr. McCrae?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. They are paid by salary, and get no fees.

Indians—Printing and stationery, generally, $6,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What does that mean?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This apparent increase of $6,000 is a mere matter of bookkeeping. The items that have been voted for printing and stationery in other votes have been collected into one vote.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—Mr. Talbot.

House again in Committee of Supply.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Before proceeding with any other items, I propose to give the committee some information which was asked this afternoon, respecting legal services performed in connection with the prosecution of parties for having sold liquor to the Indians.

J. D. Leduc is agent of the Minister of Justice at Ste. Scholastique, and was paid $194.30.

His services were retained in the case Regina vs. Napoleon Boucher for selling liquor to Indians. The case was appealed and it was necessary to retain counsel and his bill was the amount specified in the Auditor General's Report.

Blodin vs. Courchene, Pierreville, was paid $10.75 for court fees.

D. M. Brodie was paid $10 for services in connection with a liquor case at Thessalon, Ontario.

A. Gagnon, Indian agent, at Betsiamites, North Shore vs. Lawrence, was paid $44.72, travelling expenses in connection with liquor license prosecutions.

James Gedlon, constable, MicMac reserve at Maria, county of Bonaventure, was paid $30 in connection with liquor cases. The following payments were also made in connection with liquor cases:

Thomas Isaac, constable, Restigouche reserve	$66 00
J. B. White, license inspector, Thessalon, Ont.	29 00
Mr. Wioncne, constable, Restigouche	6 00
Wm. Irving, constable, Thessalon, Ont.	17 70
D. Legault, constable, Oka, Que.	9 50
A. J. Nault, constable, Maniwaki, Que.	11 10
J. Perrillard, agent, Oka, Que.	5 25
H. S. Sims, constable, Massey Station	23 75
Urbain Turcotte, constable, Pierreville, Que.	36 05

Geo. E. Drew, M.D., resides at New Westminster, B.C., and attends Indians at Fraser agency, Fort Rupert, Katney Hope, Coquitlam, Langley, Pemberton and Harrison River.

Civil government—Department of the Interior, including A. P. Collier at $1,400 and E. E. Turton at $600, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $113,121.50.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the reason for the increase here, and why this provision: 'Notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The total increase is $4,157.50. There are forty-five statutory increases of $50 each, making $2,250. There is one statutory increase of $37.50 and two of $30, $97.50. Messrs. Pope, York, Egleson and Badgley are promoted to the second-class from the third. They were at the maximum of their class, $1,000, and this will give them each an increase of $100 or $400 for all. Mr. Ackland is promoted from the position of a messenger to the position of a junior second-class clerk. He is a very competent and capable man. He was receiving $540 and he now gets $600, an increase of $60. Mr. Turton gets an increase from the position of messenger to that of junior second-class clerk also. Mr. Cote is promoted from the second to the first-class with an increase of $50. There are two additional second-class clerks with $600 each making $1,200. This makes a total of $4,457.50. One of the clerks promoted from a junior second-class to a second-class and who was receiving $1,000 is replaced by a clerk who receives $700, making a reduction of $300. This taken from the gross increase makes the net increase of $4,157.50 given in the estimates. The reason of the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' is that Mr. Collier is promoted from the second-class to the first-class. He is private secretary and did not write on the examination.

Department of the Interior—Clerical and other assistance, including $820 for J. D. Bollard and $515 for T. W. Hodgins, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	$ 3,932 50
Printing and stationery	8,500 00
Sundries	7,000 00
	$19,432 50

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no change there, except a slight decrease of $282.50.

Mr. SPROULE. Why this 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act?'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. These gentlemen were in the service when I came. They have not passed the examination. The Auditor General holds that, year by year, we must carry that clause in order to allow them to be paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may have the merit of antiquity, but it has no other. Why would it not be better to repeal the Civil Service Act than to do this? Of course, this case is not singular, but the custom prevails in every department, and seems to be on the increase. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) himself would say that this is very desirable legislation. For it is legislation, and it is repealing the Civil Service Act pro tanto, and repealing it without giving the Upper House the opportunity of saying whether it shall be done or not. I have protested against it many times, and have asked the government to consider whether an amendment of the Act could not be made so that this kind of thing might no longer be necessary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think everybody will agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that it is not desirable to have exceptions in the administration of the Act. But when the hon. gentleman gets to this side, I think he will find cases arising in which he will think that the rule ought to be relaxed. At the same time, I think we ought to have it on

the statute-books, for otherwise a minister's life would not be worth living.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not mean that the Act should be repealed, but that an endeavour should be made to get it into some such shape that it would not be necessary to repeal it in so many cases in the estimates. I remember counting seventeen or eighteen instances on one page of the estimates in which the Act was repealed for particular cases.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And I think if the hon. gentleman will look at the estimates and will consider the number of officers provided for he will see that seventeen or eighteen cases is a very small proportion. Peculiar cases will arise in which this provision is necessary. Take, for instance, the case of Mr. Hodgins. He was in the government service before the last Civil Service Act was passed. That provided that everybody who was in the government service at a certain time should be held to be regularly there so far as examination was concerned. But the Order in Council under which he was appointed ran out, and there was an interregnum of one day in the term of his service after the passing of this Act. The Auditor General held that he was not continuously in the service and could not be paid without this special provision. It happened when the change of government took place, and it was nobody's business in particular to look after the matter, and so the poor man was not paid for some time. I provided for his case in this way. Cases of that kind will arise, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman will find that the number of them is larger than might be expected.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says that these cases are very exceptional. On the same page of the estimates as that on which the present item appears are three cases out of eight, and, on the next page, three more. It seems to me it would not be a bad plan to have a year of jubilee every ten years or so, and put these civil servants straight on the list, and so try to observe the law with some kind of regularity. If it cannot be observed, then, amend it or repeal it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. Mr. Fielding). Even with the number of exceptions stated, my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) can fully justify his statement that the proportion is not large. For instance, in the Department of the Interior there are perhaps, over a hundred officials, and, of that number, there are only four that must be treated in this exceptional way. That is only 4 per cent.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. minister mean to say that there is not more than 4 per cent ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the Department of the Interior, of which we have been speaking. Cases arise under conditions which cannot be dealt with under any general rule. If they were numerous, the view of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) would be correct, and it might be better to make some general amendment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are not as numerous in this department as they are in some others. In some of the departments I have found them quite numerous; it may be that circumstances make them more necessary in some departments than in others. I am not finding any fault, I am not making the slightest criticisms of the officers. I do not know either of these gentlemen, I have no doubt they are very capable and efficient officers. It is not with the officers or their services that I am finding fault, but with the system which makes it necessary to repeal the Act in such a way as this. I have pointed out the objection to it, and the Minister of Finance recognizes it. This branch of the legislature passes these estimates in such a way that the other branch cannot say a word about them.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is strictly a money matter as respects these individual cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this branch of the legislature enacts a statute in such a way that the other branch cannot have any voice in it unless they reject the whole appropriation.

Government of the North-west Territories, $425,359.

Mr. SCOTT. Taking into view all the circumstances, I believe this item is second in importance to no other that can be found in the estimates this year. The main part of this item which relates to the North-west Territories is equivalent to the cash subsidies paid to the various provinces under the federal constitution. For a considerable time past the people of the North-west Territories have been looking forward to the formation of that country into a province or provinces. I took occasion during my first session in this House last year to call the attention of parliament at some length to some phases of that matter. I did not deem it necessary then to argue that the time had arrived for granting full provincial powers to the people of the North-west Territories, because some time previous we had had a statement from a member of the government to the effect that it was their intention in the near future to take up that matter and deal with it. I have to express my regret that a decision has been arrived at by the government not to deal with that question this year. I would not go so far as to say that the people of the North-west Territories unanimously regret the decision of the govern-

ment; there may be a considerable number who hold the view that it is yet too early in their circumstances to grant full provincial powers. But I believe I express the opinion of a very large majority of the people when I say that the conditions have now reached a stage when it would be advantageous to those people as well as to the entire Dominion, to have this question settled without further loss of time. Some hon. members may be aware of the fact that within the past two weeks the question has been debated in the local legislature at Regina, and by a vote of 23 to 7, I think, in a House of 31 members, it was decided that it was a matter of regret that this question had not been taken up and an endeavour made to settle it this present year. Perhaps, as the House is now in Committee of Supply, it may not be a proper occasion for me to discuss the provincial establishment question at length, and there may be another opportunity of doing so before the close of the session.

But I want to point out that until provincial powers are granted to the people of the North-west Territories, the responsibility devolves upon this parliament of providing for the services which come within the purview of the North-west Assembly. Those services are much the same as the services performed by the various provincial governments, with a few minor exceptions. The services for which the North-west Assembly is responsible are the same as those of which the provincial governments have charge. We know that the various provincial governments have definite and final arrangements with the federal power as to the amount of money they shall receive from the Dominion exchequer yearly, and they are themselves responsible for performing certain duties. But with regard to the North-west Territories at the present time, that responsibility devolves upon this parliament, and especially upon the Department of the Interior. In reality the business of governing the North-west Territories is but a branch of the department in the charge of the Minister of the Interior. The services which the North-west Assembly performs in the North-west Territories are just as important and possibly more so than any of the services that are performed by this federal parliament. The subjects of education and local public works are possibly just as important to the people up there as any of the subjects with which this parliament has to deal. As I said, the subjects of legislation in the North-west Territories are very similar to those dealt with by the various local legislatures of the provinces. I will mention a few of them. Public works, for instance, for the management of which there is a special department as in the provinces. The Department of Public Works in the Territories has to deal with the construction of roads and bridges, with the building of dams, and with the matter of drainage in certain parts of that large country. They have to operate ferries where it has not been possible yet to make bridges. They have to undertake a certain other duty that is not required in any of the provinces, that of making fire-guards. During last year the local Department of Public Works in the territories constructed somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,000 miles of fire guards. The administration of irrigation legislation too, comes under that department. This is the department which supervises and to some extent, administers the affairs of a large number of local improvement districts. These local improvement districts take the place of the municipalities which are to be found in Ontario and the other provinces. It has been thought wise in that country, where the population is yet sparse, and until the population becomes more dense, to have a simpler form of municipal organization than in Ontario or the older provinces, and a scheme for the establishment of local improvement districts was some years ago worked out and put in force—a very simple scheme suited to the conditions of the country, and the plan is administered, to a considerable extent, and is altogether supervised by the local Department of Public Works. There are, in some parts of the country, where the population is very spare, what are called large local improvement districts, and the administration of these is entirely attended to by the Department of Public Works. The department too, supervises and inspects the coal mines of the territories. It has a branch too, for the inspection of steam boilers. A very important part of its duties is in regard to testing for water. In some parts of that immense country settlers have found difficulty in securing water, and it has been deemed advisable to undertake a plan, and very good service has been rendered by the plan which the government undertakes, to provide well borers, drills, and augers, and to test in various localities for water. I do not need to say to this committee that these duties are very important to the people of that country, and when we look at the amount of the vote which has, in previous years, been given to the legislature to enable it to carry on these duties, when we look at the amount of the vote which it is proposed this year to grant to the legislature, and when we take into consideration the very large extent of country and the very great importance of these duties, some few of which I have enumerated, I think the committee can reach no other conclusion than this, at all events, that not too much money has been voted and is proposed to be voted to the legislative assembly to carry out such duties. The total amount in the item before us is $357,979. There are works which are needed in that country in the way of bridges—

single bridges—which if the legislature attempted to carry out and which would be of very great benefit to the people, would take nearly all the sum of $357,000. There are places in that country where works are needed and which would be a benefit to the people, and such works would take the entire vote which it is proposed to grant to the legislature, namely, $357,000. I need only refer to the matter of public works, a matter of very great importance, a matter which requires a very great expenditure in a country of the immense extent of the North-west Territories, some parts of which are of a broken character and having very large rivers. The subject of education is one of no less importance. In a country like the North-west Territories, where a very large immigration is coming in and where a very large immigration and an increasing population are expected, the subject of education is, to the people there and to the people of Canada, one of the very highest importance. As illustrating the need of an increase in the vote by this House for the purposes of the legislative assembly, I will quote some figures to show the way in which the school districts have been increasing in number. At the end of 1896 there were 436 public school districts. These had been organized since 1884, when the public school system was inaugurated. At the end of 1897 there were 459 school districts, being an increase of 21 districts in that year. At the end of 1898 there were 480, there being an increase of 23. At the end of 1899 the number had risen to 524, there being an increase of 44. At the end of 1900 there were 576, an increase of 52. At the end of 1901 the number of school districts which had been organized was 684, showing an increase during the last year of 108 districts. The expenditure of the North-west Territories upon education in 1901 was $204,000, being something more than half of the total grant made by this parliament for all the purposes of local government in the North-west Territories. I neglected to mention, in regard to the subject of public works, that the expenditure made last year was in the neighbourhood of $250,000, so that it will be seen that the expenditure on education and public works, on these two subjects, more than took up the whole of the yearly grant made by parliament last year for all purposes of local government in the territories. The local authorities find that these necessary subjects are practically all that they are able to undertake. Of course, there are necessarily some other expenditures, for instance, the expenses of the meeting of the legislature, and there are other incidental items which are necessary and which cannot be avoided. Last year, in addition to these items of public works and education, which took up a very large amount of the total appropriation, there was an amount of $80,000 for the yearly expenses of the local civil service and the meeting of the legislature a vote of $8,000 for the administration of local ordinances and civil justice, which comes under the purview of the legislature, and a vote of $20,000 to meet the expenses of the Department of Agriculture, which is performing some very important and necessary work. The Department of Agriculture administers amongst other things what is known as the Brands ordinance. In the ranching country the brand upon the animal is the chief evidence of ownership, and it is important that the legislation in regard to brands shall be carefully administered. During last year, I believe there were no less than 10,000 new brands issued by the Department of Agriculture. There was a vote of $15,000 for the purposes of grants to hospitals and the maintenance of public health, and there was a miscellaneous vote of $5,000, making a total, outside the subjects of public works and education, of $128,000. I do not think it would be profitable for me, or for any hon. member of this House to make comparisons between the expenditures in one part of the country and in another, or between one province and another, or between the North-west Territories and any of the provinces. Such comparisons might be made, and I may say that I think I could make them at the present time, and possibly convince the House by such comparisons that a very large increase might properly be made in the grant for the purpose of government in the North-west Territories, but I do not think it would be proper for me, or for any other member, to endeavour to make such comparisons. We from the North-west Territories, at all events, are not sectionalists, we believe in nationalism, we believe in coming into the House and advocating only that which will be for the general benefit of Canada. I hope the day will never come when I will be found here advocating anything which I have not proved to myself, at least, and which I have not some reasonable ground for believing I can convince the House is for the general benefit of Canada. While I am not going to endeavour to make any comparisons between the expenditures in one part of the country and in another, I am going to say, and I think this principle has been largely followed, that wherever any service seems to be advisable and necessary this House should endeavour to provide adequately for that service. I believe that is the proper principle, and I believe that if that principle be applied in this case, parliament will at the present session grant a very large increase in the vote for the purpose of governing locally the North-west Territories. Just to show what is the position of the local authority up there at the present time, I will quote a few brief figures. In the year 1899 the grant made by parliament for government in the North-west Territories was $283,000, but the total amount expended that year by the local authorities was $414,000. There is, of course, a small local re-

venue which is year by year increasing to some extent. For four or five years it has amounted annually to $30,000 or $40,000, and it is expected that this year and from this on the local revenue will not be less than perhaps $80,000 or $90,000, which is largely derived from a small direct tax which has been placed upon land. But while the total expenditure in 1899 amounted to $414,000, and the total grant from this parliament was only $283,000, the explanation is that in that year the Yukon was still to a certain extent within the administration of the local authorities of the North-west Territories, and from the Yukon a revenue of about $160,000 was obtained. That local revenue enabled the North-west government with fair adequacy to meet the wants of the country for that year. In the year 1900 the grant from this parliament was increased to $424,000, and with the local revenue the North-west government had $465,000 at their disposal. For the year 1901 the estimates which the North-west government presented to Ottawa amounted to $600,000. That amount, on a close calculation by the North-west government was deemed to be necessary to cover the actual needs of local government. The grant which they received from parliament for that year was only $357,000, the same amount as we find in the present estimates. The local authorities of the North-west Territories represented to the powers at Ottawa that the needs of that country for the year 1901 demanded $600,000, and they received only $357,000. What was done last year by the local authority to cover the evident deficiency was this: The appropriation by this parliament is for the fiscal year from the 30th of June to the 30th of June following, but the financial year in the North-west Territories is the calendar year from the 31st December to 31st December following. The vote made by this parliament last year was intended to cover the period until June 30th, 1902, but the local government found that unless they took the whole vote that was made here last year and expended it within their calendar year of 1901, they could not commence to properly meet the needs of the people of that country, the cost of education and the cost of necessary public works. The position in which the North-west government finds itself to-day is, that an ordinary vote does not put them in the same position as they were in last year, because last year they were compelled to anticipate the money that should ordinarily have gone to them in the first half of this present calendar year. Suppose we vote $357,000 for this present year, the consequence is that the North-west authorities will only be able to expend within 1902 one-half of it, or a little over $175,000. Now, if their needs this year amount approximately to $600,000, it will not take this committee long to comprehend that if a very largely increased appropriation is not made at the present time, the people in the North-west Territories who depend on the local government for their needs in the way of public works and education and local purposes generally, are going to be left in a very difficult position, and it will simply be impossible for the local government to meet these needs in any proper and adequate manner.

We had a discussion in the House yesterday upon the subject of immigration. It is unnecessary for me to say that at the present time the population in the whole of western Canada is increasing very largely. From a national point of view that is very encouraging, but from the point of view of the local government it is not an unmixed blessing to see hundreds of people literally pouring into that country daily, because every new settler means an additional tax upon the local governing authority. It means that increased expenditure will have to be made upon the construction of roads and bridges, because the greater the number of people in that country the greater the area settled, and it was found in practice last year that many of the new comers went upon areas which had not been before that time settled, and thus rendered necessary the construction of new roads and the building of culverts and bridges by the local authorities. Consequently, the local government of the North-west cannot look upon this influx of immigration as an unmixed blessing from their point of view; while from the larger point of view it is indeed a very encouraging circumstance that immigrants are coming into Canada to-day in larger numbers than they ever came in any previous time. In fact every newspaper one takes hold of from the western part of the country is half filled with accounts of new settlers coming in with large quantities of settlers' effects, bringing added riches to the country. I had a note a couple of days ago from a gentleman at North Portal, who stated that in the previous week no less than 186 cars of settlers' effects had been passed through that port from the United States into western Canada. I had another letter this evening from a gentleman in Regina which is simply an illustration of what is occurring generally in that country. He writes me:

> I wish you would impress upon the department the necessity of granting more assistance to the land agent here as soon as possible. The staff are over worked and still the work is getting further and further behind, so that when letters are written here for information the parties have to wait a week or two before they can get an answer, and you can imagine how annoyed a man would be who, a stranger in the country, has to pay a weeks hotel bill or more while he is getting an answer to his letter. I do not know of any qualified persons here whom you could appoint.

The condition of affairs in the country is becoming so prosperous that it is difficult to obtain people to accept positions in the public service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the salary ?

Mr. SCOTT. I think I can assure the Minister of the Interior that if he grants the needed assistance, I shall be able to find a person who will take the position, notwithstanding the great prosperity that exists. This letter goes on :

> The agent tells me that during the first week of April over one hundred homestead entries were made at the office here. The rush of Americans in over the Soo line has assumed tremendous proportions, the railway company being unable to handle the traffic. It takes about a week for a car of settlers' effects to come from St. Paul to Moosejaw. There are not half a dozen homesteads between Regina and the Soo line, the only part of the south plain where there are any homesteads being along the Arcola extension and I don't think that there will be any there in three months.

As I say, nearly every letter one receives from the North-west Territories and nearly every paper that comes to hand, is filled with intelligence about hundreds of newcomers who are arriving daily in that country. The Winnipeg 'Free Press,' which came to hand to-night, states that on Wednesday of this week no less than 1,000 settlers arrived in Winnipeg, and a very considerable proportion of all the settlers who arrive at Winnipeg go to some point in the North-west Territories. This is a very encouraging feature of the times, and I thoroughly agree with what was said by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior last night, that we appear to be at the dawn of a new day. The present prospect is more encouraging than it has been at any time at least in my lifetime, and I think the committee will agree that it would be too bad if any check were given to the tendency of the people towards that country, by parsimony on the part of this House in dealing with the local needs of the people. As has often been said, any effort that may be put forth by this government to promote immigration must be secondary in effect to the work which will be done by satisfied settlers in the country, who, as is often said, are the best immigration agents. For my part, I think one of the most important duties coming within the purview of the Department of the Interior with regard to immigration is to see that the local needs, in the way of public works, education, and other things, are properly and adequately met. For these reasons, for my part—and I believe I speak for every member from the North-west Territories, and I believe as well that our friends from British Columbia and Manitoba will support us unanimously in this—I think the House should very largely increase the grant to the local government of the North-west Territories.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to support what has been said by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) with regard to this vote for the government in the North-west Territories. It was with some considerable surprise that I saw in the estimates that the amount to be voted for this purpose for the coming year was no larger than the vote for the present year. I am at a loss to understand upon what basis of calculation this sum was arrived at. If it is necessary or desirable to meet the requirements of the public service in any part of the country, account must be taken of the increase of those requirements. Now, this whole country is ringing with a knowledge of the increase of population and therefore increase of requirements in the North-west, and that knowledge has produced no result in the way of meeting the requirements which necessarily arise. It may be said that the amount required for the purposes of the government of the North-west Territories is an uncertain amount. So it is. It is an amount which depends from time to time upon the requirements as they arise. With the increase of population, those requirements have increased from year to year. By reason of climatic conditions during the past year, those needs have been tremendously emphasized. By reason of heavy rains, bridges have been washed out by the dozen, and a very large part of the revenues of the territorial government which should have gone to extend the facilities of travel throughout new settlements in the country, has been used up in replacing the damage done by the floods in older settlements. It may not be altogether plain to members of the House why an increase of population means an increase of requirements. The reason is that the territories have immense areas, compared to population. They are not at all on the same footing as the province of Manitoba, where the population is contained in less than one-third of the total area of the province, and the total area of Manitoba is not over one-fourth of the area over which settlement is scattered in the North-west. An increase of settlement in the province of Manitoba means simply a thickening up of the population, and does not require the opening of new roads or the establishment of new school districts, and does not increase materially the expenses of government; while an increase of population in the North-west Territories means that people have spread out into new country, necessitating new roads and new schools and an increase in every way and materially of expenses of government. It is of course under our present condition a matter of arrangement or consideration of this parliament what shall be done from year to year to meet financial conditions. That is not the fault of the people or the government of the North-west Territories. The government of the North-west Territories has approached this government repeatedly during past years, and most formally during the past year, asking for a definite financial arrangement based on the terms of confederation, as applied to the different provinces of the

Dominion. They are not here from time to time clamouring for unknown and unheard of amounts. They are asking simply that the government or parliament either meet the requirements of the case, as they arise from time to time, or else put the territories in the same financial position as the various provinces of the Dominion, so that they may enjoy as a right what they now must ask as a favour. I submit that the position is this: This parliament and government are required either to meet the conditions that exist by an adequate vote, or else to put the territories in the position of the various provinces of the Dominion as regards financial arrangements. Either one thing or the other, and the responsibility is upon the House and the government in the matter.

As to the amount that is demanded and the comparisons that may be made with regard to that amount, the vote for carrying on the government of the North-west Territories, which stands in the same position as a subsidy voted to one of the provinces—out of which provision must be made for the construction of public works of all classes throughout the Territories, chiefly roads and bridges, the requirements of education, and the administration of all the departments of government—amounts to only $268,000. That is the total amount provided for all the expenses of government of the Territories, which are, in the existing circumstances, necessarily higher proportionately than in any other portion of the Dominion. And it is to cost the country $445,000 in the coming year for the expenses to be incurred in endeavouring to bring people into the North-west. I claim, Mr. Chairman, that these two expenditures are not proportionate. I claim that if $445,000 be a reasonable expenditure to bring people into the country, $358,000 is not a reasonable sum with which to provide for all the needs of local government, both for the people who are in the country now, and those who are to come in as the result of this expenditure on immigration work.

I need not add to what my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has said with regard to the effect that an inadequate provision for the needs of education, the opening of roads and the general matters of local government, must necessarily have on immigration into that country. The class of people who are going there in largest numbers are those whose first demand is for the facilities of schools and markets. They are an enterprising and an energetic people, who have built up the great country to the south of us, and who come over the line to build up a great country on our side. They will not be satisfied, unless they can have facilities for the education of their children and the ordinary advantages of civilization in due measure, as the circumstances permit. And now when those people are coming in large numbers, attracted by the desirability of our country, it would be the worst policy that ever was entered upon, to stint the means whereby they may be rendered satisfied with the country. Do not forget that we had a rush of immigrants to the North-west many years ago, and at that time people seemed to think that the rush could not be stopped, but it was stopped and it remained stopped for nearly twenty years. There is a rush on again, and I counsel members of this House to take such measures that it shall not be stopped until that country has been satisfactorily developed. Every one knows that the best immigration agent is the contented settler. Therefore, our best policy is to provide adequate means to give intending settlers those advantages of civilization, which they will demand, and which they consider of the very highest importance. It is because these people look for these advantages of civilization and prize them so highly that they are valuable settlers. It is because they want schools and roads and good government that they are good settlers. People who would not make those demands, to whom it makes no difference whether or not there are schools or roads or good local government, are not the kind of people we want at all. They are dear at any price, and it is the best thing that ever happened this country that the people who are coming in and filling it up now are imbued with those civilizing tendencies.

I hope that the present government will see that the public services of the North-west Territories are not starved at this critical stage in our history. I hope they will provide for those services according to the requirements, or else place the territories upon a provincial footing, so that there shall be no question about our rights in the matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I only wish to make a few remarks in addition to what has already been said on this question. I would like to emphasize, if possible, in the mind of the committee, the statements that have been made by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) and my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver). This question of an increased subsidy is a very important one in the estimation of the people generally. We should have either an increased subsidy or provincial autonomy. As far as I have given the matter attention, I think it would be much better for the country, in its existing circumstances, to receive an increased subsidy at present rather than provincial autonomy. I know that there is a tendency amongst many members of this House to say that we, the people in the west, are always clamouring for special advantages. They point to the early settlers of the older provinces in the east and tell us that we are looking to be spoonfed and ought to have the courage, endurance and hardihood of the early settler in Ontario and elsewhere. Let me say that the

people in the North-west, especially those who went in twenty years ago, have passed through experiences of hardship and endurance, which show that they really possess, in a large measure, those qualities of resistance, and patience, and have indicated by their persistent effort that they believe in the country and are willing to endure privation in order to make it prosperous. I do not think that the early settlers of Manitoba and the North-west are, in any sense, behind those of the eastern provinces. I can speak from experience, having lived in that country from 1883 to date. I know something about the hardships of the people in the early days of that country.

In reference to public works, it is quite evident that the sum at the disposal of the government of the North-west Territories is wholly inadequate. I can speak with special knowledge of that part of the country that I represent, the eastern part of Assiniboia. Take, for instance, the district lying north and south of the Qu'Appelle river. It is true, we have some steel bridges that are a credit to the territorial government that erected them. But even they are of little use in the spring season. I venture to say that to-day the great majority of the people living on the north side of the river are not able to cross the valley or approach the bridges to reach the market with a load of grain. That is a hardship. They have grain on their hands that they are anxious to get rid of and to settle their liabilities. But this they cannot do because the approaches to these bridges are in a state that altogether forbids their reaching the markets. Perhaps they will not be able to reach the markets till the end of May or the beginning of June. We have a local organization for the improvement of the roads, and this has been a step in the right direction. I think the system is even superior in point of organization to the municipal arrangements of the older provinces. The local improvement districts of the North-west Territories are doing good work and proving that the scheme will be a great success. Up to the last three or four years it has been largely in the hands of the settlers to help themselves in making roads to reach their markets, to call upon their neighbour, and they collect a number of individuals who voluntarily gave their work to make the road. But the government has organized the local improvement districts which entails a direct tax upon each quarter section for the improvement of the roads. And that certainly, as I have said, is a step in the right direction. But I have always felt that the sum that was given for the government of the North-west Territories was entirely inadequate. It is quite true that we have a claim upon the treasury of this Dominion, in common with the other provinces to a certain amount per head according to population. But it seems to me, in view of the rapid growth of immigration and of the population of that country that the future ought to be discounted by the present government and a very liberal allowance made for the increase, to enable the territorial government to make the provisions which the circumstances at present demand. The fact that we are spending more upon immigration than upon the government of that country is one argument for the increase of indemnity. There is another fact that I would like to point out to the committee. It may not be popular, perhaps, for me to call attention to it. We would not say that this Dominion is paying too much for the wards of the country and for our Indian population. I would not for a moment insinuate that the government is paying too much for the Indian youth of the North-west Territories. But it is a fact—I am not prepared to give the exact figures on the instant, but what I say can be verified—that we are spending more upon the Indian industrial schools of the North-west than for the whole government of those territories. Now, I would like to emphasize what has already been said that under existing circumstances something ought to be done and a very liberal addition ought to be made to the subsidy of the North-west Territories, and that at the present session.

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to say a very few words on this subject, first, because this affects the prairie country, and I would like to endorse the sentiments of my colleagues, and, second, because this is one of the most important questions that is to come before this House in the near future—the subsidy of the territories, or provincial autonomy therefor. I have been reading what has taken place in the House in Regina with regard to territorial autonomy and I must say that I was struck with the force of the arguments. But my own impression is that, at the present time, there are good arguments why provincial autonomy should not to be given to the territories. I believe that within the next three or four years, if immigration should continue as at present, the population of the territories will have so increased and so tended to certain portions of the territories that probably the local jealousies that now exist as to whether there should be one or two or three provinces, and where the capitals shall be, will have disappeared. I sometimes think also that they have not considered the expenditure that would devolve upon them if they had to govern themselves. Take, for instance, the mounted police. I am not sure, but I suppose the number of police in the territories must reach from five hundred to a thousand. If the duty of policing the country devolved upon the local government, what a large percentage of the subsidy got from this government it would take.

I believe the older provinces of Canada have not looked upon this matter in the proper light. Some hon. gentleman here said—

I think it was the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver)—that it is one thing to bring immigrants to the country and another to keep them here. I was one of the unfortunates who left this eastern part of Canada twenty-two years ago last month. I arrived in Winnipeg some time in March, got my ox and cart and started across the prairies with others. I shall never forget as long as I live some of the hardships I saw the settlers undergo. We met violent storms at Portage la Prairie, and further west where Brandon now is, and also about the locality of Rapid City. There were no towns there then. I have seen strong men shed tears when they saw their wives and children in water three or four feet deep trying to cross the creeks and ravines where there were no bridges. A large number of people left the country as soon as they could get out of it. I believe 85 per cent of those who came from the British islands in 1882 and 1883 left that country before 1885. In the first place, they could not get to a market or to a railway centre. They saw no sign of civilization. They had no company and they got lonely. There were no post offices, they could not get a letter or send one without going fifty or sixty miles. They had no schools, and their children were growing up in ignorance around them. That same condition exists in the territories and it will have the same effect if this government do not wake up to the facts. I know a family; I could give their names—I will give their names. Mr. Richard Lyons and his family, who settled in Manitoba, thirty-five miles from Swan River, in 1898. Mr. Lyons had eleven of a family and came from the north of Ireland. Although we have provincial government there, he remained there for fifteen months before he had a school or post office nearer than Swan River thirty-five miles away. He wrote me letters, and in one of them he said: I will leave this country in three months, unless I can get a school or post office. I wrote to the superintendent of immigration and finally succeeded in meeting his wishes. That is one example of the kind of thing that may happen in the territories.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when you think of $357,000, with, I think $40,000 the hon. gentleman said of local revenue, say $400,000 altogether, to supply all the municipal and other services required in that vast territory, I think any man who has had experience in municipal matters must wonder how it has been done. Most of you who live in cities and towns in Ontario probably know the condition here in Ottawa, as I know the condition in the city of Winnipeg. The revenue of the city of Winnipeg is some $635,000, of which $135,000 is paid yearly for schools. The revenue of the city of Winnipeg, a town of 50,000 inhabitants, is nearly double the sum with which they have to govern that whole territory 500 miles by 400 miles. I ask if that is fair. I say it is great credit to the Hon. Mr. Haultain and his colleagues that they have been able to administer the affairs of that government as economically as they have done during the last ten years. I do not believe there is a province in Canada where the same amount of money has yielded so much benefit to the people as has the money spent by the territorial government.

Hon. gentlemen from the east may think this is pecularily a western question. Now it is not, it is more an eastern matter. A great many gentlemen on the other side of the House live in cities and towns which are manufacturing centres. For instance, we have three members from Toronto, none of them here to-night. I would ask those gentlemen in the city of Toronto who understand the Massey-Harris people, what a good settler is worth to the Massey-Harris people every year. I ask them what every new family who goes into the territories is worth to the manufacturers of eastern Canada. They are worth nothing to western Canada in that way, we have no manufacturers, we have no implements, no cloth, woollens nor cottons, no fruits—everything these people have to buy must come from the east. Every settler you put there increases the wages of your artisans, increases the population of your cities and towns in Ontario. It does not help us half as much as it helps you people here, and I think it is your duty to wake up to the fact that the more settlers you get in there the larger your towns will grow, and the higher the value of your lands will become in older Canada. I say this is a matter of gigantic importance. I believe that in the supplementary estimates to be brought down this session a very large sum of money should be granted in aid of the people of the territories. Bear in mind also that while the population that is going in there now very largely comes from the United States, Europe and Great Britain, a considerable percentage, in fact I should imagine 30 or 40 per cent, are your own brothers, and sisters, and sons from the eastern provinces. Are you going to allow them to endure the hardships that your forefathers had to endure here in the Ottawa district, and other districts of eastern Canada? I say times have changed, and those people should have enough money to support their schools, to build their bridges, and to make the necessary improvements to keep pace with the advancing population. I may remark to the Postmaster General, as I remarked the other day to his deputy, that he should not expect to get, in a new country like that, sufficient revenue to run the post offices. In Ontario where your farmers are settled on 50 to 100 acres of land, it is quite easy to have a post office where there is no settler further than three miles from the post office; but out there where the settler has got to occupy 320 acres of land to make it pay, you cannot expect, at least for some

time, that the post offices are going to pay. You have got to charge up any deficiency in your postal department to some other appropriation. you can charge it to immigration if you like. But I say post offices ought to be given to the people out there without any regard to whether there is sufficient revenue to make them pay. I think that in the subsidies to be brought down at a subsequent period of the session, there should be a sum of at least $200,000 or $250,000 to supplement the grants already made to provide for running the territories.

Mr. INGRAM. Hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories have referred to this matter as being of interest to eastern members, and I take the liberty of discussing it from that point of view. I listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), and of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. McCreary), who represents a Manitoba constituency. The point these gentlemen from the territories made was that a provincial government should be granted to the people of the territories. The hon. member for Selkirk says it should not be given to the territories owing to the friction that exists there at the present time.

Mr. McCREARY. I did not say that.

Mr. INGRAM. I took down his words, and I think that is what he said. Now, I would like to ask my hon. friend, and the minister too, if there is friction now, and we all know there is more or less, how is it going to be avoided if you create the territory into a province ? Doubtless these gentlemen have perused the report of negotiations that have taken place between the authorities of the North-west Territories and the Dominion government ; they know full well that for some years past a strong agitation has taken place there with a view of forming those territories into a province. Why ? Because the people find that the immigrants coming in there in large numbers have changed the conditions, and entail additional expense on the government of the territories, and that the amount at present given by the Dominion government is insufficient. Therefore they are agitating for a provincial government so that they may be put on the same footing as other provinces.

Now, I think the Minister of the Interior said in his letter to the Hon. Mr. Haultain that the population in the North-west Territories was too sparse, that was one of the reasons why the government of Canada refused to organize the territories into a province. The next reason given was that the increased population going into those territories was changing the conditions, and that the government of Canada did not think it wise at present to organize a province, as it might soon be necessary to have more provinces than one. The Minister of the Interior, in his letter of the 21st of March, 1901, admitted that this question was of the utmost importance to the people of the North-west Territories. I think he suggested that the authorities of the territories should meet the federal executive with a view of arriving at some conclusion on the matter. I think these are three of the points in that letter sent by the Hon. Mr. Sifton stating why the Dominion government did not grant their prayer. Now, we are in Committee of the Whole here and my hon. friends from the North-west are in a position to speak more than once on this question. Let me ask them, do they differ with the Minister of the Interior in his conclusion, and if they do, will they say so ? They must know something of the facts in the document brought down in the North-west Assembly the other day. Do they consider that the territory there mentioned should comprise one province or more ? If they think it should comprise more than one province I think it is their duty to say so in this House. The people of Canada should not be kept in the dark on this subject. It is in the interest of the people of the east as well as of the west to know whether there should be one province or two, and whether the territorial government is at present administered in the interest of the people of Canada as a whole.

There is another question and it is whether the present machinery of the territories can be extended cheaper than creating new machinery. The question is whether there is any justification for refusing to organize these territories into a province. If we go to the far eastern provinces of Canada we find that the population comprising what is now the province of Prince Edward Island was much less when it was organized into a province than the population of the territories to-day.

Mr. McCREARY. It had a much smaller population.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, a much smaller population. We find also that the territories today have as large a population as British Columbia when British Columbia was brought in as a province.

Mr. SCOTT. Quite a bit larger.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, quite a bit larger. Now, let us make a comparison with the area of the North-west Territories with that of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. If the territories are brought in as they are proposed to be, I believe the area of the new province sought to be organized would be about 302,000 square miles. British Columbia has 383,000 square miles. Ontario 222,000 square miles, and Quebec 228,000 square miles. I find that so far as area is concerned, the people of the North-west Territories are as much entitled to be organized

into a province as are these other provinces which I have named and so far as population is concerned they are in a better position than Prince Edward Island and British Columbia. If the people of the North-west Territories are organized into a province I hold that they would be able as local authorities to understand their requirements very much better than we could as members of this House or as members of the Dominion government. I say that it would be better in the interests of the local government that the request should be acceded to and that the reasons given by the hon. Minister of the Interior are not sufficient why these people should be refused to be organized into a province. Some better reason should be given why these people should be refused that which they believe to be in their own interests. Let as take another point ; I recognize that there are some very ticklish questions that come up in the different provinces. I recognize that the British North America Act gives each province certain rights as to the administration of its own affairs, and we know as a matter of fact that the residents of the North-west Territories of all classes and of all creeds will be alive to their interests, and that once you undertake to organize them into a province and give them rights under the British North America Act they will be very jealous of these rights and may be hard to please. Is that the chief reason why the government refuse to organize these people into a province ? It strikes me, after considering the whole question as carefully as I can, that there is really more in that objection than there is in the reasons given by the hon. minister who represents the government in this matter. I do not desire to take up more of the time of the committee, nor do I wish to advocate an expensive form of government, but, taking the views of the representatives who come from the North-west Territories, who have expressed themselves in favour of the organization of these territories into a province. I for one, feel that if they can do that without imposing any additional burdens on the people of the country, they are justified in advocating that course.

Mr. McCREARY. Leaving to one side the question of provincial autonomy for the territories at present, leaving that question to be settled by the territorial government at the next general elections, we will say, taking the situation as we find it, may I ask the hon. gentleman if he will endorse the government in increasing the subsidy by, say $200,000 a year ? Let him commit himself upon that point.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has not been long enough in this House to get an answer from me to a question of that kind. I have been too long in this House to answer any questions of that kind. If the members of the opposition occupied seats on the government side of the House, I would be very glad to hear the leader of my party answer that question.

Mr. OLIVER. In consequence of the suggestion thrown out by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), it may be thought by members of the committee that there was some question as to the position taken by the government of the North-west Territories on this subject of provincial organization. There is no question whatever on that point. The North-west territorial government has gone so far as to lay a proposed Bill for the establishment of the territories into a province before the government

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) approve of that Bill as he finds it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think, if the Bill is agreed to in all its provisions, that it would be a very satisfactory arrangement, but, of course, whether I would agree to the formation of a province or not would depend entirely on the terms of the agreement. I hope the hon. gentleman will understand that, but I think that I would be perfectly safe in endorsing the Bill as it is prepared. If a province can be secured on those terms I think it would be a satisfactory arrangement to the people of the territories. What I wanted to particularly point out was that the people of the territories are not responsible in any shape or manner for coming to this parliament and making any indefinite demand. They came and made a definite demand and if that definite demand is not accepted, then, we say, the only alternative you should take is that you should ascertain what their requirements are and meet these requirements. I wish to add to what the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has said in regard to the making of expenditures in the territories. I had the honour to be a member of the local assembly for a number of years and without going into details I will back up the broad assertion made by that hon. gentleman that there is no province in this Dominion, and there is no country in the world, where every dollar of revenue goes as far in meeting the actual requirements of the public service as in the North-west Territories. That is as has been and that is as it is.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) a question. The hon. gentleman has not answered the point raised by the hon. Minister of the Interior, representing the government. He said that organization having been refused he is prepared to take the alternative of increasing the subsidy as the next best thing, but the point that the hon. gentleman who represents the North-west Territories should make clear is this : Does the hon. gentleman approve of the ground and steps taken by the hon. Minister of the Interior, repre-

senting the government? Does he think the reasons given by the hon. Minister of the Interior are sufficient reasons for refusing the North-west Territories organization into a province.

Mr. OLIVER. When a Bill on the subject is presented to the House and the hon. minister gives his reasons I will be prepared to discuss them.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister has given his reasons.

Mr. OLIVER. In the words of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) I have been too long in the House. The question under consideration at the present time is, the vote of certain moneys, and that is what we are to discuss now and not to answer all questions under the sun.

Mr. INGRAM. Here is the statement made by the Minister of the Interior to Mr. Haultain :

> Respecting present financial requirements the question of an increase in your subsidies is now receiving consideration, but the result cannot as you are aware be communicated until the estimates are brought before parliament. This, I have reason to hope will take place in a very short time.

Here are the estimates now, and instead of an increase there is a decrease of $10,000. Last year there were $435,359 and this year they are $425,359.

Mr. SCOTT. What I spoke about was the vote of $357,000 which is in reality the subsidy granted to the North-west Territories. There are some other items included in this vote, but that is the subsidy, and it is the same as last year.

Mr. INGRAM. And those other items appeared last year in the vote, and the fact remains that the vote for the North-west Territories is $10,000 less. The minister should tell us why this vote is not increased, and whether he intends to increase it or not. The member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) told us that this question was second to none in importance before this parliament, and if that be so ; and hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories being friends of the government they have the public documents at their disposal in the departments, and they should be prepared to come to this House and tell us whether they endorse the action of the government on that question or not. They have not done so, and it appears they are not going to do so. As an eastern member of this House, I say that the three objections raised in the letter of the Minister of the Interior are not sufficient to warrant the government in refusing to give an increased subsidy.

Mr. OLIVER. We are now discussing the vote for the North-west Territories and the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) ought to be satisfied that we have placed ourselves thoroughly on record on that point.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. BOYD. I wish to say a few words on this question, and principally for the reason that last winter I had the pleasure of attending a public meeting at Indian Head in East Assiniboia, where about 1,000 people were gathered to discuss this very question as to whether the territories should or should not have their own provincial government or governments. Whatever doubt Mr. Haultain may have had previous to that meeting, there was not the slightest doubt that the people present there were quite unanimous on the question. I could not help smiling when I heard the members for the territories speaking, and when I watched the only three or four ministers present and how they acted. The Postmaster General and the Minister of Finance were industriously reading their newspapers; the Minister of Agriculture was busy with his letters ; they were all very indifferent, and they thought the question of so little account that they took the first opportunity to get up and slide out of the House. They have left the whole thing to the Minister of the Interior. It is true that he has told the people of Manitoba and the North-west that he assumes responsibility, and is to be held responsible for the management of that country, but if he were to tell us what he thinks to-night—I do not expect he will for he has been too long in the House for that—he would tell us that he really believes that he would give the people of the territories what they want. The objection raised by the hon. gentleman for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) is not a good one. He tells us that when the country fills up with people we will be better able to know whether it is better to have one or two provinces—

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Might I interrupt my hon. friend to ask him what he refers to when he says 'what the people want' ?

Mr. BOYD. What the people desire. In reply to the statement of the hon. member for Selkirk, I may say that every one knows that this question can be settled with a great deal less difficulty now than it can years hence, when the population becomes larger. The gentlemen who represent the North-west Territories know that very well. They know that the larger the population the more diversified will be the opinion, and the greater the difficulty in settling that question as to whether it shall be one province or whether it shall be two provinces or three provinces. The meeting at Indian Head was equally divided as to whether it should be one or two provinces. I am speaking now, frankly as a man who viewed the proceedings there impartially.—

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman permit me to interrupt him ?

Mr. BOYD. Yes, all you like.

Mr. SCOTT. What evidence has the hon. gentleman that that meeting was equally divided in its opinion ?

Mr. BOYD. The applause that was given to each of the speakers. How would you judge the feeling of a meeting, except by the sentiments expressed by the people in front of you. Now then, I say that the government might just as well face the question at once. If we knew the truth of the matter I believe we would find that this is one of the questions that the cabinet is fighting like blazes about, because has not the Minister of Public Works told us that they frequently fight like blazes on different questions ? If the truth were known, it is one of the questions which is causing trouble to this cabinet, formed of the ex-ministers of different provinces. It is not a question of finance or a question of the division of the territory, that is causing the delay. The government might just as well admit that the delay is caused by the question of the schools, and the question of the language, and don't think for a moment that the people in the North-west are not pretty well aware of that. You might just as well face the question now, and the less people you have in the territories the more easily it can be dealt with. At the Indian Head meeting the complaint was that the territories were not able to aid railways, were not able to do what they would do in the matter of transportation, and what they would do if they had their provincial government. That is the important question that is now agitating the people of the territories. I agree with my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) that the gentlemen representing the territories should speak out frankly on this subject. I understand the difficulties of supporters of a government. I have been over there. But if they would speak out frankly and say whether or not they approve of the action of the government in this instance, they would be giving much more satisfaction to their constituents than they are doing by the little by-play which we have had here this evening.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat draws his conclusions from the meeting at Indian Head, he is very gravely mistaken as to the state of feeling on this question in Eastern Assiniboia. I think I can safely say that not one-tenth of the people there are in favour of provincial autonomy in the immediate future. They know that it must come and that we must prepare for it; but it would saddle additional burdens on the people. They feel that under existing circumstances they could not carry out even a complete municipal organization because of the sparseness of settlement. There may perhaps be a few people or a considerable number of people about Indian Head who desire provincial autonomy, who have the opinion that it would enable them to get more support for the development of the country in the way of building railways. I remember very well the argument of Mr. Haultain, the premier of the North-west Territories. He argued that there should be only one province, because the larger the province the greater its facility in raising money to build railroads; but if that is an argument, then it is better that the Territories should remain under the supervision of the Dominion government, which has better credit in the money markets of the world than any province could possibly have. Therefore, under existing circumstances and for some years to come, I think we are better as we are than we could possibly be with provincial autonomy. We know it must come, and no progressive settler would desire to retard it unduly; but just now it would certainly impose additional burdens on the people, and, voicing the sentiment of Eastern Assiniboia, I would state decidedly that as far as I can interpret the feeling of the people, they are not in favour of provincial autonomy immediately.

Mr. BOYD. As the hon. gentleman has been a long time in the country, I would like to ask him how long a time would it be before it would be ready for provincial autonomy ? I am very glad he has placed himself squarely before his people on this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Quite so ; we do not hesitate at all. In meetings where we have opportunities to test the feelings of the people, they do not support the immediate formation of new provinces. I am not prepared to say how long it should be. If the population goes on increasing as it has been doing of late years, it may come in the near future ; but certainly, under existing circumstances, I am not prepared to advocate the immediate organization of the country into provinces.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would not the question of additional burdens depend altogether on the terms under which the North-west Territories were formed into a province ? And are not the hon. gentleman and his friends arguing now that the subsidies should be increased ? If the subsidies were increased and the territories were formed into a province, what difference would it make ? I do not understand the logical conclusion of the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are asking an increase in the subsidy not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of right, in view of the increased population and the growing demands on the funds of the territorial government, because it is found that they cannot possibly overtake the work which is brought under their notice, retain the population, and minister to their comfort and consolidation in the country without an addition to the subsidy. As I understand, a certain amount has been granted in each province per head of the population. This the government has been

pleased to grant in past years, and sometimes they have discounted the future, and at periods of some ten years have drawn on the fund in favour of the province or the territory. What we wish them to do in this case, in view of the rapid increase of population, is not only to give us the proportionate grant per head that is given in the other provinces, but to discount the future and enable the government of the territories to overtake the work which is piling up in their hands.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps I have not made myself clear to my hon. friend; but certainly he has not made himself very clear to me. I asked him how provincial autonomy could possibly increase the burdens of the people if adequate terms were given to the North-west Territories, which I understand perfectly are being asked, not as a matter of charity, but as a matter of right. I did not suggest that they were asked as a matter of charity. Whether or not the territories are formed into a province cannot possibly affect the burdens of the people, if a subsidy which the North-west Territories regard as adequate is given to them when they are formed into a province; and we know that such an adequate subsidy is being asked now. Then, how can the establishment of provincial government in the territories result in any additional burdens on the people?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I can answer the hon. gentleman's question. The burdens I have reference to are simply these: If we have two provinces, or probably three, we shall require three separate sets of buildings, three sets of organization, and a large body of officials all over the country, which at present we do not need. It is one thing to speak of one of the older provinces maintaining municipal organization to the full extent to which it is enjoyed in Ontario and Quebec, and quite another thing to deal with a country where the people live four or six or eight miles apart, and where you may have a stretch of fifteen miles with nobody living upon it. Hon. gentlemen need to know the country, the immensity of the area, and the necessity of this area being filled up, in order to maintain and carry out with comfort and success municipal organization. So that we believe the burdens of the people would be very largely increased, and the taxation would became much higher than it is in any of the older provinces. Hence we say it is better to delay somewhat the organization of the country into provinces, and to wait until it is more fully settled.

Mr. INGRAM. I take it, from the remarks of the hon. gentleman, that in the constituency he represents the feeling of the people is not in favour of provincial organization. I understand that the majority of the local representatives coming from his constituency support Mr. Haultain's government. I find that at Yorkton, which I think is in the hon. gentleman's constituency, Mr. Haultain made this statement—I am quoting from the hon. member for West Assiniboia:

> Before the local elections in 1898, the Hon. Mr. Haultain spoke at various points throughout the territories on this subject, and I shall quote from the language he used at one place to show that even three years ago this change was looked forward to and that the present legislature of the territories was in reality given a mandate to open up negotiations with respect to the subject. Speaking at Yorkton, the Hon. Mr. Haultain said:
>
> If the financial question is capable of other solution, I will be satisfied to remain as at present. The only thing there seems to be to do is to think at least of negotiating for provincial establishment. I feel convinced that it will be the principal work of the new legislature before the end of its four years' term to enter into such negotiations. With the greater development that now seems assured, the needs in respect of schools and improvement will certainly develop. Outside of direct taxation, there seems no possibility of a solution except by provincial establishment.

That language was used, I take it, all over the territories during the contest previous to 1898. Then what do we find? When these very same representatives went to the North-west Territories legislature, this document, with several other sections was passed unanimously by the representatives of the North-west Territories. And here is a sample of these several clauses that passed unanimously in the North-west Territories legislature, that deals with the question of provincial organization:

> 4. And whereas, in the said address it was represented to Her Majesty as a reason for the extension of the Dominion of Canada westward, that the welfare of the population of these territories would be materially enhanced by the formation therein of political institutions bearing analogy, as far as circumstances will admit, to those which existed in the several provinces then forming the Dominion.

That was passed unanimously with the other clauses in this resolution. That shows that the people of the territories are in favour of provincial organization, and the sentiment in the constituency represented by the hon. gentleman must be strongly in favour of that course. That being the case, I cannot understand how he can oppose that policy here. I can understand why he personally should be opposed to it. Take, for instance, the tax levied now for school and road purposes. Is it not a fact that it is fairly high in the territories just now? Would it be reduced if they had provincial organization or increased?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Increased.

Mr. INGRAM. That being the case, and the hon. gentleman being a large landholder, I can understand that he might object to the formation of provincial government for the reason that it would interfere with him directly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. INGRAM. It might cost him something. I do not say that that is the case, but where a large landholder might find his taxes increased were the territories given provincial organization, that might be a justifiable reason for his opposing such a policy. I do not charge him with being actuated by such a motive, because of course it is not his personal interest that he is considering, but the interests of his constituents.

Mr. SCOTT. If the fears which the hon. gentleman attribute to my hon. friend from East Assinaboia (Mr. Douglas) have any basis in fact, the same cause would no doubt prompt every person in the territories to oppose our being given provincial powers.

Mr. INGRAM. Then they should not support the resolutions in favour of provincial autonomy

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman from Elgin (Mr. Ingram) was not frank enough to answer the question put to him. Very properly, in connection with the item in the estimates to provide a sum to enable the North-west government to carry on its administration this year, a straight question was put, and he declined to answer it. I shall be more frank than he was. I notice that he had last year's 'Hansard' before him. He has been quoting from the remarks I made last year on the subject of autonomy, and probably does not need to be told what my answer is to the question he asked North-west members to answer. I said that I believed the time had come when the question of giving the territories provincial rights should be taken up and dealt with. As far as I am concerned, I believe that the people in the territories in general are ready to accept provincial autonomy. Of course they are not unanimous, and I think that if the powers at Ottawa wait until they are, they will wait until Kingdom come, because neither on that or any other question will the people of so large an area ever entertain one opinion. It is a fact, as has been stated by my hon. friend opposite, that the population of the territories now is vastly larger than was that of Manitoba when that part of the country was formed into a province. It is probably 600 or 700 per cent greater, and if the population of the North-west Territories is not as large to-day as that of the province of British Columbia with a smaller area, it will be before the close of the present year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the population of the territories and British Columbia respectively ?

Mr. SCOTT. According to the census of a year ago, the population of the North-west Territories was in the neighbourhood of 160,000 and that of British Columbia a little less than 200,000; but we received in the territories last year a very large immigration, the exact number of which cannot be stated. To-day, however, I think we have a population of between 180,000 and 190,000, and probably before the end of the year it will have swelled to 220,000 or 230,000. I have stated my own opinion very positively, but at the same time there is a large number of people who are very much of the opinion expressed by my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), and as has been stated by Mr. Haultain, the premier of the territories—whose remarks were quoted a moment ago—if a sufficient grant were made annually by this parliament, there would be no cry from the territories for provincial establishment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SCOTT. Year after year, however, the local authorities in the territories have been obliged to come to Ottawa for an increase in the grant. In some years they obtained an increase fairly satisfactory, but the position taken by the North-west government to-day is that which I am supporting. If my hon. friends in this government would agree to an increase perfectly satisfactory for this year, still it would be better for the territories that the question of provincial establishment should be taken up and dealt with, because next year we will find our needs again largely increased, and the Minister of the Interior would have a difficult task in obtaining from this House the increase required. Even if he were able to provide this year the necessary increase, one which would be perfectly satisfactory, the position next year would be just as it has been heretofore.

The testimony which has been borne by my hon. friends from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) and Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to the character of government which the people of the territories have been enjoying for years past, is a fair argument which can be urged in favour of their being granted provincial autonomy. I am willing to join in the assertion which has been made that better government than has been enjoyed in the last ten years by the people of the territories has not been enjoyed by the people of any province in the Dominion. We have as able, shrewd, judicious and careful men at the head of our government as are at the head of government in any province of the Dominion. We have an educational system, which was framed by Premier Haultain, and in which my hon. friend from Alberta had a hand, when he was a member of the legislative assembly, which has not a superior anywhere in the Dominion. We have in the matter of education, a system as satisfactory as that which now prevails in Manitoba, and we have arrived at that position without any of the turmoil which was created before the Manitoba system could be brought to its present satisfactory state. But we are getting a little beside the question. I did not intend this evening to give rise to any lengthy discussion upon

the question of provincial autonomy. We are dealing now with the grant to the North-west assembly for the purpose of carrying on their business this year, and it would not do our people any particular good this year if the House were to decide that full provincial powers ought to be granted and at the same time allow the vote for the present year to remain as it is, and leave us, in some measure, in a state of starvation.

I think we should direct our attention, as I endeavoured to direct my remarks in the first instance, to the question of the vote and to providing this session for a considerable enlargement of it. Possibly, it would not be out of order to make the comparison of the vote for this service, a service for which this parliament is entirely responsible, and the votes for other services. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) did make a comparison in one particular. I have taken the pains to copy the total figures devoted to some services voted for by parliament. I may say that, for fear some of our friends might say I was introducing sectional questions, I have taken votes which apply to one part of this country as much as to any other. For penitentiaries, we spend a total of $491,490, considerably in excess of the amount deemed to be sufficient for the whole purposes of the government of the North-west Territories. Legislation costs $446,290, entirely apart from the indemnity paid to the members of parliament. This is the amount it costs to manage these parliament buildings and supply the printing in connection with the work of parliament. To the Agriculture Department we vote about $400,000, apart from the vote for the taking of the census. Then, as my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) pointed out, we spend almost half a million dollars on immigration. That is, we spend fully as much to bring people into the North-west Territories as we spend for all their local needs after we get them there. Fisheries inspection costs $337,000, or almost as much as this whole vote to the North-west Territories. The expense of looking after the Indians is considerably in excess of a million dollars. And, as the hon. member for Eastern Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) remarked, we spend $417,000 for the education of Indian children, much more than we spend for the whole cost of education and all other purposes as well in the North-west Territories. On the North-west mounted police in that territory, one single service, we spend $400,000, and, on the mounted police in the Yukon $450,000. The Yukon government vote, which is exactly similar to the item under discussion and which applies to a country where there is not a population, probably, of more than 25,000, costs $250,000. There is voted this year for superannuation, $328,000, almost as much as the entire vote for local government in the North-west Territories. I wish to say that I am not taking the slightest exception to these votes. Speaking more particularly to my hon. friends in the government, and to my friends on this side, I may say that it has been a matter of pride to us that the general services throughout the Dominion has been so well looked after since the Liberals came into power. Under the government's policy of a revenue tariff——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SCOTT. Whatever dispute there may be about the name, there is no question that it lives up to the name of a revenue tariff, for under it Canada has been getting a sufficient revenue. And it has been a matter of pride to us that every service that has required looking after has been generously, properly and adequately looked after. But, unless a very considerable increase is made in the vote for the North-west Territories there is one item in which we shall be obliged to admit that there is no cause for pride.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad, that, in one respect the education of my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) is improving. I think he is one of the gentlemen who were not able to understand the meaning of the word 'adequate' in a resolution lately moved in this House. I have noticed that in the various addresses with which he has favoured the House, he has used that word at least fifteen or twenty times this evening. It is evident that during the period intervening he has made excellent use of the dictionary. I trust that some hon. gentlemen who laboured under the same difficulty have been employing their leisure in the same excellent way.

Mr. SCOTT. I have been trying to learn the resolution by heart.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad my hon. friend's endeavours have had such excellent results. There is a good deal of food for reflection in what the hon. gentleman has said. I, for one, am convinced that the administration of the government of the North-west Territories must have been carried on in a very excellent way in order to have given the people any semblance of provision for the public service, seeing they have what seems to me a very meagre sum, considering the large number of people and the enormous territory that has to be dealt with. It does seem that this service cannot, out of such a subsidy, be provided for quite as well as the people of the North-west have a right to expect having regard to the interests which have been mentioned by hon. gentlemen opposite. I am still not quite clear as to what my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) means when he says that provincial autonomy would increase the burdens of the people. There are certain services to be provided for in the North-west. They must either be provided for by the people in that country themselves, or they must be provided for by all the people of the

country, that is, through the Dominion government. I do not see how the adoption of provincial autonomy will necessarily affect the question one way or the other. It is entirely a question of the terms upon which autonomy is established. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Scott) has brought to the attention of the House certain services upon which a good deal of money has been spent in this country. We on this side might add to the illustrations he has given. I might point out to the hon. gentleman that the bringing down of a contract with respect to the building of a railway in the Yukon eight days before the meeting of this parliament has resulted in a claim against the government which will probably cost this country nearly as much as the whole grant to the North-west Territories in one year.

Mr. SCOTT. That was the fault of an out of date Senate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would be inclined to think it was the fault of a government that was not able to wait for eight days until the parliament met and the matter could be dealt with. Of course, these are different points of view. Another thing I would call the attention of the hon. gentlemen to is that this government spent, I think unnecessarily—and I think anybody who fairly examines the evidence will say unnecessarily—in the purchase of the Drummond County Railway, enough to double the subsidy to the Territories for five or six years. The same remark is true of the contract this government made with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway and also with regard to a great many public works in respect to which, during the past five or six years, enormous sums of money have been, as I believe, spent unjustifiably and extravagantly. I have no doubt that if a proper system of administration had been adopted with regard to a great many of these works, the amount granted to the North-west Territories might have been increased 50 per cent during the past five or six years without increasing the burdens of the people of this country by a single dollar. As my hon. friend has brought some illustrations with regard to this subject, I thought it only right to remind him of this, because he has given me some food for reflection in the sensible remarks he has made, and I desire to give him food for reflection with regard to these matters, and I trust he will take my remarks as much to heart as I have in all sincerity taken to heart the remarks he has addressed to the House on that subject.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). At last we have had one member from the North-west Territories on the other side of the House coming out and expressing himself as strongly opposed, at the present time at any rate, to provincial autonomy being granted to the territories. I think he is the only member from the North-west Territories who has had the boldness to come out and in explicit terms to take that stand. But that hon. gentleman, I think, when he was elected in 1896, came to this House as an independent, he came as representing a patron organization, and he rather scorned the average Conservative or Liberal who came down here to be caucused with the rest of the members, and to respond to the party lash. I notice that he is now just as servile a supporter of the government as you will find on the other side, and he does not think it any disgrace now to be caucused with other members, and to respond to the party lash with the best of them ; so much so, that he is willing to give credit to the government for having taken a stand that will displease the people of the territories, in refusing to grant them provincial autonomy at the present time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask a question ? The people of the west have not asked for provincial autonomy, and the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is not advocating nor opposing provincial autonomy. He has only stated that in his judgment the time has not fully come when it ought to be given, but it must come in the near future.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Now the hon. member for East Assiniboia has stated that the people of the North-west Territories have not asked for provincial autonomy. I would like to know who their government represents. Does not the government represent the people ? Do they not voice the sentiments of the people, and has not the territorial assembly asked this parliament to grant them provincial autonomy ? You may just as well say that this government do not represent the people of Canada at the present time, as in many things I grant they do not. But the member for East Assiniboia stated in his remarks that he did not think the time had fully come when it would be wise to grant provincial autonomy. I do not know what he means by that qualified statement. Probably next session, if the government comes down with a Bill granting provincial autonomy, he will be the first to get up and give them credit for it, stating that he is very glad to see them do it, and I have no doubt that had they taken that stand on this occasion, he would have been equally ready to give them credit for so doing. That shows what a good party man he is. Now after the declaration of the Minister of the Interior he falls in with the views of the government and says he believes the people of the territories do not desire provincial autonomy at the present time. One reason, he says, is that it will increase the burdens of the people. I think the question asked by the leader of the opposition was very appropriate, and I could not see exactly what the member for East Assiniboia meant in his reply. As the leader of the opposition has said, it rests en-

tirely with the two governments as to whether the burden of the people will be increased or not, according to the terms that will be made. I agree with the members from the territories that the present subsidy is not adequate; and by the way, the leader of the opposition took the words out of my mouth when he jollied the member from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) on his education having been advanced to that position that he understands that word adequate far better than he did when the budget debate was on.

Mr. McCREARY. Probably the hon. gentleman will be a little more definite on this point than he was on the tariff, and say what an adequate amount will be.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I will reply to the hon. member in the words of the leader of the government when he was in opposition, that is time enough to prescribe when you are called in. I hope the hon. gentleman will agree in the opinion of his chief. I admit that the subsidy granted at the present time to the territories is not sufficient, and if autonomy was granted to those territories, as a Manitoban I would be quite agreeable to see better terms granted to the new province, for then we would have a lever to get a little better terms ourselves. The member for West Assiniboia says that at the present time, if the subsidy was increased, the people of the territories would prefer not to have autonomy. I do not agree with that sentiment. I think there is a feeling in the average elector of the west that the subsidy should be increased.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman attribute that opinion to me?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. member said a few minutes ago that if an additional subsidy was granted to the North-west Territories the people would not ask for provincial autonomy. If the hon. member looks in the 'Hansard' to-morrow he will find that statement.

Mr. SCOTT. If I said that, I said something that I did not mean to say.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I took down the hon. gentleman's words, and I think he will find that declaration in the 'Hansard.'

Mr. SCOTT. I think I said that, even if the subsidy for this present year were made entirely satisfactory, I would still think there was good reason for asking for a final settlement, because next year, with the increase in population, and the increased needs for an additional amount of money, the Minister of the Interior would be in the same difficulty as has been experienced in the past in obtaining the increase annually made necessary by increasing population and needs.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The hon. gentleman should thank me for having drawn his attention to his statement, as it has given him an opportunity of setting himself right, and to-morrow he will have an opportunity of revising his speech in the 'Hansard.' I think the people of the west, notwithstanding that there might be an additional subsidy would still be in favour of local autonomy. They all desire to manage their own local affairs, and even an additional subsidy would not long quiet them. Now the reasons given for refusing provincial autonomy by the Minister of the Interior I do not think were sufficient in themselves, certainly they were not satisfactory to the government of the North-west Territories. Mr. Haultain had been led to believe that this government would take into immediate consideration the question of granting provincial autonomy. The Minister of the Interior, in writing to him, said that no doubt it would not come as a surprise to Mr. Haultain that the government at the present time had decided not to grant autonomy; but Mr. Haultain was surprised. These are the words used by the Minister of the Interior when he refused provincial autonomy to Mr. Haultain:

> It is the view of the government that it will not be wise at the present time to pass legislation forming the North-west Territories into a province or provinces. Some of the reasons leading to this view may be found in the fact that the population of the territories is yet sparse.

I think that is an argument that will not hold water very long. As has been pointed out by some hon. members, the population is not as sparse as it was when Manitoba was created a province.

> That the rapid increase in population now taking place will in a short time alter the conditions to be dealt with very materially; and that there is a considerable divergence of opinion respecting the question whether there should be one province only or more than one province.

I think that objection in itself is very weak, it is, as has been said, one that will always exist. There will always be a difference of opinion on that subject. There is one thing I can tell the hon. member for East Assiniboia, and that is, if only one province is granted, a great many of his own constituents will favour annexation to Manitoba. But most people, I think, in the territories are favourable to two provinces. However, that is a question of detail, as Mr. Haultain said, that could be left in abeyance.

> Respecting the present financial requirements, the question of an increase in your subsidy is now receiving consideration, but the result cannot, as you are aware, be communicated until the estimates are brought before parliament. This I have every reason to hope will take place in a very short time.

Well, the estimates have been placed before parliament and no increase in the subsidy has been thus far announced, though the hon. minister may later on in his supplementary estimates, and I trust he may,

bring down an increase in the subsidy. There is a reply made by Mr. Haultain which shows that he was surprised at this declaration by the hon. Minister of the Interior. He quotes a portion of the minister's letter addressed to him some time previously, in which it was stated :

Without at the present moment committing myself to any positive statement I am prepared to say that the time has arrived when the question of organizing the territories on the provincial basis ought to be the subject of full consideration. It would appear to me that the better way of bringing the matter to a more definite position would be to arrange for a conference upon the subject between the representatives of your government and a committee of council representing the federal government.

From that declaration on the part of the hon. Minister of the Interior, Mr. Haultain was led to believe that this conference which was suggested by the hon. gentleman would result in granting immediate provincial autonomy to the North-west Territories, and he thus expresses himself in his reply to the hon. minister :

These opinions and the long delay that followed, in order to choose a convenient time for that 'mature and careful consideration of the various and important subjects which will require to be debated and settled in connection with the establishing of the territories as a province or upon a provincial basis,' led us to suppose that when the subject was finally taken up it would be taken up with a view to immediate settlement.

These were the views expressed by Mr. Haultain, and I think the reasons assigned by the hon. Minister of the Interior for not acceding to their demands, are poor reasons, and surely there must be something else behind these which, if the hon. gentleman would be candid enough to admit it, have influenced his position in refusing the territories autonomy at the present time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR: Mr. Chairman, the discussion which has taken place on both sides of the House has, I think, been a desirable discussion because of the fact that it has placed before the country and before hon. members from the eastern part of the country—I am sorry that there are not more of them here this evening—a very fair and moderate statement of the position of affairs. I can find no fault with my hon. friends from the North-west Territories for the manner in which they have stated their position, although hon. members in the committee will see that they, themselves, are not agreed in regard to what ought to be done. This is no particular discredit to any of the members who have expressed their opinions, because the circumstances are of such a character that there is plenty of room for a difference of opinion. It would be a very strange thing if, amongst men who have formed their opinions themselves, there should not be differences of opinion in regard to a matter of such importance, where all the circumstances are of such an unusual character. It does not very often happen that any legislative assembly has to deal with a question involving the constitutional status of a territory such as that which we are now discussing. The committee, perhaps, hardly realizes the fact that we are discussing the questions of the financial and constitutional status of a territory which has almost as much fertile land as the continent of Europe, and which bids fair, under existing circumstances, to be an enormously important factor in the development of the business, not only of Canada, but of the north American continent before very many years pass away. When I speak of the extent of that territory, I am not speaking of the extent of its superficial area, but of the number of acres which are actually fertile and are capable of producing in such a way that they are fairly and reasonably equipped for settlement in the ordinary sense of the word. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go into a very lengthy or detailed discussion of the matter, but, I would say to the committee, that I think I am justified in taking the position that the North-west Territories have not been badly treated during the last five years. Immediately upon assuming office, I was met by the members of the territorial government, and they made a proposal to me in regard to what they thought they ought to have in the way of subsidy for the next four years. If I remember rightly, this took place in the fall of 1896, before I was sworn in, and before I had actually assumed the performance of my duties in this place. I indicated to the members of the government what I thought, under the circumstances, I could recommend, and I was led by these gentlemen to believe that the amount which I was disposed to recommend would be satisfactory for the next three or four years. The amount which I recommended was added to the subsidy of the North-west Territories at the next session of parliament, and I think, under the then existing circumstances, I had the right to believe that in the opinion of the members of the executive at the time of the conference that for three or four years the amount thus added would prove a satisfactory addition to the subsidy. Then circumstances changed, and demands were made upon the government here for increases and additions to the subsidy of the North-west Territories, to some extent, inconsistently with the understanding which was reached at that time, although I am quite prepared to admit there was nothing of a binding character, but at the same time, it was of such a character that I had reasonable grounds for believing that they had succeeded in getting the government to deal satisfactorily with the position as it then existed. Population began to flow into the territories, and as an hon. member from the North-west has properly and pertinently explained to the committee, the expenditure

necessary on the part of the territories has been to a very considerable extent affected and affected unfavourably in the sense that the expenditure has been increased to a very considerable extent owing to the fact that there has lately been a series of wet seasons which have resulted in making a very much larger demand on the resources of the territorial government for necessary public works and for the construction of roads and bridges. That increase, having been made, was continued. A still further increase was made a couple of years ago, and when last year the members of the territorial government waited upon us and explained that, owing to the floods which had taken place in the northern part of the territories, many of their bridges had been washed away and that renewals were an urgent necessity, a very large additional amount was voted for the purpose of assisting them in making these renewals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the hon. Minister of the Interior a question? Was the amount of the subsidy based in any way upon estimated population or on what was it based?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, it was arbitrarily fixed. Every year the premier of the North-west Territories sends down a detailed estimate. When I say it is detailed, I should explain that it is not detailed, as it is not a detailed estimate in the way in which our estimates are detailed, but an estimate generally stating what is required for each service, and giving a certain amount of detail in connection with the moneys that are asked for. As I said, last year or the year before, $100,000 was voted for the purpose of enabling the territorial government to renew bridges and public works which had been destroyed by the floods which had taken place the previous year. On the whole, therefore, I think we have been, in a fair and reasonable way, endeavouring to meet the wishes of our friends in the North-west Territories, and therefore, I do not think that the members of the territorial government feel that we have treated them illiberally, or that we have been disposed to turn a deaf ear to their representations. I may add that in the first year after the government took office, we extended to the North-west Territories what they had been vainly seeking for years before, a system of responsible government. But I remember very distinctly that the day I brought that Bill into the House, the late Mr. Davin stood up and expressed agreeable surprise at the Bill being brought in, declaring that he had been trying to get the Conservative government to introduce a similar Bill for the previous ten years.

Great progress has been made in the North-west. We have in the last five years established in that country a system of responsible government, we have increased their subsidy largely and we have reasonably and fairly endeavoured to meet them in their demands of a financial character. I am free to say that in the last year or two circumstances have changed rapidly, and the march of events has been quicker than in former years. That is due to the rapid increase of the population and the prospect of a still more rapid increase in the future. I do not suppose that my hon. friends would think that the situation were so urgent if it were not for the fact that the population has increased with great rapidity. I believe the subject is one that requires the greatest of consideration, and I fully agree with the members from the territories who say that it would be a national disaster if we neglected to provide for the public service of the territories, so that the people would go in there and become dissatisfied, and that the tide of population which is flowing in that direction should be turned back as it was turned back some fifteen or twenty years ago.

But I venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no such grievance existing in the North-west Territories at the present time as, within the next year at least, renders it in the smallest degree probable that any such disaster would take place for the reason indicated. I think during the next year the territorial government will be somewhat strained in their efforts to meet their obligations if some increased assistance is not given. I indicated in my letter to Mr. Haultain that the subject of an increased subsidy was under the consideration of the government. If I recollect aright the main estimates had been brought down on the Table of the House at that time. I may say for the satisfaction of my hon. friends on the other side, that the estimates to which I referred were the supplementary estimates which have not yet been laid upon the Table.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. In regard to what will be done or what can be done, I shall not be able to say anything until the supplementary estimates appear, and they will speak for themselves. As to the criticism which has been made on the action of the government with respect of the application for provincial autonomy—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the hon. gentleman leaves that point, might I ask him: Has the government of the North-west Territories any independent source of revenue apart from that which it derives from this grant?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Nothing substantial. The local revenues of the North-west Territories are of a very trivial description. I think they amount to not more than $30,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Last year they amounted to $80,000, and possibly this year they will

amount to $100,000, derived from the local land tax.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Respecting what has been said in connection with the conduct of the government upon the application of the territorial government for provincial autonomy, let me say I do not think that in respect to that application, that as yet at least there is any serious, reasonable grievance existing on the part of our territorial friends. The settlement of the constitutional and financial status of that vast territory is surely worth a little consideration. The time to consider the question, even in the opinion of the most urgent friends of provincial autonomy, did not arrive until a year ago. It was not suggested until about a year ago that the subject should be seriously considered, and if hon. gentlemen will remember how long it takes to settle questions of this kind and to settle them satisfactorily, I think they will admit that rash haste with regard to a question of such vast importance—a question which must be satisfactorily settled if settled at all—rash haste would not at all be conducive to a settlement which would be satisfactory in the long run to the people of the territories. I would not feel that I was taking an unreasonable position before this House if I said: That if the people of the North-west Territories get a reasonable and satisfactory settlement, a settlement that the people of Canada and the people of the territories particularly will regard as a good settlement; a fair and reasonable settlement promising permanency; promising lack of agitation, and difficulties, and applications for re-opening of the case in future years—if they get such a settlement within three or four years I should feel very well satisfied indeed, and I should feel that we have accomplished that result in a comparatively short time. In saying that, I am not at this moment indicating any view I have just now as to when this question will be finally and definitely settled.

I wish to say in answer to my hon. friend for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) whose face I see wearing a smile of a somewhat critical character—I wish to say a few words in regard to what he evidently has in his mind. He evidently has in his mind the idea that we are deterred from dealing with the constitutional question relating to the North-west Territories by the possible difficulty of the separate school question being raised in connection with that constitutional settlement. I think some of his friends are under the impression that the reason why we have not dealt with it at this session of parliament is, that there is some political game to be played, and that the party with which the government is identified hopes to gain something politically by reason of the delay. I am bound to say Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned and so far as I know, there is no political advantage to be gained by either party in connection with the settlement of this question. I know of no political game that can be played, and so far as the separate schools are concerned my own view is that the school question is settled so far as the North-west Territories is concerned. I understand that the settlement at which they have arrived—and I am very happy to be able to express that opinion—is a satisfactory settlement, and that the Roman Catholic people on the one hand and the Protestant people on the other, feel that they have a satisfactory compromise and that there is no necessity for difficulty or agitation upon the question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Therefore, I think we may possibly be able to look forward to a settlement of this constitutional question, at least when it is proposed by the government to this parliament, being carried out without any acrimonious discussion upon a question of that kind which might be a most difficult and unpleasant one to have to decide, if there were any contention upon it.

I gave certain reasons in the brief letter which I wrote to Mr. Haultain as to why the government did not feel disposed to deal with this question at the present time. Now, I have lived a great many years in the western portion of Canada and I think I have some little understanding of our people there. I sympathize with them, but I know that when they get an idea about a thing to be done they generally have an idea that it should be done right off. They are not disposed to allow the march of events to proceed very long without having a final settlement of what they claim ought to be settled. They are not generally desirous to listen to counsel which goes in the direction of delay. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has possibly been the clearest exponent of that principle which is generally followed by western people, and he puts it very well. He says: We have asked you for certain things and if you are not prepared to do just exactly what we say, why pay the shot and pay as much as we ask. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) forgets that he takes for granted the whole of the discussion and all the points involved in the discussion because he says: We are entitled to what we ask in the first place, and if you do not give us what we ask we are entitled to fix the amount you will give us. I think the House of Commons will hardly admit that that is the case, because we shall have to take the position, however much we sympathize with our friends in the North-west Territories, that there are two parties to the question of their financial status, and two parties to the question how much they ought to have. These questions cannot be settled by a logical proposition such as

my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) puts with such clearness. A good deal of thoughtful consideration will have to be given to the details.

I want to say a word on two phases of the question—what the position of the territories is, and whether it is desirable for them to have provincial autonomy at the present time. I am bound to say that I think the view expressed so strongly by certain gentlemen representing the territories is not justified by the facts, although there is considerable difference of opinion on the subject. They express the opinion that the financial difficulties of the territories would entirely disappear if they had provincial autonomy. Now, it has been pointed out—and it might be pointed out more in detail if it were necessary—that there are services performed by the government of Canada in the North-west territories at the present time which are of an exceptional character, because of the exceptional position of that country. We maintain a large police force there; but let not our friends think that that police force is maintained solely for what may be called Dominion purposes. Not at all. We require to maintain a force of some kind for Dominion purposes; but at present we maintain it not only for Dominion purposes, not only because it is desirable to have a military force in so large a territory, and where in former years at least there were a considerable number of Indians who were somewhat hostile in their tendency, but at the present time we maintain a large number of those policemen scattered about the country, singly or in groups of two or three, for the purpose of performing the duties of local constables; and if we undertook to remove one of those constables from the neighbourhood where he is placed, such a storm would arise as no minister would care to face. There is a stronger demand for local police in the North-west Territories than in any other part of Canada. I will not be so uncharitable as to say that it is so strong simply because the Federal government has to pay the shot; but the demand is there, and there is some reason for it, because at the present time and for some years to come the population will be so sparse that they will not be able to form themselves into local communities and by small local taxation give themselves the police protection which is provided in other parts of Canada. When the population of the North-west Territories increases to five of six hundred thousand, circumstances will be different. The people will be closer together, municipalities will be formed, we shall be able to collect our police force into military companies for military purposes, and the people will look after their own police protection. But that time has not come yet, and that is one of the things that are to be considered in connection with this question. The territorial government would not be prepared to undertake any such expenditure for police purposes, and if we withdrew that police force from local service, they would have to come back to the Dominion government and ask us again to undertake that kind of work.

There are other circumstances which I think might well lead the House to take a year or two to consider the questions which have to be settled. We have in the North-west Territories a vast extent of country, and if you will take the trouble to note the discussions which have taken place, you will find that the people who live in the district of West Assiniboia are almost unanimously in favour of immediate provincial autonomy and of the territories being constituted into one province, whereas in the neighbourhood of Indian Head, where the meeting was held to which my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) refers, there is not that same amount of unanimity of opinion. My hon. friend said he was at a public meeting, where 1,000 people were present, and where there was a very unanimous expression of opinion ; and, if I understood him rightly, he said that he judged of the view of the meeting by the applause given to the speakers. I was not at the meeting, but I read a very full account of it made by a shortland reporter, to the effect, which I think was not disputed, that the meeting was a large and very intelligent one, that they gave a reasonable and courteous reception and applause to the speakers on both sides, and assumed the attitude of intelligent men who had come to listen and consider the arguments that would be presented to them; and it can hardly be said that the people at that meeting, which assembled to hear Mr. Haultain on one side and Mr. Roblin on the other side of the question, whether the territories should be formed into one province, or that portion of the territories should be united with the province of Manitoba, fully made up their minds on the question that evening. There is still some difference of opinion among the people. There is some sentiment in favour of that district being united to the province of Manitoba; but the prevailing sentiment is that it should remain a part of the North-west Territories. If you go to the district of Saskatchewan, you will find an entirely different sentiment prevailing among the people there. They are not in favour of the territories being formed into one province, and they are not in a hurry for provincial autonomy; but when it comes they do not want their district to be united with the territory to the south. At the present time you have a vast territory there containing about 200,000 people. The census showed about 150,000 in the organized territories; there are perhaps 10,000 or 12,000 in the country to the north; and with the increment caused by the immigration of last year, there are at the present time approximately about 200,000 people. The analogy as to the number of people who were in Manitoba when it became a member

of the confederation, or as to the number in British Columbia, does not hold at all, because those provinces were brought into confederation by way of a necessity which existed at that time. It was not in the deliberate exercise of the discretion of the parliament of Canada, thinking that it would be an ideal or desirable state of affairs to have 17,000 people constituted into a province, that the province of Manitoba was formed. It was formed because the necessity arose. There were people there who demanded local powers, and the peaceful settlement of the country could not have been effected, and that territory could not have been brought under the rule of the Dominion of Canada, without those terms being granted at that time. Hon. gentlemen will remember that there was a rebellion, and it is possible that the trouble arose only on account of the belief that was created by interested persons that the government here did not intend to give them provincial autonomy or to treat them fairly. They had to be treated in that way, because they were insisting that the existing status should be recognized, and it was recognized as a matter of necessity. British Columbia came in as a sovereign colony under a bargain made with the people of Canada, and the people of Canada had no choice in that respect. But that is no reason for saying that when you get 17,000 people in a territory in any part of the Dominion of Canada, you are to form them into a province. That is not justified by common sense or by the precedents cited in favour of it. I think what parliament will be disposed to do will be to treat this question on a fair and liberal basis; but they will desire, when they come to deal with it, to have before them sufficient data to enable them to feel that they are working out a settlement which has in it the element of permanency. And I think parliament would be rather prepared for two or three or four years to vote sums of money, which might be reasonably arrived at as approximately what the territories actually require for their immediate necessities, and let us get more information with regard to what the position will be and what the necessary requirements of the territories will be, so that when we do arrive at a settlement, it shall have some of the elements of finality. At this late hour, I shall not undertake to discuss the various details which will have to be considered in the formation of a province in the North-west. If hon. gentlemen will look through the Bill presented for our consideration by our friends from the territories, they will see at once that there are items in it quite sufficient to make any government take a little time for their consideration. We have in this Bill a provision that all mines, minerals, timber and royalties, belonging to the Crown, situated or arising in the territories, and all sums due and payable on the 1st of January, 1903, for such mines, minerals, timber and royalties shall belong to the province. In addition to other matters relating to the finances, which were supposed to be dealt with somewhat on the line, that has been taken in the other provinces, and as to which possibly no serious objection would be taken, there is a provision that the province shall be entitled to receive, by half-yearly payments in advance from the government of Canada, interest at 5 per cent per annum on the sum of one dollar per acre for every acre of land granted by the Dominion otherwise than as homesteads or pre-emption. I see some hon. members smiling, and I think I have convinced the committee that there is sufficient material in that Bill for a year's consideration. When I said that it was desirable that we should take a little time to consider, I do not think I was asking anything unreasonable. I did not discuss with premier Haultain the details of the Bill. I desire to say, in all frankness, to the committee, that I did not think it desirable to discuss the details. I do not think it desirable, in a matter of such vast importanece to the people of Canada generally and of the territories in particular, to unnecessarily rush the government of Canada into a record on these questions. They are questions upon which a good deal of light may be thrown by further discussion. The circumstances during the last year were not propitious to a complete discussion of the question with the members of the North-west government, and perhaps that is one of the most important features which I ought to bring before the House.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the delegates of the North-west Territories come down over a year ago to discuss the question with the hon. gentleman?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, but it is pretty hard to make a categorical statement about what the members of the territorial government did come down to discuss. The hon. gentleman will appreciate that difficulty. I suppose that there has been no time when I have met the members of the North-west government—and I have met them every year since I have been Minister of the Interior—that I have not discussed with them, in a casual manner, the question of provincial autonomy.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood Premier Haultain and Mr. Ross were here a year ago and discussed this very question with the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The point which I want to convey to my hon. friend is this, that during the last four or five years, on every occasion when I had the pleasure of meeting the members of the territorial government, there has perhaps not been a meeting at which, in a casual way, the question of the time when, and the circumstances under which, pro-

vincial autonomy would be given the territories, has not been more or less discussed. But as to any meeting for the purpose of taking up the question of provincial autonomy, in the sense of a serious discussion of the terms upon which we would contemplate forming a province of the territories, there has only been one discussion in that sense of the word, and that is the discussion which took place during last year, after Mr. Ross went out of the government. There was a preliminary talk about a year and a half ago, and of course some correspondence followed, and it was arranged that there should be a discussion when we would atempt to come down to details. And let me say that until the discussion of this last year, 1901, it was not understood, either by myself or the members of the territorial government, that we were at close quarters upon this question. We were simply discussing it as a thing which would come in the future, but no attempt was made to fix a time for discussion when any settlement would be arrived at. Last year it was arranged that a discussion should take place, and our friends of the territorial government did urge that it should take place earlier. But the Minister of Finance was obliged to go to England immediately after the session, and a discussion in his absence would of course have been impossible, he being one of the members of the government whose presence would be absolutely necessary in addition to the Prime Minister and myself. So that until the Minister of Finance returned from England, it was impossible altogether to arrive at any arrangement as to when the conference should take place. When the members of the government who were away in England did come back, the happy event of the visit of the Prince of Wales occurred. That engaged the attention of everybody some little time, and the result was that it was impossible to give any time for the discussion of this question until after that event took place. Two members of the territorial government came down just about the time His Highness was leaving. We proceeded to get together to discuss the question on two or three occasions, and go into the details as fully as possible. From time to time members of the government gave the various phases of the question consideration, and the conclusion I arrived at was that notwithstanding a case, strong in some respects, was made out by our friends in the territories, it was better that the matter should be laid over for the present, and I am bound to say that the more I have thought of the matter since that decision was arrived at, the more strongly I am convinced that it was a wise one. I am not desirous of binding myself this evening to any expression of opinion, as very rapid changes are likely to take place in the position of the territories in the next year or two, and it would be most unwise for us now to undertake to settle a question of this character, the settlement of which must largely depend on the amount of population in the territories. Why, one of the first things we would have to deal with would be a per capita allowance according to the population, upon the assumption that the cost of government is to be based to some extent on the number of the population. We were asked to fix a per capita allowance based on a population of 250,000; but if our anticipations turn out to be at all correct, it will increase very rapidly, and our estimate of the number of people upon which the per capita allowance should be based might prove to be wholly inadequate and erroneous within two or three years.

The suggestion was made that we should take frequent censuses. But, there are unusual features about that; and, moreover, we would have to face another difficulty, as to what the limit would be upon which the per capita allowance would be granted, because there is a limit in the cases of the other provinces. So, the House can see at a glance, that if you take this enormous territory which is six or seven hundred miles long and runs from the international boundary to north of Prince Albert—speaking of the territory habitable in the sense of being useful for agricultural settlement, and consider that people are likely to go in it at the rate of 50,000 a year and that quite probably those places where settlement is now the thickest will be the thinnest in that respect in a few years, for unquestionably, settlement will go in places where it has not been hitherto—taking these things into consideration the House will understand that rapid and great changes will take place in the territories within a few years, and it would hardly be the part of wise statesmanship to make arrangements that would so completely lack the element of permanency. The House will understand that there would be no advantage in giving provincial autonomy to these people and having them come down here every year for better terms. Every province has had to come to the Federal government for better terms. I was a boy in Manitoba when the representatives of that province had to come every year for better terms. Every year they made their pilgrimage to Ottawa, for this purpose. This was because the elements of permanency and finality did not exist in the terms between Manitoba and the Dominion. The arrangements were made at a time when population was so small and the circumstances were of such a character that nobody could understand what the financial arrangement of the future needed to be. There was constant agitation going on in the province as to what better terms were acceptable. And there was constant difficulty over these questions between the provincial and Dominion governments. We should bring upon ourselves exactly the same condition of affairs in the North-west Territories. If any settlement were made which it would be possible to get this House

to ratify, within twelve months you would have the territorial government asking for better terms and for a re-opening of the financial situation. From my experience in the west, I venture to say that that is what would happen. I feel confident that if some hon. gentlemen who have agitated for autonomy, will quietly think of the matter, they will agree with me that this would probably be the result. So, we should not be in a better position if they were given autonomy. We have already given them responsible government. To all intents and purposes they have the advantages of provincial life, except that they do not look after the administration of justice, registry office or the police force. This is a great financial relief to them. One or two things like the registry office we would be prepared to hand over to them if they desire.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sifton) be good enough to inform the House what the exact status would be if the provincial autonomy were granted. I am not as familiar with the legislation as the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have responsible government, but the jurisdiction of the government is defined specifically by the Act of this government. There are, as I have said, certain departments in which they have no jurisdiction, one being the police, another the administration of justice and another the registry office. This last is a small matter, as I say, which might be turned over without discussion. We get a little surplus revenue out of the registry offices, but it might readily be admitted that they might have it. These are the three principal subjects with regard to which they have no jurisdiction, which occurred to me at the present moment. My hon. friend will see, without provincial status, they have no power to incur debt, and I am not sure that that is an unmixed evil. Let the House consider that a moment——

Mr. SCOTT. Is there really any difference with regard to the police in the state of the territory and the state of the provinces ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Speaking from recollection, I think there are only two clauses in the constitution under which the police jurisdiction of the provinces arises. The province has control over municipal institutions, which has been held in some cases, I think, to give a certain amount of police power. In addition, the province has power over the administration of justice. That is in reality the clause in the constitution which gives the provinces the power to do and to control police work. The North-west Territories have not the power under the present condition of things, that power being held by the government here.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This government retains control of mines and land and minerals ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Of all the Crown lands.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In that respect the position differs from that of a province.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. From the position of the original provinces. The only two portions of Canada where the Crown lands belong to the Dominion are the province of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, including, of course, the Yukon. The control of the administration of justice and police by the Dominion governmens brings upon this government very great expense, caused very largely by the present peculiar circumstances of the case. The proportionate expense would be nothing like the same if there was a large population in the territories. The position would be very substantially changed if there was a reasonably large population in that district. On the question of the power to incur indebtedness, I speak with some deference. I do not wish to express the idea that the people of the North-west Territories are not as competent to conduct their own affairs as the people of any other portion of Canada, for I think they are. But it must not be forgotten by a body like the House of Commons who are responsible for what may happen in the future, that you have there a very sparse population of about two hundred thousand people situated in a vast and very rich territory. If they had the power to mortgage that territory for all time to come, which they would have if they were granted provincial powers, it might be mortgaged for very unwise and very unnecessary purposese. In saying this, I wish to guard against the imputation of saying that the people of the North-west Territories are not as capable of taking care of themselves and doing their own business as any others. But I say it is a fair subject for consideration for this parliament whether the time has come when power should be given to the people of the North-west Territories to incur indebtedness.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has stated that if the government entered into any financial arrangement with the North-west Territories to form it into a province, the financial arrangement that the government would make would not last long, that the new province would be here in a short time, asking for better financial arrangements. Here is what they say, if the hon. gentleman will allow me :

A subsidy of $50,000 and 80 cents per head on the estimated population of 250,000 is asked for at the outset, with an increase at the same rate until paid on a population of 1,396,091, which is what the province of Ontario is paid on.

Now, coupling that agreement to be entered into with the statement made by the hon. gentleman that the increase of population will be so vast that he thinks it is necessary to delay this whole matter, I want to point out that when the territories start in with $50,000 at the outset, and 80 cents per head for every additional person coming in, the subsidy will increase very fast until they come to the limit of the sum paid to the province of Ontario.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend will not find that his inference is justified by the facts, if he infers that the result of the increase in population would enable the people of the North-west Territories adequately to discharge their financial responsibility by an allowance for government fixed simply upon the number of population arrived at in the way suggested by Mr. Haultain. Mr. Haultain's confidence in the ability of the North-west Territories to discharge their financial obligations is, I think, derived much more largely from certain other clauses of his Bill, the clause, for instance, which suggests that they should have control of all the mines, timber and royalties thereon, and the clause which suggests that $1 an acre should be given them for all the land grants in the North-west Territories. I think if those grants were provided for they would be able to get along very well.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing the hon. gentleman entered into an arrangement to grant every prayer they asked, does he intimate that they would not be satisfied with that arrangement, and that they would be back in a short time for additional money ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, the hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say that if they got everything they asked they would not be satisfied, I had no idea of suggesting that. On the contrary, I think if parliament were prepared to give them all they asked in that Bill, they would be willing to stay away for quite a while. I think if they got an allowance of a trifle over a million dollars a year it would be a very adequate allowance.

Mr. INGRAM. I will put it in another way. Supposing this government and the North-west authorities entered into an agreement, agreed upon by both parties, does the hon. gentleman mean to say that that agreement would be broken within a short period, and that they would be back here for an additional amount ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The experience of the government is that in governmental matters you cannot make a bargain, agreed to by both parties, that will bind people not to come back again if it does not meet the necessities of the case. If it does not enable them to discharge their financial responsibility, then they will come back. It does not make any difference whether you make a bargain with them or not, they will come back any way.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman says that if they did enter into an agreement with them they would come back in a short time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question whether they would come back for further assistance depends upon whether you make a permanent arrangement which will enable them properly to discharge the functions they have to discharge. My hon. friend will see that my argument has been to show that circumstances are changing so fast that the wisdom of man cannot devise any arrangement, such as this parliament would sanction, which at the present time would enable them to discharge the financial requirements of their position.

Mr. INGRAM. The longer you wait the more difficulties there will be, I suppose.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not at all. I think for the next few years circumstances will change very rapidly in the North-west Territories, and I think that when they acquire a population of 600,000 or 700,000, which may not be very far away, then we shall have arrived at a position of affairs in which parliament can fairly understand what is ahead of the territories, and can fairly address themselves to the question of permanently settling the financial status of those territories.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of the Interior has referred to the very explicit statement or demand by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), with regard to the amount of subsidy. I will mention to him, however, that the views of my hon. friend from Alberta with regard to the granting of provincial autonomy to these territories, do not seem to be quite so clear ; because, so far as I was able to understand that hon. gentleman, he said that if we passed a Bill for that purpose such as exactly suited him, it would be entirely satisfactory to him. That is about as near as he could get the hon. gentleman to commit himself.

Mr. OLIVER. Was not that clear enough?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I admire my hon. friend's caution. Now with regard to the details of the Bill, with which I am not at all familiar, as I have not had an opportunity of seeing it—I do not think those details have much to do with the question. It is a question which will have to be dealt with by this government, it is a question of course, which should be dealt with in a manner satisfactory to the territories for the time being. But because the government of the territories submits a Bill which this government does not regard as satisfactory, that of itself is hardly a sufficient reason for putting off a settlement of this question

for four or five years. I would like to say to the Minister of the Interior, that some of the reasons which he has advanced for not dealing with this question at the present time seem to be reasons for never dealing with it. He speaks of the question of population. Now we do not apprehend that population in the North-west Territories is going to stand still after the expiration of four or five years. It will probably continue to increase, at least we hope it will, at the rate of 60,000, 70,000 or 80,000 every year, and that for many years to come. My hon. friend suggests that the question should be put off four or five years, or until the population attains 600,000 or 700,000 people. Well, is there any particular reason why the people of the North-west Territories, when they have attained the number of 200,000 or 300,000, should not be entrusted with the government of their own territory? My hon. friend refers to the fact that they have a very rich country, a country of great resources. Is it not true that we may place the same confidence in the people of that country as we place in the people of other communities in Canada? Is there any special reason to suppose they will unduly mortgage their future? There is not a province in Canada that is not capable at this very moment of abusing its borowing powers so as to make itself hopelessly bankrupt, not one; and why should it be supposed that these people are any more likely to abuse their borrowing powers than the people of Ontario, Quebec, or the maritime provinces? I am glad to note that my hon. friend regards the school question in that country as satisfactorily settled, and I trust that it is so. With regard to his view that if terms were made with that territory now these gentlemen would come again year by year, I suppose that is more an argument of convenience, from the standpoint of the government, than otherwise. It does not seem to possess much value, even from that standpoint, because the people of the North-west Territories are coming every year, as it is now, and if they should continue to come it will occasion no greater inconvenience to the government than it has in years past.

I do not see that the financial question, or the question of making an arrangement on a per capita basis, if it is an adequate reason now, will not be an adequate reason in the future for preventing these territories from having self-government. My hon. friend says that it is difficult to arrange it upon a per capita basis and that even the proposal which has been suggested of holding a census at frequent intervals is not sufficient. How will my hon. friend deal with it at the expiration of four or five years? Will not exactly the same difficulty present itself then to the government that presents itself now? We do not suppose that the population of the territories will not continue to increase by leaps and bounds after the next four or five years, and will there not, therefore, always be the same difficulty that exists now? My hon. friend did not make himself very clear to me on that point, because I do not see, if there is a certain difficulty now existing which the government has to face, that it will not present itself in the future if the settlement is delayed for four or five years. There is, it seems to me, a strong reason for lending an ear to what these people demand in this respect, and it is that the people of the North-west Territories will be more adequately represented in respect to local matters if they possess provincial autonomy than they are at present. Certain branches of their government are dealt with here as my hon. friend has stated in his speech. If provincial autonomy were granted to them, if they had the right of provincial self-government, then, such matters would be dealt with in their own legislature by gentlemen who are more familiar with the wants and necessities of that country than the majority of the members of this committee. I feel, here, that the great majority of the members of this House are not adequate—if I may be pardoned for the use of the word—to the discussion of these subjects because they do not understand the country, because they do not understand the people, or their wants, or necessities as well as the people who live in that country, or as well as hon. members from that country. In that respect it would be a very important advance in the government of that country if these local matters, which are ordinarily assigned to provincial governments, should be dealt with by the people of the North-west Territories themselves, through their representatives in their own provincial assemblies. I do not pretend to have given this subject sufficient consideration to make my remarks of any great value. What I have said is merely my impression gathered from what has been placed before the committee to-night so fully and ably by my hon. friends on both sides of the House from the North-west Territories, and from statements which have been made by the hon. Minister of the Interior; but, having regard to the information which I have derived from these hon. gentlemen, it does seem to me that the hon. Minister of the Interior is inclined to unduly postpone the granting of provincial rights to the people of the North-west Territories in stating that it is not a matter which can be properly or reasonably considered until the expiration of four or five years from the present time.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to correct a wrong impression which the hon. Minister of the Interior derived from my remark about the Indian Head meeting. What I wished to convey to the committee was, while the meeting was divided as to whether the boundaries of Manitoba should be extended into the territories, or whether they should have provincial government in

the territories as they are now known, if I could gather anything from the meeting at all, it was that there was the greatest possible unanimity that some form of local government should prevail.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is time for a change.

Mr. BOYD. Apparently that is the way they viewed it. I think we must admit that it is an unfortunate thing, after the experience which the hon. gentleman, now the head of his department, has had in Manitoba, if an arrangement cannot be arrived at which will be satisfactory. There might have been some excuse in the years gone by with the government that preceded the present government in total ignoraunce of Manitoba at that time, but I think that it is unfortunate, to say the least, that at this time and with the experience that these men have had of the west, we are not able to agree on some form of government here. I am pleased that this debate has brought out something that it is quite evident was not known at the time of the Indian Head meeting. I heard many of the people say after the meeting that they were pleased to have Mr. Haultain placed in such a position that they could understand where he was. It is evident that Mr. Haultain has not been able to ascertain exactly where the hon. Minister of the Interior stood. However, I think that this debate has brought forth very clearly the fact that he, for the present, at least, is not prepared to say that they should have provincial government in the west for the next four or five years. It is quite clear that has been brought forth and also it has been brought out that the form of school legislation that they now have would have been satisfactory to him. I, for my part, trust that it may be and whatever will satisfy them will satisfy me. We have also had brought forth in the debate the fact that the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) is not in favour of a provincial government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. You are mistaken.

Mr. BOYD. Not at the present time. The hon. gentleman wants four or five years delay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not define.

Mr. BOYD. He is not very definite. We know where he stands. We know where the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) stands, but we are not so fortunate as to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). He will probably tell his constituents all about it. I am quite free to admit that if the government are not going to give the people of the North-west this form of government I will support a proposal to increase the amount of the subsidy to them. While I do not suppose it would affect the action of the present government, I do not mind telling hon. gentlemen what my position is in regard to the form of government in that country. I believe we should have two provinces in that country. The experience which we have had in the country from which the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) come, I think, shows us that a multiplicity of governments is not the wisest or the best thing to have. But, in the west, I do not think it would be wise to have three or four small governments. Nor do I believe that the people of that country, or the members of this House will be satisfied if you say to them: We propose to form one government in the North-west Territories and to constitute a province comprising 1,250,000 square miles alongside of another province with 250,000 square miles. I do not think that the people of the western country will be satisfied with that; at least, I do not believe the people of Canada will approve of it, nor do I think the people of Canada will look upon it as a fair distribution of the territory, but I do think that if it is fairly discussed and laid before the people of Canada, they will agree that there is room for two large and prosperous provinces in that country. That will be extending the boundaries of Manitoba a reasonable distance, and that each of them shall be in that way sufficiently large. I do not hesitate to say that this is my view, and the government is welcome to the benefit of it; not that I expect they will give attention to any opinion that I may express on the subject.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) has endeavoured to explain the reference he made to the feeling expressed at the Indian Head meeting. I understood him to say that the people were divided there on the question as between one or two provinces.

Mr. BOYD. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. The question as between one or two provinces in the North-west Territories on which the people are divided, is as between two provinces or one province to be made up out of the present organized territories. The Indian Head meeting was called to hear a discussion between the premier of the territories and the premier of Manitoba on the question as to whether the North-weset Territories should be formed into a province, or whether part of the North-west Territories should be placed in the province of Manitoba, which is an entirely different question. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior stated that there were various opinions amongst the people of the territories, and that in certain parts of the territories there was a feeling in favour of a portion being placed in the province of Manitoba. I would bring to the attention of the House that within the last few days this matter was voted upon in the legislative assembly at Regina, and by a practi-

cally unanimous vote the representatives of the people in the legislature there decided that they did not wish any part of the North-west Territories to be placed in the province of Manitoba. There may be a few people scattered here and there who would not object to the annexation of some part of the territories to the province of Manitoba, but the opinion as expressed by the representatives of the people in their assembly was unanimously against division of the territories, by taking away any part lying to the westward of Manitoba and adding it to that province. I do not know that this debate upon provincial autonomy in all its phases is appropriate to a discussion of this item, but let me say a word with reference to certain 'demands,' if we may call them so, or, suggestions that were made by the responsible people representing the North-west Territories. The Minister of the Interior has quoted a clause in which they practically demand—or in which they suggest, at all events—that the public resources should be handed over to the local authority. The hon. minister also said that he doubted whether any agreement which the House of Commons at the present time could be got to accept, would be such an agreement as would not compel the North-west Territories to come back here within one or two years. That simply proves to my mind that the demands or suggestions made by the government of the North-west are not unreasonable. It may be that to a majority of the members of the House of Commons at the present time, they might seem unreasonable, but if, unless these suggestions are adopted, the position is going to involve a lack of permanency in the arrangement, then we must come to the conclusion that there is reason in the suggestion made by those who represent the North-west Territories.

I dealt at some length last session with this phase of the question, devoting myself not to an argument in favour of the proposition that the time had arrived, but to some phase of the terms which I thought ought to be arranged. I say now, as I said then, that I do not believe that any arrangement will have the basis of permanency, or that any arrangement will ever be arrived at that would be satisfactory to the people of the North-west, except an arrangement by which the public resources shall be handed over to the local authority, and that they shall be placed upon the same basis as are the people of the other provinces of Canada, except the province of Manitoba. Leaving that phase of the question, and turning to the item, it is evident that the people of the North-west Territories are not going to be granted provincial autonomy this year, and that being so, the local authority needs money to carry on this year's business. I accept what has been said by my hon. friend the minister, and I am glad to have the intimation that there will be an increase brought down in the supplementary estimates. But with regard to the reply he made to my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) respecting the fact that there were two sides to the question, even with regard to the estimate; I do not know that it would be fair to adopt that statement with too great positiveness. As I endeavoured to explain at an earlier stage, this in reality at the present time, is simply one of the ordinary services which parliament is in duty bound to provide for. With regard to every other department of government, the minister has the advice of officers who are directly responsible to him, as to the money he asks the House of Commons to vote; but with regard to this particular service the Minister of the Interior has no responsible officer who is in a position to declare whether the estimates that are submitted by the North-west government are reasonable estimates or not. I therefore say that the demand that is made by the North-west government has in a great measure to be accepted as final. The North-west authorities are the people who make the estimate; they are responsible to the electors there for the amount of the estimate which they present, and therefore this service is in a different position from probably any other service that the House of Commons has to provide for. The authorities there have this year stated that they need an amount approximating $600,000. As a matter of fact, estimates were brought down in the House of Assembly at Regina last week appropriating about $600,000. I accept with pleasure the intimation of the Minister of the Interior that an increase will be provided in the supplementary estimates, and I wish again to impress upon him as strongly as I can the real necessity for a very large and substantial increase.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is early yet, only two minutes past twelve, and we have a large subject before us. Possibly we cannot do better than discuss it fully even at this late hour of the night. To my mind we have a very serious problem to settle in the North-west. I look upon this question as one that will require the very best consideration this government can give to it. A new population is coming in to the North-west Territories; coming in from various countries, and no doubt that population will demand increased rights. To my mind, so long as the people of the North-west Territories consider themselves only as wards of this government, no spirit of self-reliance will ever assert itself amongst them. They will realize that they are dependant on us for the little bit of money we choose from year to year to dole out to them, and instead of becoming a great people, they will feel that they are simply the wards of the rest of the Dominion. Now, I would regard that as a matter of considerable importance. The sooner these people realize that they stand on the same basis as all other portions of the Dominion, the better it will

be for Canada. Who has a right to say when provincial autonomy should be given to the North-west ? I do not claim that we here have any right to dictate to those people or coerce the North-west Territories to any form of government. When confederation was brought about we obtained our charter from the parliament of Great Britain ; but the parliament of Great Britain did not pass the British North America Act until the people of Canada asked it to do so; and when that parliament was asked by the people of Canada to crystallize into law a constitution for the united provinces, it did not hesitate to do so ; and it framed that constitution, I believe, entirely on the basis which we desired. Now, we stand in relation to the North-west Territories very much in the same position that the parliament of Great Britain did to the old provinces of Canada ; and to my mind, when the people of the North-west demand provincial autonomy, this parliament had better not hesitate one minute, but give them what they desire. I believe that will be better for the Dominion as a whole, and materially better for those people, more especially for the new population who are coming in, and who will join in giving effect to the new form of government which will be permanent ; and there will be a greater spirit of independence among the people. They will realize that they have their rights, that they are Canadians in the true sense of the word, and they will become better citizens. For my part, I would not for a single day withhold provincial autonomy from those people after we learn that they desire it. There seems to be some difference of opinion amongst the hon. members who come from that section of the country as to what the people of the North-west do desire. One hon. member says that in his section they are opposed to provincial autonomy, and other members say that the people in their sections take the opposite view. To my mind the best guide we can get is the government of the North-west Territories. Mr. Haultain, the Prime Minister of those territories, is certainly more immediately in touch with the requirements of that country and the sentiments of the people on the question than hon. members representing that country in this parliament. I find, in a letter which he has written to the hon. Minister of the Interior only within the past few weeks, he says :

> I am prepared to say that the time has arrived when the question of organizing the territories on a provincial basis ought to be a subject of serious consideration.

Mr. Haultain, we are told, is a good ruler and administrator, has economically handled every dollar handed over to him, stands high in the estimation of the people, has been kept in power for a considerable length of time, and seems to voice the requirements of the country. Therefore I am disposed to attach considerable weight to what he says.

We are told by our friends from the North-west Territories that there would be no cry if a sufficient amount of money were given by this parliament to the North-west Territories to meet their expenses. I am not sure that the whole thing is a matter of money. I think there is some sentiment above that. Those people realize that they are simply the children of the Dominion, being taken care of by the rest of the Dominion, that they have no such status as we have in Ontario, in Quebec or in the small province of Prince Edward Island. They feel that they are the wards of the nation, like the Indians, that we give them so much money and send police out to look after them. In that way they feel that they are not citizens of this great Dominion to the same extent as the people of all the other provinces. I have no objection to vote more money to the North-west Territories. I think the present allowance is too small for their growing needs, and I do not think the government will meet with any opposition if they increase the grant. At any rate, we cannot afford to have those people feel that they are not treated fairly. We shall have to submit very largely to what they determine to be best in their own interest, and if we can satisfy them more readily by giving them provincial autonomy than by giving them a larger grant. I would say, give them provincial autonomy, and let us satisfy them in the best way we can. But if hon. gentlemen stand out and say that the time has not arrived for provincial autonomy, and that further demands must be made on the treasury of this country, in order that adequate assistanec, as we are told, may be given to them to meet their requirements, the best thing they can do to obtain that adequate assistance, is to join in giving adequate protection to the industries in the east where a large part of this money comes from, and then they will have better hope of fulfilling their expectations. Hon. members from the west must sink some of these small ideas which they have, and become men of broad minds ; and when they want to get an adequate sum to carry on the affairs of their country, they must deal on adequate terms with the rest of the Dominion, where a large part of the money is raised.

I hope the day is not far distant when we will realize that another great province has been added to the Dominion. If there is the slightest fear that there is going to be trouble in the west over the question, I hope that the government will at once take the matter into their most serious consideration. They should not have allowed the simple matter of the Finance Minister having to go on a pleasure trip to England, or the visit of a royal personage to Canada, or any reason of that kind to prevent their taking up this question. Let us have the question settled before any trouble arises which might perhaps cause another rebellion in the North-west.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we might very well now adjourn. In any case there is no quorum, and considerable business has been done.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 21, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ORTHODOX RUSSO-GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta) moved that the report of the Committee on Standing Orders on a petition of the Right Rev. Tikhon for an Act of incorporation under the name of 'the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church' be referred back to the said committee for obtaining their recommendation for the introduction of the Bill, notwithstanding rule 49.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). This petition has already been twice referred to the Standing Orders Committee. The first time the committee reported that the rules of the House had not been complied with, and then my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) moved that it be referred back to the said committee for reconsideration. The committee has reconsidered the petition, and instead of amending their first report, they call the attention of the House to further objections to the petition, to the fact that the petitioner is not a British subject, and is not living in the British possessions, but that he is a resident of San Francisco, and an alien, as he admits himself in his petition. Now I do not know whether my hon. friend expects that this committee will stultify itself by making a different report than that which it has already twice made. Moreover, I do not know that the rules of the House will admit that this report may be referred back to the same committee without giving any reasons therefor. There is no reason adduced, there is no instruction asked to be given to the committee. The committee has considered the question twice very attentively, and I may say that the officers of the Crown were present at its meetings. In the first place the Solicitor General (Hon. Mr. Carroll), and in the second place both the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick)) and the Solicitor General were present, and the last report of the committee was made, in fact, at the suggestion of the Minister of Justice himself. I am not usually a supporter of the government, but on this occasion I think I will have to support them. I am not at all objecting to the incorporation of the Russo-Greek Church, but I think this should be done in a regular way, in such a way that the people who are most interested should know what is taking place. We are asked to incorporate a bishop, a foreigner, who resides in San Francisco, and who claims to be Bishop of the Greek Church in North America and of the Aleutian Islands, he wants to be recognized as such in his petition, and he wants to control the Greek Church in Canada. While my objections are perhaps not relevant to the point of order, I desire to say that in this very important matter we ought to make haste slowly. The committee has taken all these questions into consideration and found everything irregular. The petition itself that came before the Committee on Standing Orders is not even endorsed by the member who presented it to the House, there is no responsible name to the petition, it is irregular in every way, and we cannot expect that the Committee on Standing Orders will stultify itself by reconsidering for the third time a question they have already sufficiently considered. I am not a member of that committee, and, contrary to the statement made by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton), I did not take advantage of my position as a member of the committee to bring about the report which was made. I was there as a private member, and I was there as a representative of a portion of the population that it is sought to incorporate without their knowledge. I have one or two thousand of these people in my riding, and it is for that reason that I protest against the way things are arranged, and the way in which the incorporation has been sought. I raise the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and I ask your decision upon it.

Mr. OLIVER. May I make a statement, or at least give the hon. member some information in regard to the motion that I have made? I understood him to say that it was indefinite, that the Bill was asked to be reported without consideration. My motion asks that the Bill be referred to the committee for the purpose of getting the committee to recommend the Bill for the consideration of the House. We understand that that was the understanding of the House, and I supposed it was the understanding of the committee. There has been a mistake somewhere, I think. The committee has reported on the Bill, but has not reported the Bill, which I understand was the intention of the committee. The report of the Committee on Standing Orders may be found on page 338 of the Votes and Proceedings, and is as follows :—

In obedience with the Order of the House of the 15th instant, your committee have again taken into consideration the petition of the Right Reverend Tikhon, of the city of San Francisco, California, bishop of the Orthodox

Russo-Greek Catholic Church, for North America and the Aleutian Islands, for an Act of incorporation. The attention of your committee having been drawn to the fact that the petitioner in this case is, by his own admission, an alien, living in a foreign land, and desiring as such to be created a corporation sole within the Dominion of Canada, they beg to report the same for the information of your House.

Now I read that report as reporting the Bill to the House. But I am informed that another construction can be placed upon it, and that it does not report the Bill to the House ; and that therefore the Bill is not and cannot properly come before the House without further consideration by the committee. As I read the report the Bill is reported to the House, but in deference to the views of other parties I have to ask the House to refer it back to the committee so that there may be no mistake.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). As chairman of the committee, I may say that there is a little misunderstanding. The point having been called to the attention of the committee that the petitioner appeared, on the face of the petition, to be a non-resident of Canada, I understood the committee to decide that the point should be called to the attention of the House and that only, as regards notice the petition is all right, but that the point should be called to the attention of the House; therefore, nothing more was said and the petition was accepted with that understanding. Of course, there was a haziness about it. My own impression is that when it was considered it was the intention that the petition should go before the House in the usual way and that the committee should simply call the attention of the House to that particular point in order that it might be considered by the House. As far as that point is concerned the committee expresses no opinion, but I think it would be well that it should go back to the committee to have the question settled as to whether the committee intended to recommend the Bill in calling attention to that point.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly evident from the proceedings which have come before the House in connection with this Bill, that technical objections are sought to be raised as against this Bill for the purpose of preventing the House from considering its merits. In the first place we had the objection raised as to insufficiency of notice. It went back and it was perfectly evident that the notice was substantially sufficient. When the question of the residence of the petitioner was suggested, it was of course admitted by everybody that it was a question either for the House, itself, to consider, or for the House to consider through its committee on private Bills. But, what is attempted now is to prevent the House from considering that fact altogether. This House, itself, either in proper session, or through its committee on private Bills, ought to consider objections such as those that have been raised. If the objection to the consideration of this Bill be raised under a rule of the House, then, it is quite clear, that it is not customary to enforce that rule. The precedents upon the subject are quite clear. I would ask your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Bourinot, page 320 :

Aliens, not resident in this country, have strictly no right to petition parliament. In the case of applications for private bills, however, this rule is not enforced. It was agreed in 1878, at the suggestion of Mr. Speaker Anglin, to receive a petition from the Hartford directors of the Connecticut Mutual Insurance Company, on the ground that it was a mutual company, partly composed of Canadians, and that it was the subject of parliamentary legislation, the company being required to make a certain deposit before doing business in the country. In 1883, a petition from certain persons in the city of Portland in the state of Maine, asking for an Act of incorporation, was received on the ground that the subject matter came within the jurisdiction of the House, as in the case already cited. The reception of such petitions may be considered as an act of grace.

While a petition has been presented and has gone to the Committee on Standing Orders, I understand that the members of the committee and the promoter of the Bill understood that the Bill was being reported to the House. After it had gone to them, as was quite proper, it was called to the attention of the committee that the petitioner was an alien and they desired to call the attention of the House to the fact, so that the House might consider it and might, in its judgment, agree to the usual grace being extended to this petition. I submit that the House ought not to put this petitioner in the position of not being able to get before us at all. Having complied with the rules so far as notice is concerned, having done everything that the law requires him to do, and the Bill having been passed upon by the Standing Orders Committee, he should be put in the position of being able to come before the House and of having it decided by the House whether his Act of incorporation should be passed or not. Certainly, he has that right, and every person who comes asking for legislation has that right. If this House decides that it will not extend the usual grace to him but that on the ground that he is an alien it will refuse to give him the legislation which he requires, and I am not going to assume that the House will decide in that way at all, he certainly has a right to have a decision from the House. If it be necessary under the terms of the report, as the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has read it—that is a matter upon which you, Mr. Speaker, will rule—if it be necessary that the Bill shall go back to the Standing Orders Committee in order that the committee may amend this report, I submit, that it is only fair and just to the petitioner that he should

have a decision from this House on the merits of his Bill.

Mr. D. C. FRASER (Guysborough). I think there is only one matter before the House and that is: Does the report convey what the committee agreed to? I certainly understood that the committee was to report the Bill with the statement that they did this for the information of the House, because the petitioner had, in the petition, represented himself as a citizen of the United States, and that the matter would come up in connection with the Bill. Certainy, I agree that the Bill should not be left with the committee without coming back at all. The question is: Does the report of the committee bring back the Bill to this House? I think it is very doubtful. I think that while I would inquire into the standing of this man that the Bill ought to come back here as the committee agreed and then we will take action. I do not say that I will vote for the Bill, but, if it comes back, it will come back from the committee, and, as I understand, they were to report on the Bill, adding the words that were there. As we have had the report the committee do not report the Bill at all. I think we should have the Bill reported.

Mr. SPEAKER. Objection is raised to this motion which has been made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) and which demands that the report of the committee presenting this petition shall be referred back to the Committee on Stand-Orders. If I understand the situation, a petition was presented some time ago by this reverend gentleman, and was received by the House. The petition has been actually received by the House and has been referred to the Standing Orders Committee. Now, I think also that the petition, even though it be signed by an alien, can be received by this House if the House is disposed to receive it. I see that in many instances, especially concerning private Bills, petitions signed by some aliens have been received. This petition has been before the Standing Orders Committee, a report has been made upon it and the report according to the motion is not satisfactory. I think that the motion to refer back that report to the committee is absolutely in order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The only thing referred to this House is a particular fact regarding the Bill, and the Bill is before the committee yet to report on it or not as they see fit. In view of this, I submit with great respect that this motion is entirely irregular. The committee have not technically reported on the Bill, but only on a fact in connection with it, and the House can deal with that or not as they see fit. I submit that there is nothing in the world to prevent the committee proceeding to deal with this Bill just as if this fact had not been reported to the House.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—EXPENDITURE FROM 1895.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I wish to give notice that I will move to-morrow the motion which stands in my name.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I thought the Minister of Railways was to make his statement to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not until after the committee reports.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very well.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 119) to further amend the Yukon Territory Act. He said: The first section of this Bill changes the wording of the clause which gives the Commissioner in Council of the Yukon territory jurisdiction, and the effect of the change is that in case of a conflict between an ordinance passed by the Governor in Council and an ordinance passed by the Commissioner in Council, the ordinance passed by the Governor in Council shall prevail. It is simply for the purpose of avoiding unnecessary litigation where there is a dispute in regard to jurisdiction. The Bill also gives the local council of the Yukon territory the control and regulation of the sale of intoxicating liquors in the territory. It will be observed by the House that that clause does not affect the section in the Act which deals with the manufacture of liquor in the Yukon territory. The second section refers to the sittings of the court. The third section makes an important change in connection with the local council of the territory. It is the view of the government that matters have now arrived at the stage at which a further measure of representative government may be extended to the Yukon territory, and it is therefore provided in accordance with the application of the Yukon council: That instead of two elected representatives in the local council there shall hereafter be five. The fourth section of the Bill amends the clause which relates to the powers of the Governor in Council respecting the territories. The amendment as drawn removes the prohibition as against the Governor in Council imposing a tax in that territory, but I desire to explain to the House that this clause was drafted by error, and I will ask an amendment to be made, the exact terms of which I will announce on the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many members will compose the council under this Bill?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There are five appointed members now, and

there will be five elected; with the commissioner.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 120) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: I need not explain in detail the different sections of this Bill, but the purport of it and the effect of it if passed will be: To provide that hereafter sales of land and homestead entries which may be granted in the North-west Territories shall be subject to the provision that the government of the North-west Territories may open a road not more than 66 feet wide and comprising not more than 5 per cent of the particular parcel of land in question, without paying anything for the right of way. That is to say: Homestead entries and sales shall be subject to the right of the government of the North-west Territories to open a road across the lands sold. It is found that a large number of roads have to be opened by the government other than on the road allowances, and the difficulty of opening these roads is largely increased by demands for compensation for the right of way. I have thought that we should assist them to the best of our ability by providing that hereafter, lands when sold shall be subject to the right of the North-west government to open a road without paying anything for the right of way. The details are worked out in the Bill. There was formerly a similar provision with respect to the right of way of the Canadian Pacific Railway so that there is no special difficulty in practice in working this arrangement out.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACT—AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 121) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories. He said: The intention of this Bill is to give the Legislative Assembly of the North-west power to pass ordinances in regard to road allowances which have been handed over to the territorial governments. There is also provision as to the returns of the survey being filed after the change in road allowances is made.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 122) to further amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of aliens.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. SMITH (Vancouver). The object of the amendment which I propose by this Bill, is to put the enforcement of the Alien Labour Act in charge of the Minister of Labour, instead of the Attorney General as now. I propose to amend the Act so as to give effect to section 6. The House will remember that since certain amendments were made to the Alien Labour Act last session, the government have interpreted the law to mean that they have nothing at all to do with the enforcement of the Act. The amendment in this Bill will give effect to section 6, so that the government will be called upon to send out their commissioner at the request of the labour unions to investigate any complaint with regard to the importation of alien labour into the country, and to report on each case, and if necessary deport them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

List of shareholders of chartered banks.—The Minister of Finance.

Report of commissioners appointed to inquire into the alleged paper combine.—The Minister of Finance.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 69) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

On section 11,

Mr. OLIVER moved:

That section 11 of the said Bill be amended by striking out the words, 'at such rates as may be fixed by agreement.'

He said: I do not wish to detain the committee; but this section incorporates the railway company as an irrigation company. I have no objection to that whatever; but as the only irrigation district in Canada is within the constituency which I represent and the adjoining constituency, I feel bound to be satisfied as to what the law is in regard to irrigation in that district. It seems to me that the words which I have moved to strike out conflict with the general Irrigation Act, chapter 35 of 1898, section 51 of which provides that 'the minister may regulate from time to time the water rates which may be charged by licensees, and the publication of tariffs of rates.' My contention is that if we empower the company specifically in this Act to charge such rates as may be agreed upon, we relieve them from the control of the general Irrigation Act in that particular, which I need hardly say is

the most important provision in the Act. I am anxious to have this question clearly decided before allowing the section to pass. If the words of the section do not conflict with the provision in the general Act, then I wish to withdraw all opposition to it; but if there is a possibility of these words conflicting with that vital power in the general Act, then I would respectfully ask that they be struck out.

Mr. SCOTT. The power to be conferred by section 11 of this Bill is, I understand, to be exercised wholly within the district of Alberta, and the district which I represent. I may say that I have no objection to urge generally. On the contrary, I am very pleased to know that a strong company like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, having financial ability, has in contemplation the construction and operation of irrigation works, likely to largely promote the development of the country. But while I have no objection to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company obtaining the powers of an irrigation company, I have objection to them being put in a position different from that of other irrigation companies already organized, or which may hereafter be organized. Other companies are under the general irrigation laws subject to public control of rates. It may be that the words which we move to strike out of section 11 do not relieve the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from such control, but if the words do not have this effect, then it seems to me they are wholly unnecessary. At all events they may serve to cast a doubt, and give rise to difficulty. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as an irrigation company, is to be exactly on the footing of other companies, the words which we wish to be struck out are unnecessary.

Mr. GUTHRIE. This matter was fully considered when the Bill was in committee, and if hon. members will study the clause they will find that it only applies to lands now owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway. As regards their own lands the company can surely claim the right, which any individual enjoys, of making what agreements they please for the furnishing of water, but the moment they seek to go off their own lands, or in what are known as the even number sections, the general Irrigation Act will apply to them as well as it does to other companies. The saving clause which defines the whole position is the following:

> At such rates as may be fixed by agreement, and for the purposes aforesaid, generally exercise the powers of irrigation.

That puts it beyond reasonable doubt that the moment that company seek to irrigate lands not their own they will come within the scope of the general Act.

Mr. OLIVER. The ownership of lands does not relieve the owner from the control of the government in the sale or disposal of the water, which is specifically declared by the Act to be the property of the Crown. The owner is given the privilege of selling that which belongs to the public, but only at such a price as may be fixed by the Minister of the Interior. It makes no difference, under the general Act, who owns the land. The point is that the country owns the water and has the right of fixing the rates at which that water shall be sold, and when you allow the Canadian Pacific Railway to fix its own rates, you are relieving it from the general operation of the Act and enabling it to sell public property at such figures as it may choose to fix, thus giving it a privilege by statute over every other irrigation company. That is absolutely contrary to the spirit and intention of the Irrigation Act.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). When this matter came up before the Railway Committee it had not previously attracted my attention, and when the general proposition was advanced by some member of the committee that this company, as an irrigation company, would be subject to the general Irrigation Act, I felt that except, in so far as the company might by statute be exempted from the operation of that Act, the proposition was well stated, and, in a general way, I expressed my assent to the statement of the law as made. On further consideration I am inclined to modify the view I then expressed as respects this particular portion of the clause. The company, it is true, has only asked for powers to construct irrigation works upon its own property, but the concluding portion of section 11 contemplates that the water which it may conduct through its own property, it may dispose of to municipalities or individuals who may own property adjoining or contiguous to that of the company, or be within reach of the company's operations. In that case it does not strike me that the company is simply providing water to persons who may occupy its own property but is obtaining a general irrigating power. And when they do so supply all persons outside, I would think it only reasonable and just that the provisions of the general law should apply, which says that the rates shall be fixed in accordance with its provisions. In that view, the words which are proposed to be struck out by the motion, it seems to me, might properly be struck out, so I support the amendment. I think there is no difficulty or trouble at all likely to arise from that, because the provisions of the general law are ample to enable this company which is supplying the general public to do so under as favourable circumstances as any other irrigation company that may be incorporated.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill, as amended, reported; read the third time, and passed.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN AND ST. LAWRENCE SHIP CANAL COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 103) respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 1,

Mr. LaRIVIERE. At the request of the party acting on behalf of the company, who have met this morning in Montreal, and in the absence of Mr. Geoffrion, I would move that the names of Thomas Craig, of Montreal, and W. Dale Harris, of Ottawa, be added to the list of directors. I take it that there will be no objection.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill, as amended, reported; read the third time, and passed.

THE NORTH SHORE POWER, RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the North Shore Power, Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

On the preamble,

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has this Bill anything to do with the North Shore Navigation Company?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not the slightest.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Are not the terms somewhat confusing? There is already a company incorporating the North Shore Navigation Company.

Mr. McCARTHY. Their place of business is going to be down east of the Saguenay, 300 miles below Quebec. I don't think there is any chance of their coming into conflict.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Not the slightest.

On section 6,

Mr. ROSAMOND. I think these are altogether too wide powers to give to any company. Everything under the sun is taken in.

Mr. McCARTHY. I could not hear what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rosamond) said. I am in charge of the Bill if the hon. gentleman wants any explanations.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What explanation or excuse is there for giving such extensive powers to this company? About every trade and business in the country is to be carried on by this company.

Mr. McCARTHY. The power, as far as manufacturing industries is concerned, is limited to the territory east of the Saguenay river on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. The territory is an absolute wilderness. The incorporators of this company have purchased about 600 miles of limits, they have acquired a water power on the Marguerite river and their business operations will be carried on at Bay of Seven Islands. That company is going into a district in which there is no habitation, which is an absolute wilderness and it will have to develop as it goes ahead. While the powers which it asks for are considerable, I think the hon. gentlemen will agree with me that, having regard to the circumstances, they are not too great. They will enter there and they will immediately have to put up a saw mill and a pulp mill as the limits will require both a saw mill and a pulp mill. They may find in that district clay out of which they can make brick and tile and they require the power that is given in the Bill for the purpose of enabling them to manufacture their own brick for the erection of buildings and other uses. They may find certain kinds of ore which can be manufactured there. Perhaps my hon. friend will agree with me when I say, that if they take sheep down there and find that they propagate and increase they may be allowed to sheer these sheep and manufacture the wool into material for the clothing of their employees.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What about the cotton mills?

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not know that they have discovered any cotton in that district. Having these matters in view the committee did not think the powers they were conferring upon this company were too great; in fact it was stated, that people who have the nerve to put their money into an enterprise of this kind and purchase the licenses and the territory upon which they are going to operate, asking no concessions from any body, ought to be encouraged to the fullest extent.

Mr. MONK. We should encourage them, but it seems to me that these powers are very extensive. I do not know all about that district, but it is a very wealthy district. There is very large mineral and timber wealth and I think there are companies already organized to work in that district. Although we must give the greatest encouragement to parties who are willing to invest their capital down there, we must not lose sight of the fact that this is a very rich district in natural resources. If my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) reads section 6 he will find that this company is authorized to do almost anything—build canals, for instance. Where will these canals be built?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is only for power purposes. The company's works are on the river six miles from the Bay of Seven Islands.

Mr. MONK. I am very glad to see a company extending its operations down there but I am afraid that these powers are too various and too numerous.

Mr. McCARTHY. Speaking as an Ontario member I may say that we are very sorry to lose them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it would be simpler to enumerate two or three things that the company may not do and say that it may do everything else. I do not observe any restrictions upon the operations of this company at all. My hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) says they are restricted to a particular area. Where is that ?

Mr. McCARTHY. It is in the amendment, —east of the Saguenay river on the north shore of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you go far enough east on the Saguenay river you can come round to it again and that practically takes in the whole earth.

Mr. McCARTHY. You cannot stay on the north shore of the St. Lawrence and come around to it again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me absolutely unrestricted as to territory. Take only one of these clauses in the Bill and you will find a numerous variety of things in which this company may engage : The company may :

(b.) carry on the business, in all its branches, of manufacturing pulp wood, pulp, paper and all other business incident thereto ; and also the business of manufacturing and burning of bricks, tiles, drain pipes, terra cotta and other materials from clay ; and also the business of general merchants and general contractors ; and also the business of general manufacturers, millers, common carriers, wharfingers, warehousemen, and may construct, charter, acquire and navigate steam and other vessels between any port and place in Canada, and any other port or place in Canada or elsewhere ;

This is only one of many sections.

Mr. McCARTHY. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) would like to discuss the Bill clause by clause I think I could satisfy him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think some special reason ought to be advanced for giving a company such an enormous variety of powers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) what possible objection, from a public standpoint, there can be to giving these powers to a company to carry on the business enumerated in that clause ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Sutherland) a question. Why not incorporate the company under some general form of this kind : The company may carry on any business it sees fit in any part of the world ? Would the hon. gentleman think that a desirable class of legislation ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have not that power. As far as Canada is concerned, in my humble opinion, an enterprise of this kind must prove a public benefit. It is always difficult for me to understand why, when a Bill comes before the House incorporating a company which is raising capital to develop the country in a legitimate business way, there should be so much discussion and so much opposition to it. I believe it would be in the interest of the companies and in the interest of the public if we were to incorporate companies of this kind in a very simple way, making them subject to the laws of the country. I believe that almost every limitation is against the interests of the public and I believe that legislation interfering with enterprises of this kind which is supposed to be in the interest of the public and against the interests of the corporation, is very frequently against the interests of the public. Such limitations are not imposed upon companies in other countries doing business here. These companies, if they go on at all, simply go on by evading the law if the limitation put upon them is found to hamper their operations too severely. I feel very much interested in this class of legislation and I should like to know why we should not follow the example of England and the United States and give more liberal terms to companies like this which are investing their capital and carrying on a legitimate business in the country.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume that the powers conferred on this company could have been conferred upon it by the legislature of Quebec. It need not have come here at all for these powers and I take it that this House will be chiefly interested in securing the rights of the Dominion in this territory. There are very many parts of Quebec in which there are waterways and other resources of value to Canada as a whole, that might possibly be interfered with to the detriment of any similar company.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know if there is anything of that kind.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). As long as these interests are safeguarded I think the conferring of these powers would be all right.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think this Bill must have been before the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee and that it did not get so far as the Railway Committee, because I have been attending the Railway Committee—

Mr. McCARTHY. It is reported from the Private Bills Committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, I am right in my conjecture. My interest in the Bill before the committee is as to how far the railway portion of it has been properly safeguarded. I see that power is taken also to 'maintain, construct, use and operate canals.' That language is very general.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is limited to the country below the Saguenay.

You will not be able to build any canals down there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I see also that the Bill states that the Railway Act is not to be applicable. If that has been amended so as to include the application of such provisions of the Railway Act as would be proper and necessary, I would not have any serious objection to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That section is amended.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have seen the Bill since it came to the House, and I do not see that the ordinary clauses of the Railway Act which are made applicable to railway undertakings apply in this Bill, but only certain amendments which were made to the general Railway Act in 1890.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is so. If the members of this committee understood the conditions under which this company will be called upon to operate, they would realize that there is nothing dangerous in the powers conferred in this Bill. The operations of the company are limited to that territory on the north shore of the St. Lawrence which is east of the Saguenay river. That means that they are going into a country that is at the present time almost absolutely a barren desert.

Mr. MONK. Not barren.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have fished and hunted over this part of the country and there is not one inhabitant to a hundred square miles. Perhaps the word barren does not apply, but there is practically nothing there except timber, minerals and fish. There is, however, in that district possibly the best harbour on the St. Lawrence, east of Quebec, and known as the Bay of Seven Islands ; a bay which is 25 miles wide, and which is the only harbour of refuge on the north shore of the St. Lawrence east of Tadousac. These gentlemen have bought 1,000 miles of limits down in that territory and it is their intention to develop these limits. They have also acquired a very extensive water power. Up to the present time, almost all the pulp wood of that territory has been exported to the United States, but the intention is to populate that country so that we may manufacture our own timber into pulp. They must have means to export that pulp. This territory is absolutely inaccessible for seven months in the year, and for the other five months it is only accessible by water, there being a bi-monthly service by steamer from Quebec. The territory of this company does not extend as far as the Bay of Seven Islands but they have acquired a stretch of land fronting on the bay where they propose to build wharfs, and to which they wish to have communication by a railway, ten or twelve miles long, in order that they may bring their pulp down to the harbour. A mile, or a mile and a half back from the shore there is nothing but mountains, so that this short railroad must run alongside the shore. It is absolutely necessary that they should have this railway to the Bay of Seven Islands in order to export the products of their mills. I said that the country was barren, and I was perhaps very properly corrected by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). The country is not barren, but it is practically uninhabited and it will be necessary for the company to bring people down there and to provide them all the necessaries of life. They therefore ask to have a grist mill, to have a farm, and to have all these things which are necessary to start this new company in a country which at the present time affords absolutely no facilities for business. While these powers may appear extraordinary, I would remind the House that they are limited to this territory on the north shore of the St. Lawrence east of the Saguenay, and the company is not going to enter into serious competition with industries in other parts of Canada. Suppose that even they had power to operate a cotton mill, they could not compete with cotton mills elsewhere. I would point out that last year this House gave just as extensive powers to the Ottawa and Hull Power Company, and moreover, they gave to that company the right to operate throughout the whole of Canada and elsewhere.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What Bill was that ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Chapter 108, 1 Edward VII. In view of the fact that we have limited the operations of this company to the territory I have described, and in view also of the precedent created last year, I think we can well afford to let this Bill go through.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not wish to be understood as endeavouring to create any difficulty about the passing of this Bill. It may be quite true that this territory is comparatively unpeopled to-day and there may be no town or villages and no public highways, but if there be even one public highway it is liable to be crossed by the railway.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Draw the amendment the way you want it.

Mr. McCARTHY. The railway is only ten miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But ten miles of railroad may cross at least one highway, and there are strong reasons why it should be subjected to the Railway Act. There may be many highways 3 or 4 years hence, and we are

creating a railway corporation with power to obstruct the highways, and we ought to see, in granting that power, that the company is made subject to all the provisions which govern railways.

Mr. WADE. I would suggest as to section 15, which provides that the Railway Act shall not apply to the company, the words be added 'except as respects the company's undertaking.'

Mr. MONK. Does not the Minister of Justice think some of these clauses are a little too general? I am glad to see that this company has succeeded in acquiring a thousand square miles of territory, because, although not inhabited much at present, it is a very rich territory. There is a pulp industry at Chicoutimi which sells its whole output to England at $18 a ton, and I think it is kept very busy. Here is a clause which states that 'the company may construct, acquire, use, maintain and operate canals, watercourses, raceways, and water powers, and construct dams, sluices, conduits and buildings in connection therewith.'

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let that power be limited, if you wish, to be exercised in connection with their enterprise.

Mr. MONK. They have also power 'to lease and acquire rights and privileges with respect to fisheries and fishing in the waters of the St. Lawrence river and gulf and streams emptying therein.' I question very much if that clause would satisfy what population there is down there. We may find this company in the position of those two powerful companies which acquired such large fishing rights in Gaspé that they are considered to-day to be a considerable deterrent to the advancement of the county.

Mr. McCARTHY. I move that subsection 'j' be amended by adding the words 'in connection with their undertaking.'

Mr. ROSAMOND. The hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill mentioned that the company are bringing down sheep, and that they propose starting a woollen factory. I think there must be an omission from that clause, because if they bring down the sheep, it would be well for them to make provision for tanning the sheepskins. Therefore, I would suggest that a tanning business be added.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have no objection.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the promoter of this Bill whether he seriously means us to carry sub-clause 'd,' which provides that the company may carry on the business of farming and stock-raising. I do not know that this parliament is accustomed to license companies to carry on a farming business. I have heard with a good deal of interest what the Minister of Justice said about the country being uninhabited; but I protest against this company going into an uninhabited country and doing all the farming there instead of bringing in immigrants. Apparently no immigrant can go into that country to engage in farming unless he deals with this corporation. I think we ought to have some restriction placed upon this company, that will bring in the policy of the immigration department of this government, so that we may know whether immigrants are to be excluded from going into that uninhabited country, unless they make such arrangements with this company as it thinks fit. It seems to me that this is nothing but a hugh trust or monopoly for that part of the country.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Will my hon. friend explain what he means when he says that this company is a trust? The Bill authorizes the company to run a farm.

Mr. LANCASTER. I ask you to restrict this company so that it will not have power to prevent any one else going there to farm.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My trouble is to understand what is in this Bill to prevent any one going there to farm.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is but one clause that prevents it. You ought to embody in the Bill a provision that the company may engage in banking.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They have a good substitute for money in that part of the country, where the people use little bits of paper called pitons. I cannot see anything in the Bill which prevents a man going there to farm. It simply gives the company the right to farm, but does not prevent any one else doing so.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is the first time I have known any incorporated company to be given that power.

Mr. WADE. This company, I think, owns a thousand miles of land. Will any hon. gentleman tell us what possible objection there is to allowing it to farm that land; or if there are any minerals there, to its being allowed to mine or smelt them; or, if there is timber, to its being allowed to cut that timber or manufacture it into pulp. What reason is there for preventing the company utilizing their thousand miles of territory in any may they possibly can? These gentlemen, by going into the state of New Jersey and filing their application, could have created themselves into a legal entity, and could have come here and done everything they ask for power to do under this charter. Or they could have gone to Nova Scotia and done the same thing or, I understand, in Ontario, under the Joint Stock Companies Act. Certainly they could do so with us, or they could have gone down to Maine and

have got it. Is there any objection to their working that property in every possible way, I do not care how, that will make it most productive. Hon. gentlemen make objections to this kind of charter but they do not say what their objections are or what hardship or possible wrong can be accomplished under it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume of course that this company will have an exclusive right, and that no other company or individual will be able to operate without its consent, because the company owns the land and can prevent anybody else going upon it. It seems to me then that it makes very little difference to us what power we grant it. But it is quite possible that when this company secures incorporation, it may not carry out more than a very small fraction of the powers we are giving it. It is difficult for us to know, when Bills of this kind are introduced, just what the intention is, and I have no doubt that a great many Bills are drawn up in this way, with the intention of misleading the House and causing us to believe that the parties seeking incorporation are going to do a great many things, when they only intend doing two or three. The company asks power to carry on the business of lumberers, timber merchants and manufacturers of timber and lumber in all its branches. That gives it the power to cut all the timber on its territories and possibly it will do nothing more. For my part, I do not believe it will enter into one-twentieth part of all the other undertakings, for which it seeks incorporation, and therefore I think we should limit its powers as far as possible and have them exclusively exercised for the benefit of Canadians. One restriction we should put into this Bill would be to prevent this company from exporting a single stick of pulp wood, and compel it to do all its manufacturing in this country. When it is asking for such extraordinary powers, we should hedge our grant around with everything that will compel the company to give the country something back in return instead of simply carrying away our natural products. The power in the first section will enable the company to cut all the timber on its property and export it from the country—to put as little labour into it as possible, and distribute as little money as possible in the country, which possibly would be the most profitable way for the company to conduct its operations. Before giving the company such extraordinary powers as it asks for, we should insist on some limitation in the interests of the people. I would suggest that the promoter of the Bill should agree to the insertion of a clause, which will prevent the export of pulp wood from this territory to any foreign country, and will oppose the Bill unless that be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. So far as the timber products of the company are concerned, they are entirely within the purview of the local government. When any one obtains the right to cut timber from a local government, he purchases that right subject to any restrictions which the local government may deem fit to impose from time to time. The Ontario government, for instance, some time ago prevented the export of pine logs, and altered the licenses they had given in this respect. There was a lawsuit, but the alteration was sustained, so that any man who purchases timber limits does so subject to the conditions and regulations of the Crown Lands Department of the province. Thus the purchase by this company from the Quebec government is subject to the regulations and conditions which that government may impose, and that government may impose an export duty on any pulp wood exported and not manufactured in the territory. I am informed, however, by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister that in the province of Quebec the license holders have to pay so much timber dues on the wood they cut, but if that wood is manufactured in the province, they are allowed a rebate. In Ontario the license holders have no right to export pine logs, and I think the same regulation applies also to pulp wood. When a lumber merchant purchases, as those seeking incorporation have done, he does so subject to the regulations and conditions imposed by the Minister of Crown Lands in the province of Quebec, so that I do not see why this House should interfere in the direction suggested. I might further add that the parties seeking incorporation have told me that their intention is to proceed at once to erect a large saw mill and pulp mill on the territory they have purchased and build up a large industry there. I may tell my hon. friend that his statement that these powers are asked for in order to mislead parliament is entirely incorrect. It is necessary for people who are developing a country to have these powers. The hon. gentleman well knows that when the Sault Ste. Marie Company was incorporated, it began operating in pulp. Then the proprietors discovered mineral wealth in their territory, and immediately began developing that. Then they found that they required ships for navigation purposes, and immediately began to develop in that direction. All those who have gone into the work of developing the country have learned by experience that it is necessary they should obtain the powers mentioned in this Bill. It is most important that this company should have the right to acquire ships—more so than it is to the Sault Ste. Marie Company, because there is at present only bimonthly trips by steamer to that locality and ships do not call regularly there, and probably could not be induced to go there. These people will require the necessary ships to transport their supplies and materials in and the manufactured products out, and I do not think that we ought to curtail the powers they are asking. The incor-

porators of this company are all Canadians but one. The two first named gentlemen are old Toronto men who went to New York and made money there in the paper business and who desire to develop largely the territory they have acquired. One of them is a United States citizen, but the other is still a Canadian. The other members of the company are all Toronto men of substantial means. These people have paid their money for the limits and are going to a territory, which is now practically a wilderness, for the purpose of developing it as Canadians and for Canadians.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it, if the operations of this company are to be restricted to a portion of the province of Quebec, that this parliament is asked to incorporate it ?

Mr. McCARTHY. There are several powers which they would require to have from this parliament. For instance, there is the power of navigating.

Mr. BORDEN (Hailfax). I observe that.

Mr. McCARTHY. If they do manufacture pulp to a large extent, they will probably require their own ships to bring the product to the English and European markets.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not regard that incidental consideration as a sufficient justification for the interference of this parliament. I do not know what proof was laid before the committee that it is absolutely necessary that this company, which is entirely in the embryo at present—

Mr. McCARTHY. It is only in the embryo as regards its charter. It has acquired and paid for all this territory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These gentlemen have not yet commenced to manufacture so that the company, as regards its operations, is still entirely in the embryo, and I would not suppose that it was an absolutely necessary incident of a company formed for this purpose, that it should own its own ships. But if that be the case, the proper mode would be to go the provincial legislature, which has primary jurisdiction over this matter, namely, the legislature of Quebec, and seek incorporation there in the first instance. And then, when the company has been formed, if it is necessary that it should have this power, let it come and get that incidental power from this parliament. That has been done in many cases in the past and is the proper way to legislate, it seems to me. For, what we are doing is this—in order to grant an incidental power, such as is mentioned by the hon. gentleman and which may never be exercised by the company at all, we are invading the jurisdiction of the legislature of the province of Quebec, and, without giving any voice to the representatives of the people of that province in their legislature, we are dealing with a great multitude of subjects which are properly matters to be considered by the legislature and not by the Dominion parliament at all. I would like to know from the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether he regards this as a good mode of legislation. I raised this question once before during the present session and gave my opinion that the proper mode was to go to the provincial legislature for such powers as they could give, and not for this parliament to seize jurisdiction from them. I have not changed my mind on this subject, but so far as I have been able to give consideration to the matter, that seems to me the proper way. For otherwise you usurp the functions of the provincial legislature by dealing with ninety-nine things that they could properly deal with on the plea that there is one subject concerning which the company wishes powers and which can be dealt with only by this parliament.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The organization of capital for the development of industry is one of the latest achievements of civilization. It is quite within the memory of hon. members present that companies could not be incorporated except by an Act of parliament. Men who wished to associate for the purpose of carrying on business had to come to the legislature to get their powers. It was found, after this had been carried on for some time, that no danger would be incurred, and, on the other hand every good purpose would be served if, instead of parliament dealing with these matters, power were delegated to the government. An Act was passed in this country following similar Acts passed in the mother country and elsewhere, giving the government power to grant charters for certain purposes. That Act has been in force for about twenty-five years. Now it is found too cumbrous, and a Bill has been introduced in another branch of the legislature to facilitate the creation of corporations. For my part, I cannot see what objection there can be to granting to any corporation the amplest powers to engage in business which will develop the country. I can see that there is one ground for restriction, and that is that no company should be granted a monopoly. When the question of granting a monopoly arises, that introduces another principle. But I cannot see why this company should not be organized to do business in pulp, to engage in navigation or to do anything in the way of that kind of business, especially in such a territory as that which is to be the scene of this company's operations. If there were danger that this company would come into conflict with existing interests, we should carefully study its nature, but so far as I know the provisions of the Bill, no mono-

poly is given. We give this company power to carry on its business, but I do not know any reason why another company cannot go into business right alongside of it. What wrong is done then, and what danger is involved to the interests of anybody ? I do not see that any good purpose would be served by refusing this incorporation, and, on the other hand it seems to me such a refusal might restrict the development of the country and put a damper upon the use of capital. I have followed the discussion with care, but have not heard any suggestion that there is a monopoly granted. But, if there is, we ought to attend to it. If the only objection is that the powers are too large and cover too many industries, I must say that I do not think there is force in that objection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I asked the right hon. gentleman as to the power of the provincial legislature and the advisability of our invading their jurisdiction for merely incidental purposes.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not see that we are invading any right of the legislature or that they are invading ours. We clearly have power to incorporate such a company as this, and I am strongly of opinion that it is wise for a company of this kind to seek its powers from the Dominion legislature. We can give it more extensive powers and more elasticity—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend, perhaps, is forgetting that the provincial legislatures have power to incorporate companies—

The PRIME MINISTER. So it has.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To incorporate companies for provincial objects.

The PRIME MINISTER. We also have power to incorporate companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I say that every power sought by this company could be given and should be given by the provincial legislature, except the incidental power which may never be exercised or used of carrying on the business of common carriers between Canada and other countries. Are we to invade the jurisdiction of the provincial legislature in respect of ninety-nine subjects because there is one power which may or may not be required by the company and which is within our jurisdiction ? Is it not much better to let the provincial legislature deal with these ninety-nine subjects, and then, if the hundredth power is required, let the company, having secured incorporation from the provincial legislature, come before this parliament and seek this power if it is necessary ? Is not that the better mode of legislation in the interests of good government ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know that it is. No doubt, a great deal of what is done by this parliament could be done by the provincial legislature. The hon. gentleman goes further and says that it should be done by the provincial legislature. I do not see that, in passing this Bill, we are invading a single right of the province. We give them power to do business all over the world, and this company if it is in earnest, as I understand it is, can be better served by securing its powers from this parliament than by securing them from the provincial legislature.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) if he considers the case more fully will realize that the power to carry on business as a common carrier is absolutely essential to the proper exercise of the rights conferred upon the company in other respects. The company could not get out the material necessary to their work from the Bay of Seven Islands except by the aid of navigation, nor can they hope to export their product in any other way than in steamers. Therefore, the right to carry on the business of common carriers to foreign countries and to other provinces is as essential to their business as the right to manufacture lumber.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Has the amendment been made to properly safeguard the railway interests ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. J. GIRARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the Bill which is now before the House relates to a company which is seeking to implant a new industry in the county of Chicoutimi and Saguenay. As the representative of that county, I think it my duty to say a few words on the Bill under discussion. It was my intention at first to have spoken English ; but as I am not quite familiar with the English language I thought it preferable to speak French.

The company is going into a territory which is almost an absolute wilderness, and in which there is practically nothing, except fishing, which is confined mainly to codfish. There is a very small population, and with the exception of a few fishermen and telegraph employees, it consists mainly in Indians who repair to the Bay of Seven Islands several times a year. The Quebec government have gone to great expenditure in order to make known the natural resources of the province, its mineral wealth and its water powers ; and they have brought to light the fact, that on the north shore of the St. Lawrence, there is considerable forest wealth, notably around the Bay of the Seven Islands. There are also good farming lands and a pretty extensive agricultural area. Apart from the surveys made by the provincial govern-

ment, a few capitalists have also taken the means of ascertaining the accuracy of those surveys and data The promoters of this Bill, after going to the trouble of making those surveys, have purchased from the Quebec government one thousand miles of limits down in that territory and they have also acquired water-powers. They have, started building a railway and they are putting up a pulp mill, with a force of over a hundred men.

I do not intend to go now into the merits of this Bill, nor do I wish to inquire whether this parliament have the power to incorporate this company, or whether we are invading the rights of the local government in so doing. But from the standpoint of the public interest, I am free to say that on the North Shore where there are now only a few fishing settlements, the news that this manufacture was being put up was heard with the greatest satisfaction. This morning, I received several letters from Pointe aux Esquimaux, from Magpie and other places, and these people want to know whether the fishermen, who have no other means of livelihood, could find employment with the company at the Bay of Seven Islands.

There is no doubt that the whole region of the North Shore will be greatly benefited by the fact that this company has acquired this territory and is going to put up those mills ; and on that ground alone, great credit is due to the promoters of this Bill, despite the fact that they are asking for such extensive powers around the Bay of Seven Islands.

It is well known that there are large deposits of magnetic iron ore all along the Moisie river, and that, many years ago, those deposits were worked by Mr. Molson, of Montreal ; but, for the want of transportation facilities, that mining enterprise had to be discontinued. But now, there are many chances of that industry being revived and put on a paying basis.

Some hon. gentlemen object to granting the company the power of carrying on the business of farming and stock-raising. I do not think such objection can be raised in the interest of the settlers. If I understand aright the Bill now before the House, it does not encroach upon the rights of the provincial legislature in that respect.

Now, as long as the provincial law governing the sale of lands is enforced, there is no danger of a monoply being granted, or of this company coming into conflict with the agricultural interests. With the bad record they have been building up for the north shore, which has been described as a barren wilderness, altogether unfit for farming purposes, surely, if this company were not to go into that territory and attempt to carry on a farming business, no private individual, unless he could dispose of unlimited resources, could ever dream of making the attempt. On the contrary, should the company succeed in its operations, and should its venture be attended with paying results from a farming standpoint, other settlers would undoubtedly follow in its footsteps. As I remarked a little while ago, from the reports of the Crown Lands Department of the province of Quebec, we gather that around the Bay of Seven Islands, there are agricultural lands enough for two parishes to be carved out of them. But that territory is inaccessible except by water in the summer season. Now, the company which is seeking incorporation from this parliament intends to provide communications for the carriage of its agricultural and other products. On the other hand, such settlers as may go into that country will have a considerable market at their door, for the sale of their products, as they will have to supply the wants of all the workingmen in the employ of the company.

I do not think that the powers this company is asking for, extensive as they are, can come into conflict with the interests of the district. Should there be a monoply, the action of that monopoly would be restricted to the territory to the east of the Saguenay river, which is included in the county which I represent here. I have no hesitation in saying that the people down in the Saguenay region will only be too glad to welcome that monopoly ; the more so as, with the exception of Escoumains and Manicouagan there is no manufacturing industry at all in that district. As this company is willing to invest its capital down there, it ought to be encouraged to the fullest extent, and we ought to give the people all the necessary powers. Should their venture prove successful, other capitalists are likely to go into that district and invest their money in other manufacturing industries ; for there are many other water powers that could be operated in portions of the country which have not yet been granted.

On these several grounds, I hope that the objections raised may be waived, and that the company will be granted the charter it is seeking from this parliament. From the granting of this charter and the exercise of the powers asked for, there is no danger to be feared from the standpoint of the agricultural interests ; whereas from the standpoint of the manufacturing interests it cannot be fairly claimed that a monopoly is being created.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, I wish to relieve my hon. friend (Mr. Girard) as to the position we are now taking. I have indeed listened with a great deal of pleasure to his remarks, and I think he has given us very useful data on a territory with which we are not very familiar. We have no objection to granting this company all the necessary powers for the carrying out of its undertakings. But the only question is whether we have the power to incorporate such a company as this.

I, for one, believe—and I have no hesitation in saying so—that, judging from the various subject matters enumerated in this Bill, the provincial legislature has primary jurisdiction over the matter. You cannot deal with these subjects without invading provincial rights, and this is well worth considering. There are but two or three words in this charter that would justify us in claiming jurisdiction. If you remove these two or three words, the scope of the Bill is purely provincial, and we cannot constitutionally legislate. These two words are to be found in subsection 2, empowering the company to carry on the business of common carriers between any port in Canada or elsewhere. Well, in my opinion, this is insufficient to bring this Bill within the purview of the federal government, because any company, be it ever so provincial or local in character, can seek and secure such a power, and exercise or use it without invading the legislative sphere of its province. So, a purely local company, incorporated for carrying on the business of stock-raising in the Saguenay district, could ship its cattle to other countries. It is a privilege inherent in its character, which can be legally exercised by a purely local company. So I do not believe that even these words, under which the company is empowered to carry on business as common carriers and ship its products to foreign countries, are sufficient to confer jurisdiction upon this parliament.

Let my hon. friend bear in mind that we are willing to grant the company all the necessary powers, but we may well inquire whether in conferring upon such a powerful company the power mentioned in section D of owning and farming lands, it will not work to the detriment of the settlers down there who are engaged in agricultural pursuits. Moreover, there is the very extensive power, conferred upon the company under subsection J, which was amended by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, empowering the company to build canals, raceways, sluices and dams without any restrictions upon their operations at all, so as to protect the people down there. There is also the power of acquiring fishing rights. I think there are in that district a good many fishermen. I am not so familiar with that country as my hon. friend from Chicoutimi and Saguenay, but I doubt whether the whole people in that district would be in favour of conferring on that company so extensive and such a variety of powers. I am quite willing to give all these powers to the company, but I am anxious to know whether it would prove agreeable to the people of that locality.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) Let my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who objects to the conferring on the company of the power to carry on a farming business, look over the provincial statutes, and he will find, I think, that any company may undoubtedly enjoy a similar right without being incorporated. Under similar circumstances, it is lawful for any one to run a farm. The Price concern, the pioneer of the lumber business in the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, also went into farming—when they started their operations—and they did so, with a view to raising, as extensively as possible, all the necessary produce for their operations. And by this, the settlers who later on went into that district to engage in farming pursuits, were largely benefited.

At present it may be said that this territory is an absolute wilderness, and that it is wholly unpeopled. Well, if that company carries on a successful farming business, those who will come and work for it with the preconceived idea that that region is unfit for settlement will soon be undeceived.

The people cannot object to the company owning two hundred acres of land in its own name. Under the provincial legislation, it would be entitled to no more. I do not say that in addition to that it could not acquire as many more acres of land in the name of its employees, but I hold that it cannot own any more in its own name.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I understand that the company has bought 1,000 acres of limits. Is it wholly timber limits ?

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) There is a wide difference between the lease of timber limits and the sale of colonization lots. In the first case, the leaseholder can only take away the timber ; he is not proprietor of the ground.

With regard to the rights of the shore fishermen—and a large number of people have no other means of living—they are subordinate to both the federal and provincial governments. The company could have no fishing rights unless with the consent of both the federal and provincial authorities, who, anyhow, would have to consider the nature of the company's claims.

On these grounds, I do not consider as serious the objections that have been raised. The people do not oppose the granting of this charter. Besides, a federal charter could not invade provincial rights as to those matters pertaining to the province. Assuming that this charter be granted, I do not think it will ever be considered as a stain upon the federal legislation. If we do not grant the privilege asked for, the company will apply to the provincial authorities, and will no doubt obtain everything that can be conceded there. But it will be without power as far as navigation is concerned, because these powers cannot be regularly granted by a provincial charter. Navigation is under federal control.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. (Translation.) The aim we have in view by the present Bill is to create a corporation whose

object is to develop the natural resources of this part of the country, especially the lumber industry, the pulp industry, the fisheries and the magnetic iron mines. To develop these resources, not only must we manufacture pulp wood and iron, and catch fish, but we have also to export these products elsewhere ; otherwise it would be useless to attempt going into this industry. Now, it is just as necessary to give this company the power of exporting its products as the right of manufacturing its products. The one is just as essential as the other. With this end in view, it is absolutely necessary for the company to apply to this parliament, for everything connected with navigation is under federal control. Therefore it is necessary that this parliament should give the company its whole legal entity. The local legislature can only grant it a partial legal entity. It has to come here to obtain complete powers. That is the rule which should apply in the present case.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I understand that the pulp company at Chicoutimi is doing considerable business. Does it hold its charter from the federal parliament ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. (Translation.) It has been incorporated by letters patent.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) This company exports its products to England, and I think they are sold in advance for seven or eight years to come.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. (Translation.) I know something about this company. As far as the export of their products is concerned, for a good many years back a pretty large fleet of ships have visited the very place where this company is carrying on its business, so the company has the choice of the best markets. But that is not all, there is also a railway near by, and three-fourths of its products are exported via Quebec. With regard to the Bay of Seven Islands, as my hon. friend of Chicoutimi (Mr. Girard) is aware, it is not frequented by oceanic steamers, but by coasting vessels only—schooners and other small craft of that description.

The promoters of the Bill intend to establish a line of steamers to carry the products of those different industries to the markets of the world, and so far as shipping facilities are concerned, the town of Chicoutimi is better provided than the Bay of Seven Islands.

Mr. GIRARD. (Translation.) At the present time the Chicoutimi company has no means of transportation of its own. The goods, as soon as they are manufactured, are piled up on the wharf and placed on board the steamers or railway. But as to the company which is now seeking a charter from parliament, what they want is the power to own steamers and to give shipping facilities to a locality formerly considered as inaccessible by water. My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said that this place had never been visited by oceanic vessels. Quite a number of vessels have entered the bay ; it is a safe harbour of refuge. As a matter of fact, the only argument put forth to show that oceanic vessels cannot enter the bay is the sad wreck of a French steamer which had made for the bay without knowing the way. The wreck took place at the entrance of the bay.

On section 18,

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That clause should not be in the Act. If we have jurisdiction let us exercise it, and not say that this company, a private enterprise, is for the general benefit of Canada in order to bring it under our jurisdiction. That is the only thing that gives them jurisdiction. We can take the jurisdiction over nearly everything in Canada by adding a clause like that. If we have not jurisdiction such a Bill ought not to have been introduced.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are doing it all the same.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not with private enterprises.

Mr. MONK. It may be better to enact that clause so as to give us jurisdiction.

Mr. McCARTHY. If the opinion of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is correct, we certainly need it.

Mr. MONK. I take the position that we have not jurisdiction unless we make use of the power we have under section 92. Under that section we can declare that this work is for the general advantage of Canada, and what the hon. member for Saguenay (Mr. Girard) has said, would lead me to that opinion. Then it gives us jurisdiction ipso facto.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 93) respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railways Company.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Express Company.—Mr. Davis.

QUESTIONS.

TELEPHONE COMPANIES IN CANADA.

Mr. MORRISON—by Mr. Sutherland (Essex)—asked :

1. How many telephone companies are there doing business in Canada ? In what provinces do they operate ? (a.) What is the total mileage of each company ? (b.) What is the capitalization of each company ?

2. What is the mileage of the Bell Telephone Company ?

3. How many of such companies have transfer or other connection with the Bell Telephone Company ?

4. What is the amount of unissued stock of the Bell Telephone Company ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. We have fifty-five telephone companies on our list of 1902. Of these, six report themselves as sold to the Bell Telephone Company; three not operating in 1901; one sold to Bellechasse Telephone Company, and one amalgamated with New Westminster and Burrard Inlet Telephone Company, leaving forty-four telephone companies in operation.

Of the fifty-five, twentyfive are in the province of Quebec, seven in Ontario, six in Nova Scotia, five in New Brunswick, eight in British Columbia, two in the North-west Territories, and one in Prince Edward Island.

The Bell Telephone Company has offices in more than one province—in Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

2. The return of the Bell Telephone Company gives the miles of wire as 94,314.

3. I have no information as to the number of companies which have transfer-connection with the Bell Telephone Company.

4. The Bell Telephone Company report that they have no unissued stock.

I am unable to state the capitalization of the several telephone companies.

PURCHASE OF GRAPES BY THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. What amount was received for the expenditure of $1,554.55, as shown in the Auditor-General's report for the year 1890 and 1891, on page D—62, as follows :—

Excelsior Basket Company, 15,000 4 pound baskets	$ 270 00
Grank Trunk Railway, rent for cold storage	5 00
D. J. McKinnon, travelling expenses, $14.90; freight charges, $88 ; customs fees, $1 ; printing, $22.59 ; telegrams, $3.15 ; telephones, $1.50 ; paid W. B. Calder for inspecting, &c., 33 days at $4 ; expenses, $6.50	269 55
D. J. McKinnon & Sons, grapes, 40,400 pounds at 2½ cents	1,010 00
	$1,554 55

2. Where does the amount received, if any, appear in the Auditor General's report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. Three hundred and seventy-seven dollars and thirty-seven cents.

Note—The grapes were purchased through Mr. D. J. MacKinnon, for the Department of Agriculture, from the following fruit-growers :

Mr. MORRISON.

E. D. Smith, Winona	$ 160 65
J. Geddes, Winona	129 15
M. Pettit, Winona	116 65
A. H. Pettit & Son, Grimsby	13 20
J. W. Smith, Winona	165 70
W. F. Geddes, Winona	45 60
W. M. Orr, Winona	110 40
E. J. Woolverton, Grimsby	62 25
N. Keep, Winona	50 40
D. J. MacKinnon & Sons, Grimsby	124 80
S. M. Culp. Grimsby	31 20
	$1,010 00

This fruit was sent to see if Canadian grapes could be successfully sold on the English market, and a quantity of this fruit was given away in Great Britain for advertising purposes.

2. Auditor General's Report, year ended June 30th, 1901, page D—67, item 'Less—Refunds from sales of fruit, poultry, cheese, &c.'

Manchester Fruit Brokers	$241 02
Simons, Shuttleworth & Co	136 35
	$377 37
Included in item	$1,089 79

PAYMENT TO WELLINGTON MUTCH, ELDON, P. E. I.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. Was the sum of $247.42, as shown in the Auditor General's Report for the year ending June 30th, 1901, page D—60, paid to Wellington Mutch, Eldon, P.E.I., for the following articles and services, viz. :—

233 chickens, $55.64 ; ground oats, 1,137 lbs. at $2 per cwt., 876 lbs. at $1.90 ; skimmed milk, 2,698 lbs. at 40 cents per cwt.; tallow, 35¾ lbs. at 4 cents ; sulphur, 5 lbs. at 5 cents ; coops, 10 at $1.75 ; nails, 5 cents ; 17 bags, $1.34 ; attending and feeding chickens, $84 ; use of scales, $2 ; paid to pluckers, 18 days at 75 cents ; man and team, 8 days at $2 ; cartage, $3.13 ; labour, $3.	$247 42

2. Is the amount shown in page D—68 of the said Auditor General's Report, viz.: 'Eldon,' the sum of $70.57, all that was received for the sale of said chickens ?

3. If not, where is the balance shown as having been received, in said Auditor General's Report?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. The amount taken to the credit of Belfast in the Auditor General's Report should have been credited to Eldon, making the net revenue for Eldon $70.57 plus $46.13, or $116.70.

REVISING OFFICER FOR LISGAR, MAN.

Mr. BOYD asked :

1. Who was appointed the revising officer for the revision of the voters' list in the late election in the constituency of Lisgar?

2. What was the date of his appointment; and what was the date of the final revision of the said lists ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The revising officer for Lisgar was Alexander McLeod, barrister-at-law, Morden, Manitoba. He was appointed on the 9th November, 1901.

A copy of the list as revised was received by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery on the 17th day of February, 1901.

The lists do not show on their face the day on which the final revision was made. Nor have we any record of the exact date.

The lists were printed in Manitoba.

EXPORT OF CATTLE TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. HOLMES asked :

1. How many cattle, home product, one year old and under, were exported to the United States in each year since 1890 ?

2. What was their value ?

3. How many cattle over one year old, home product, were exported to the United States in each year since 1890 ?

4. What was their value ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). In 1891, 1892 and 1893 the statistics were not kept in such a way as to show the number one year old or less, but the information asked for, as far as it can be furnished by the Customs Department, is contained in the following statement showing the number and value of cattle. (Canadian produce) 'one year old or less' and 'over one year old' exported from Canada to the United States, in each year since 1890 :

	One Year Old or Less.		Over One Year Old.		Total.	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$
1890	Not separately stated prior to 1894.				7,840	104,623
1891					2,763	26,975
1892					551	21,327
1893					402	11,032
1894	37	632	219	3,139	256	3,771
1895	536	1,410	346	17,806	882	19,216
1896	1,423	3,614	223	5,256	1,646	8,870
1897	4,688	29,613	31,310	479,525	35,998	509,138
1898	12,231	108,001	75,674	1,131,047	87,905	1,239,048
1899	24,010	242,947	68,824	1,055,223	92,834	1,298,170
1900	29,925	375,098	57,064	1,026,039	86,989	1,401,137
1901	20,903	260,063	25,341	630,377	46,244	891,340

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITHIN THE EMPIRE.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Hughes (Victoria)—asked :

1. Did the government, since February 1st last, receive copies of resolutions from any board of trade or other commercial organization of a similar character setting forth the opinion of such boards of trade or other organizations, that in the event of the imposition of duties upon wheat and other cereals by Great Britain, the products of Canada should be exempt from such taxation, or should receive preferential treatment ?

2. If any such resolutions were sent to the government, from what organizations did they come, and at what dates were they received ?

3. Has the government, since the first day of February last, made any and what representations to the British government, that in the event of the imposition of duties upon wheat and other cereals, the products of this country should be exempt from such taxation, or should receive preferential treatment ?

4. If so, what is the date of such representations ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1 and 2. Yes, certain resolutions were received which will be placed on the Table of the House.

3 and 4. Parliament has been made aware that a conference is to take place in London this summer, at the invitation of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, between the Imperial authorities and the self-governing colonies of the empire. In respect to the imposition of duties upon grain and flour, communications have been and are still exchanged on the subject between the two governments, but in the present stage of the negotiations, it is not expedient to bring down any correspondence relating thereto, until such conference has taken place.

QUEEN'S AND KING'S COUNSEL.

Mr. LEMIEUX—by Mr. Talbot—asked :

1. Have any Queen's Counsels or King's Counsels been appointed, by the Federal government, since the 23rd June, 1896 ?

2. If so, who are the persons who have been appointed, and what are the dates of their appointments ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). There have been, since the 23rd of June, 1896, three King's Counsel appointed, two in the North-west Territories, and one in the Yukon.

PAYMENTS TO GILBERT BROS. ENGINEERING COMPANY.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. How much was paid the Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company for work done in Galops Rapids from May 1st, 1901, to December 15th, 1901 ?

2. Is the work now completed ?

3. If not, is it the intention of the government to have this firm, with their fleet, at work this season in said rapids ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Gilbert Bros. Engineering Company, not Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Company have been paid for work done in the Galops Rapids from May 1st to December 15th, 1901, the sum of $18,760.

2. No.

3. No decision has been arrived at yet as to this.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER—DISTRICT OF CASSIAR.

Mr. McGOWAN asked :

1. On whose recommendation was J. W. McFarlane appointed census commissioner (or to some other position) in the census department for the Atlin district of Cassiar, British Columbia ?

2. How long was the said McFarlane so employed, and what was the amount paid him as remuneration for his services, including expenses ?

3. Was McFarlane's account reduced ; and if so, how much ?

4. What was the amount paid Enumerator Coutts for his services, including expenses ?

5. What was the amount paid Enumerator Polly for his services, including expenses ?

6. What was the amount paid Enumerator Brown for his services, including expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. G. R. Maxwell.
2. (a) 210 days. (b) $3,415.70.
3. (a) Yes. (b) $560.70.
4. $1,643.10.
5. $826.50.
6. $843.

RIFLE PRACTICE FOR YOUNG CANADIANS.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (North Victoria) moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, the best interests of the country demand that the youth of Canada should as soon as possible be afforded opportunity of practicing target shooting ; and to that end, it would be advisable to supply each school district or similar locality with rifles and the new safety practice ammunition for use on the Peters or similar inexpensive and safe target, where all citizens from the age of fourteen upwards should be afforded opportunity of practice.

He said : As it is near six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I shall be exceedingly brief in presenting some observations in support of this motion. All authorities on constitutional law and government agree that one of the greatest dangers to the permanent stability of any nation is the maintenance of a large standing army. But as every nation must take adequate measures for its defence the alternative of an effective militia force is offered in substitution for a standing army. Such a militia force might be deemed adequate for the purposes of a country situated as Canada is. Except on occasions of great emergency, I can imagine no easier way to maintain what would be the equivalent of a standing army, than the maintenance of a system by which the youth of the country would be thoroughly trained in rifle shooting, and in the simple and necessary movements in drill which the new strategy and tactics require. The proposition which I make in the resolution is simple on the face of it. There is a very inexpensive system of target practice provided at the present day, and I wish to see that system placed at the disposal of the youth of our country. In the United States they have what is called the gallery or pratice ammunition, whereby a regular service rifle and short range ammunition can be used without any danger of the bullets doing injury, beyond the range of the target. Of course with the regular service ammunition it would be impossible to use these rifles in practice, but with this ammunition which I understand the Minister of Militia is about introducing into Canada, there is no danger whatever. I would point out that the good rifle shots of to-day who are beyond the age of forty years, learned the use of the rifle by snapping caps at candles. The best shots at Wimbledon in the old days and the best shots at Bisley nowadays learned rifle shooting by snapping caps at candles, and hitting or missing as the case may be; the great thing being the practice in pulling the trigger. If the system which I have outlined in the resolution is adopted, it will be of great service to the militia of Canada. I may point out that Mr. Beck, mayor of London, has placed at the disposal of Colonel Peters, the D.O.C., a very handsome trophy to be competed for by the people of the schools in his district.

Mr. INGRAM. Is not that confined to collegiate institutes ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). It applies to wherever there are cadet corps in the district. In the city of Montreal there are some excellent cadet corps, among others the Highland cadets of Montreal, and the Highland cadets of Westmount, both of

which corps are maintained without one cent of cost to the government, and both corps, chiefly the Montreal Highland cadets have furnished nearly one hundred men to the South African contingents, as well as several hundred well trained and well drilled men to the militia corps of that city. In Toronto there is a most excellent cadet corps made up of detachments from the different schools. When I had the honour to be first English master of the Toronto Collegiate Institute years ago, I had a battalion composed of the young men of that institution, and I may say that a number of officers in the city regiments and in different regiments throughout the province received their training in that cadet battalion. Wherever the young men of a country are drilled early in life, experience has proved that they maintain in after years their zeal and interest in military matters, and this very fact in Canada has kept the militia force of our country together, in spite of the many drawbacks that have combatted it during a number of years. It was my intention to speak at greater length, but it being six o'clock I will simply draw the attention of the minister to the necessity for drilling the youth of our country in their early days when their sympathetic interest is most alive to matters of this kind. If we can adopt the system foreshadowed in this resolution, together with the system of training officers which I previously outlined, I am satisfied that Canada will have at her disposal a reserve of men such as no country in the world could equal. I believe, Sir, that without the slightest trouble Canada could turn 1,000,000 men of fighting age and not draw her resources to any greater extent than the Boers have drawn on their resources during the war in South Africa. With such a body of men, Canada would be impossible of invasion, I care not how powerful the enemy might be. I trust the minister will accept this resolution, and with that hope I submit it to his judgment.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). I am in entire accord with the spirit of the observations made by my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes). We have in Switzerland an object lesson as to what can be done in the way of making the militia effective. In that country they have an army of 250,000 men which is exclusively a militia force. I wish, however, to point out that while I am in sympathy with the observations that the hon. gentleman has made, I think we cannot pass a resolution of this kind here, because the matter with which it deals is within the purview and control of the local legislature. Education being in the hands of the provincial legislatures, I think it would be impossible to carry out a resolution of this kind without the consent of the provinces. It seems to me the proper course would be to open up correspondence with the governments of the respective provinces with reference to the matter, and I may say that I had it in contemplation to do this ; and now that my hon. friend has given his views to the House, and has received the assurance I have given him, I think it would be more convenient if the resolution were withdrawn.

Mr. INGRAM. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Militia Act gives him power to supply free ammunition to the different clubs and associations ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. But the Act does not allow him to give free ammunition to the cadet corps ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. That is what I said.

Mr. INGRAM. That is very unfortunate. I hope the hon. gentleman will carry out the suggestion he made some time ago.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I would point out to my hon. friend that the militia is composed of men from 18 years up. We have no power to include in the militia any below the age specified in the law.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand it is the hon. gentleman's intention to amend the Act ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, next year.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The resolution does not in the slightest degree infringe on the constitution. I would like it to stand, so that we may have some discussion on the question.

Mr. LANCASTER. Under the circumstances, I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

That the consideration of notices of motion be postponed, and that the House proceed forthwith to order No. 10 of Public Bills and Orders, House in Committee on Bill (No. 3) and Act to amend the Railway Act.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT—CATTLE-GUARDS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved that the House go into committee on Bill (3) to amend the Railway Act. He said : In moving that the House

resolve itself into committee on the Bill, I realize at the outset of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that I am met with an obstacle but one which I hope on reflection the House will not regard as sufficiently serious to defeat this Bill. I am appealing to the whole House from the decision of the Railway Committee which has not seen fit to report the Bill. This committee perhaps, does not voice the feeling of the House and the report being the vote of only some fifty members, is only twenty-five per cent of those who sit in this House, and is at most a minority of those who are here to-night, or who will be here later.

The law, as it stands at present, with regard to cattle-guards on highway crossings was admitted by the Railway Committee, as it is all through the country, to be in an improper state. Although the railway companies were originally required to have cattle-guards at all highway crossings, so as to prevent animals straying on the lines of railway, that Act has been so amended as to practically relieve them from that obligation. By the amendments of 1888 and 1890, the whole value of the original legislation regarding cattle-guards was taken away, because these amendments provided that the railway companies shall only be liable for damages, even when they do not have these cattle-guards at their crossings in cases where the animals were properly at the points of intersection between the railway lines and the highway when the accident occurred. In fact the law, as it stands at present, provides that the companies shall only be liable under a circumstance which cannot reasonably be expected to exist at all. It would be more frank and honest to repeal the whole section requiring cattle-guards. I do not suppose that the people would stand it, but still it would be better to do so than to delude them, as we are now doing, with the mere semblance of a protection which has not the slightest existence in reality. It would be far better to say that the railway companies shall not be bound to have cattle-guards at all than to say that they shall only pay damages for not having them, when the animal that happens to be killed 'is properly on the highway,' bearing in mind that the courts have construed those words as meaning in charge of a human being. But it can be easily seen that there is no need for a railway company to have a cattle-guard when the animal is in charge of a human being. No one in charge of an animal will allow it to get on to a railway line, and the legislation in the first instance was no doubt intended to compel the railway companies to take means for preventing animals, that were not in charge of anybody, from straying on their track, and the reason is evident. An animal cannot read the sign 'railway crossing' or appreciate the danger of getting on to a railway line, and therefore it was deemed necessary that the companies should be compelled to provide some obstruction against its doing so. I am quite well aware that the speed of railway trains and the necessities of railway service may require changes in the cattle-guards from time to time, but I submit that the railways should be compelled to put up some guard that would be reasonably sufficient to prevent animals getting on to their tracks from the highway, whether these animals be in charge of a human being or not. In the discussion in the Railway Committee, it was urged against the supporters of the Bill I have introduced that it would encourage farmers to become careless and allow their animals to run on the highway and thence on the railway line, and that we should do everything possible to teach the farmers that they must keep their animals off the highway, but we all know that, despite the greatest care, an animal may escape on to the highway. The wind may blow down a farmer's fence, a neighbour coming to visit him may accidently leave his gate open, and thus a farmer, who takes every care, whose gates are fastened and whose fences are good, may still find that by the purest accident one of his animals has wandered on to the highway and thence on to the railway track, and yet though the railway company may have wilfully neglected to provide the protection required by law, he must bear the whole loss.

But then look at the other side of the question. Here is a most positive enactment requiring railway companies to provide sufficient cattle-guards, and they do not comply with it simply because, under the amendments to the law as originally passed, it is scarcely possible for them to be ever required to pay any damages. The farmer is to be held responsible for any accident which might occur, despite his greatest care, and the railways are allowed to go scot free even though they deliberately neglect to comply with the law. The railways are only held responsible where the animals are properly on their tracks and the courts have decided that an animal is only properly on their tracks when it was in charge of a human being and strayed into the danger despite all his care. It must be obvious to everybody that an animal which is in the charge of anybody, would not be allowed to stray into danger, and the railways therefore may violate the law with impunity, whereas the farmer has to suffer the loss should one of his animals, by the merest accident, which the greatest watchfulness cannot always prevent, make its way on to the highway and then to the railway track and be killed.

If the railway companies want the inhabitants of this country to conform to the law they ought—rich and powerful as they are—to set the example and first comply with it themselves, and the effect of my Bill would be that the danger would be met

on both sides and there would consequently be very little danger of any accident happening. There is no doubt that by the neglect of the companies to provide these cattle guards, when an animal does stray on to a railway track, it runs great danger of being killed, and yet although the railway company was in fault in not complying with the law, the owner of the animal has to bear the whole loss. But even though the owner should be somewhat in fault, why should the chief offender go scot free? And it must be perfectly evident that the railway companies will not supply those cattle-guards while the law is in its present condition, because people are not likely to do things when they are not subject to any penalty for not doing them. And the law as it stands to-day does not require them except as against a human being to keep a cattle-guard there. The animal comes to that point. If the cattle-guard is not there, there are three directions for it to take—one to the left, one to the right—along the railway track in either case—or straight ahead, where there is no danger. If there is no cattle-guard, there are two chances out of three that the animal will be killed. It is quite as likely to turn to the right or to the left as to go straight ahead, particularly when you remember that the pasture, during some seasons of the year, is better along the railway track than elsewhere. It is not unfair to say that the animal is twice as likely to go down the railway as it is to go along the highway. If it goes down the railway it is pretty sure to get killed, and if it gets killed, no one is practically responsible. The railway will say that the animal was running at large and had no right to be where it was. Though, by Act of parliament the railway is compelled to have—or, rather, is supposed—to have cattle-guards for highway crossings, their answer is: It is true we had no cattle-guard, and so are violating the statute, but we are not liable, because your animal was at large, not controlled by a human being. But, if the cattle-guards are there, is it not plain that the animal will go straight ahead, because the guards will prevent it from going to one side? I know it is said that there is no cattle-guard that will keep every animal from turning upon the railway track. Even though that is the case, yet, if we reduce the likelihood of accident, we are passing good legislation. At the very least, cattle-guards can be put in that will turn a large percentage of the animals and prevent them from getting on the track. So it does not come down to a question whether the owner or whether the railway shall lose the animal, but whether there shall be any animal lost at all. I am not seeking to bring about a state of the law under which a railway will be liable to kill animals. It is not my primary object to cause the railway company to kill an animal and then cause them to be liable for it; the primary object is that there shall be no animal killed, and so no liability. I seek to create a state of affairs under which both the railway and the owner of the animal will take a certain amount of responsibility, and these responsibilities meeting, so to say, will leave no room for accidents. The law will make it clear that the farmer will be liable if the animal is killed at the point of intersection, that is, upon that part of the earth which is both highway and railway. That being so, he will want to keep his animal at home. But, if it is not killed there, but goes down the railway track because there is no cattle-guard on either side to prevent it, and is killed there, the railway will be liable. This could have no other effect than to prevent the very losses that are making all the trouble. So it is not a question of whether the farmer or the railway shall pay for an animal willy nilly, but whether we shall put responsibility fairly on both parties, so that both parties will work together to prevent accident and loss to anybody. With this general statement of the purpose of the Bill, let me pass on to one or two other matters which I wish to enter on before I sit down.

It was said in the Railway Committee that, if this Bill were allowed to stand over until next year, there would probably be a standard cattle-guard introduced, and made acceptable by Order in Council, or order of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, or in some other way. Because, it was said, you cannot expect any guard that any railway company will put in to turn every animal. There is something in that, as in a great many other contentions, if you do not carry them too far. But if you carry it to the length of saying that because of that this Bill should not pass, then, with all due deference to those who use it, I submit that it is unreasonable. For, if you make a standard cattle-guard next month or next year, you must pass an Act like this to compel the railway companies to put those cattle-guards in, because, at present, the company is not liable without any guard, if the animal is not in charge of a human being. So, even if I concede that there will be a standard guard authorized in some official way and that if these guards are put in by the railways, they will prevent animals from straying from the highway to the track, you will still be under the necessity of passing some such Bill as mine. It may not be in exactly the same words, still, it must have the same effect, or the railway company will not be obliged to put in these standard guards.

Now, here is a grievance which is admitted to exist, a grievance so clear that nobody has gone further in opposing my measure than to say that we will get the railways to put in a better guard by next year, if you will allow the Bill to stand. But the grievance being what I have just shown it to be, I ask this House why that grievance

shall be allowed to continue for another year? Why should the report of the committee prevail? What good reason is there for saying that it is wise not to proceed further with this measure? Why should another twelve months go by with this state of affairs allowed to continue, now that the attention of the House has been drawn to it? Why should not the railways be bound to do something as much for the next twelve months as for twelve months after that, or ten years from now? Why should the railway companies go on for another year without responsibility while we are waiting for some guard which it may suit the railways to put in? Why not compel them to put in the best guard they can and leave it to the courts to say whether they have put in a guard that is 'suitable and sufficient' to turn animals. When the Bill is in Committee of the Whole, the principle having been admitted, if it is thought by the majority of the committee that the wording is not such as to secure justice, amendments can be made. If any amendment can better carry out the object desired, I am here to say, before we go into committee, that any amendment that does not really kill the measure I am introducing will not be refused by me, will not be opposed factiously by me, because it is not of my own drawing. I do not know that any amendment can be drawn that will make the Bill any better or that will carry out the idea better than the form of words that I have proposed:

> And no animal not allowed by law to run at large shall be held for the purpose of such liability-----

—that is, the liability mentioned in the Act to keep up the cattle-gard——

> —to be improperly on a place adjoining the railway if such animal gets upon the railway from the highway by reason of such omission or neglect to maintain such cattle guards or fences at the highway crossing.

You will notice that, under this amendment, the railway will not be responsible unless the animal goes upon the land which is the railways own individual property, and which the animal cannot reach if the railway company have a cattle-guard at each side of the highway where the railway crosses. There is no responsibility upon the railway unless the animal gets right over the land where the cattle-guard ought to be and on the railway itself, on the property of the railway which is separated entirely, or if my Bill passes, will require to be separated entirely from the railway by the cattle-guard. As other gentlemen desire to speak upon this Bill, I will not trespass any longer on the time of the House. I trust that the Bill will be allowed to go to committee and will be passed, if not in the exact language in which I have drawn it, at least in language that will make it as efficient, and will remedy to a reasonable extent the grievance which I submit I have proved exists, and put the responsibility upon the railway which, for the reasons I have stated, ought to be placed upon them.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest and with close attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). I may say by way of apology in offering a few observations to the committee that I certainly do not find in my conscience the accusation that I have taken up a great deal of time of the House thus far this session, so I hope and trust that hon. members will bear with me for a few minutes while I discuss what to some of them seems to be a matter of no importance, but which to others of us who know and understand the feelings and wishes of our constituents, is a matter of considerable importance. I shall endeavour to avoid all those points made by the hon. member for Lincoln, and to confine myself to other phases of the question upon which he has not touched. In the first place many hon. members seem to have the idea that the legislation proposed is along the lines of a return to the old pit-guard. I intend to deal first with this phase of the question. I, for one, if this amounted to a return to the old pit-guard, would most decidedly vote against the proposed legislation. I believe that the pit-guard can find no proper place in railroading at the present day. We know that in the pit-guards of former times water often found a lodging place and froze in the winter, and the road bed was so disturbed as to make railroading uncertain. More than that, when a railway train ran off the track it was quite a usual thing, or a not unusual thing at least, for the trucks of the carriages to plunge into the pit; the trucks were then pulled from the bottom of the carriage and a frightful accident was the result. With the surface-guard, on the other hand, derailment meant nothing so serious, and the train might run along a good half a mile on the track and then be pulled up with no accident of any consequence. So I say that a return to the old pit-guard is quite out of the question. Many petitions were laid before this House in the earlier part of the session asking for legislation along the lines of relief to the farmers, and afterwards this House was flooded with a number of petitions from the railway employees praying that pit-guards should not be restored. Mr. Chairman, I say that pit-guards will not be restored, and I propose to show why I think they will not be restored, and if they are not restored, then the petitions of these railway employees are met. Now, I am going to tell you why I think they will not be restored. Some two or three days before this matter was taken up for discussion in the Railway Committee, one

of the great railroads of our country, the Canadian Pacific Railway, was good enough to send each member of this House a very carefully and neatly prepared brief giving its side of the question with regard to cattle-guards ; and I think if, from the four corners of this instrument, I can prove that there will be no return to pit cattle-guards, that there is no reasonable probability of such a return, why then I am proving our case out of the mouths of the witnesses of our opponents, a doubly strong way to prove it. I intend to read some extracts from that brief to bear out my contention that there is no possibility of a return to the old pit-guard if we pass the legislation proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln. In the first place, an official high in the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway—I have not his name here, but hon. gentlemen can find it in the brief to which I have referred—says :

> I learn from the railway people---

And by the railway people he refers to the employees of the road to whom certain questions were put with regard to cattle-guards.

> I learn from the railway people that the dangers to track of the pit cattle-guard are so many that it is practically out of the question for them to use them.

Strong testimony from the same source is that of Mr. H. J. Cambie, no less a person than the divisional engineer at Vancouver, says :

> The old fashioned open pit guards with the track rails laid direct on the stringers are complete traps for wrecking trains, and are not worth discussion.

Finally the last statement, which is more important than all the others, is that of Mr. Tye, chief engineer of construction, who says :

> The damage caused by one wreck is more than sufficient to offset any loss or injury to stock for many years.

Now, Sir, the whole argument of the opponents of this measure is this, that a return to pit-guards would cause not only one accident but many accidents ; yet here is one of their chief employees saying that a single accident, as opposed to many accidents, would cause a damage to the railway in dollars and cents far exceeding the sum they would have to pay for every head of cattle killed in a number of years. And so since these great corporations well know their own interests, it is fair and reasonable to argue that they would prefer paying for all the cattle they killed to going back to the old pit-guard which would cause them so much more financial loss. So, I think I have demonstrated from that instrument that there is no danger of a return to pit-guards, and that therefore the petitions of these railway employees against pit-guards are fully answered.

Next, Sir, with regard to the surface-guard ; and here, if I may be permitted to make a bull—and surely a discussion of cattle-guards might be some excuse for doing so—I will say that surface-guards can be divided pretty generally into three classes : The first-class where there is no guard at all, the second-class where there is only a bluff-guard, and the third-class where there has been an honest endeavour to meet the law as it stands upon the statute-book. First, with regard to no guards, I can assure hon. gentlemen that to my personal knowledge, and I only know but a very small part of Ontario, there are a number of crossings at which no cattle guard at all has been installed. What is the reason for this ? The present state of the law is directly responsible for this, and I am going to tell you why. If a cow now gets on to the railway because she is wandering on the highway unattended, even though there be no cattle-guard to stop her, the railway says : 'Oh, your cow was unlawfully on the highway,' and the farmer cannot collect from it. But, if on the other hand, the cow is properly tended by a human being, why, then, she is not going to get killed on the right of way and the railway does not have to pay either way ; so that, which ever way you take it, it is heads I win, tails you lose. The railway company do not have to pay either way, and they have only to fly in the face of public opinion and not build a cattle-guard at all. But here, they entirely forget the fact that they offer a direct insult to public intelligence which will arouse such a storm of indignation as will compel the peoples' representatives in this House to provide by legislation a remedy for this grievance. Next we come to what is called the bluff cattle-guard.

Mr. CLARKE. What ?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is a term sometimes used in a game called poker. This bluff cattle-guard consists of a succession of slats of wood laid lengthwise and just slanting a little bit. It never stops an animal for one instant ; the animal crosses that guard and goes upon the track. It is perhaps a little better than none at all because it is not such a bare-faced slap at the intelligence of the people. It is an attempt to cajole the farmer into the belief that the railway company are trying to comply with the law. And then, we come to the third kind of cattle-guard which is an honest endeavour to meet the law. This is a metal guard which is reasonably sufficient for the purpose. I have seen a number of these guards on the Canada Southern Railway, now known as the Michigan Central Railway, and they are giving very fair satisfaction indeed, but, these cattle-guards are expensive in their installation and they are very few and far between. Now, we may go further than that because I have in my hand a copy of the brief with which the Canadian Pacific Railway has furnished us,

I may say that if it be arguable whether we have a cattle-guard which is suitable and sufficient, the legislation proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) does not propose any particular kind of cattle-guard, but simply that the law requiring the company to provide suitable and sufficient cattle-guards shall be enforced. Have we got these cattle-guards to-day? Let me turn for a moment to this question. Here we have the report of Mr. James Beattie, of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he says:

There are a number of surface cattle-guards on my division giving the best of satisfaction.

This out of the mouth of a witness on the other side. He says:

The new surface guard being put in this season, I am satisfied, is all that could be desired. It has a neat appearance.

That is nice for the cattle and for the farmers.

And I fail to see how stock can possibly get over it. It is a common occurrence for sheep and swine to walk over the stringers across the old pit-guard. This is impossible with new cattle-guard.

There is a witness of their own saying that he has something better than the pit-guard, and he winds up:

I think every point should be strained to keep to the present system of surface cattle-guards.

Mr. Kilpatrick, in his statement, is equally emphatic:

I would therefore recommend the use of surface-guards very strongly, as if properly put in——

If properly put in, mark you.

—they are effective for the purpose intended, and do not become a trap endangering life and property.

This cattle-guard now, if properly put in, will meet the requirements of the law and perhaps if we change the law to make it more important for the railways to put this in, the companies will see that the cattle-guards are properly put in. Finally, Mr. Leonard, himself, says:

One of the most effective surface-guards is the 'Sheffield' in use on some parts of the division, and the Canadian Pacific Railway guard made standard by drawing No. 16702 last year, is reported as giving good satisfaction.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have quoted enough to prove by the evidence furnished by the brief of the Canadian Pacific Railway that the railway companies have to-day in existence a surface cattle-guard which is suitable and sufficient to turn the cattle back, or if we have not got that perfected cattle-guard, we are at least going so rapidly towards it that if we apply the financial spur to the flank of the rather lazy railway horse, he will be put into a gallop that will take him under the wire a winner with a suitable guard as the prize, and I think it is the members of this House who should see that that spur is properly applied. There have been arguments advanced against this law, and one of the strongest and most frequently quoted which I have heard, is that the farmers of this country will to a great extent resort to this means of selling their cattle. I do not think that any one in this House will seriously entertain that idea for a minute. The farmers of this country have now a very good market for their cattle, and I misjudge their decency and public spirit if to any extent they will adopt this means of selling their cattle. But they cannot be sure of making a sale even if they were purposely to turn their cattle on the highway. If one of these animals goes down the road and is killed at the point of intersection with the railway, the owner gets nothing for the animal. In almost every township in the province of Ontario there is a by-law against cattle being allowed to wander at large upon the public highway. This by-law can be enforced by impounding the cattle found on the highway. I maintain that it is only in the season of the year which is dryest that there is any great danger of cattle getting on the railway, and the reason for that is obvious. Cattle, like human beings, often look for pastures green and pastures new, and so it is that cattle, having eaten the last mouthful of grass on their pasture fields, and seeing the pastures green and pastures new on the roadside, break out and go wandering down the road, and it is in this way that they get upon the railway track provided with defective cattle-guards. Now, Sir, this dry season is the very season when the railway companies have their lines patrolled from one end to the other by their section men who are on the constant watch for fires. These men see these cattle at large, they can impound them, and if they do impound them the farmers have to pay the poundage. I maintain, as a man who knows the conditions existing on the farm, that farmers under these circumstances are not going to allow their cattle to wander about. Now, there was some suggestion made as to an amendment of this Bill along the lines of it being necessary for the railway company to show that the farmer is guilty of negligence in order to shift the responsibility from itself to the farmer. An amendment of that kind I would gladly welcome. It seems to me that if the farmer has been negligent, it is only reasonable that he should pay for his negligence and get nothing for his animal, but the railway should be obliged to show that he has been negligent, provided he has first shown that they were entirely negligent in not providing proper railway cattle-guards. It has been said that this is a matter of very great difficulty for the railway company, that the railway should not be asked to prove any such thing, that it will be very hard for the railway to get witnesses from among the farmer's friends to prove that he wittingly and purposely drove his cow on the railway. There are two sides to every question. One

phase of the law is in regard to fires kindled by railways on the property of farmers. The farmer, if a fire is kindled, has not only got to show that the fire was kindled by the railway, but he has to show that it was kindled negligently by the railway. He has got to show that the engine which has set this fire alight was false in its construction, and by what evidence can he prove that ? He can only prove it by the employees of the railway, each one of whom is afraid of his life to give evidence, for it may cost him his position. If you reverse the case, and ask the railway to prove from the mouths of the farmers that there was negligence on the part of the farmer whose beast was killed, a great hubbub is raised and it is asked : Is this fair and just to the railway ? I do not wish to say much about the objections raised by other members of this House who do not come from the province of Ontario. I believe that this grievance is largely confined to the province of Ontario, and I judge that from the overwhelming majority that was given by the Ontario members in the Railway Committee in favour of this legislation. I think they were almost as four to one. I appeal to the members from other provinces. If this matter is not a grievance with them let them trust to us in Ontario; let them take our opinion and if they see an overwhelming vote in favour of this legislation by the Ontario members, let them be guided by the view of the majority from Ontario and give us a sympathetic vote, even as time and time again in Ontario we have given them sympathetic votes on some matters of local concern to them. Frequently we are guided by the opinion of the North-west members with regard to this or that railway charter, and we ask a return for that confidence from them now. One member from the Territories said he was going to vote against this Bill because it interfered with the Herd law. I do not believe it does. It proposes a change in the existing law and that existing law does not touch the Herd law at all. Another member said that the Bill did not go far enough and that he would vote against it. That member came from a province by the sounding sea. We are content to take half a loaf; it is much better than no bread, and we would be glad of that gentleman's sympathetic vote even though this Bill does not go as far as he would like. For my part, I never yet had so much pleasure in supporting any legislation as in supporting this. I believe the Bill is in everybody's interest. I do not feel that this Bill will be adverse to the interests of any of those concerned, and I will tell you why. First of all, it is going to be better for the farmer, because if this Bill becomes law he will get paid for his cattle when they are killed by the railway, whereas before he had to go without compensation, which was often a very serious hardship to him. It is going to be better for the travelling public, which so frequently has been invoked in this discussion. The farmers, I may mention, are a large percentage of the travelling public. If we pass this legislation the railways will put in suitable and sufficient guards, and there will be fewer accidents than now, and the travelling public will be killed and injured less often. It will be for the benefit of the railways themselves, for the reason that there will be fewer accidents, and consequently less loss to the railways, and in a year or two the extra expense of these cattle-guards will flow back into their coffers two-fold. I will give another reason why it is better for the railway companies. I believe, as a business man—though I admit of comparatively little experience—that the sentimental aspect of the case must never be forgotten. I do not care how strong a railway is; it is better for it to have the good-will of the people of the country through which it runs than to have their ill will, and I can assure the railway companies that there is a feeling of indignation in many parts of Ontario to-day against them, because the farmers believe they are tyrannized over by the companies. If the railway companies will remove this grievance, that feeling of antagonism would be effaced, and in time to come there would be a better feeling.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, after having talked the matter over with several people, since this Bill came before the House, I reached the conclusion that it was desirable to amend it by adding after the word 'animal,' in the 9th line, the following words : 'without any negligence on the part of the proprietor.' Under the English common law, contributive negligence debars the injured party from any recourse.

If the railway company has neglected to provide the protection required by law, and if the proprietor was guilty of neglect, each must bear his loss.

Under our law, farmers are bound to keep their animals off the highway. The proprietor, whose animal was found straying on the railway track, is supposed to have violated the law. They can take and impound the animal found straying on the railway track, and the proprietor has to pay the poundage. But we also know that, despite the greatest care, an animal may escape on the highway, without the farmer being in the least guilty of neglect. Under the law as it is now, he has no right of action. Under the Bill now before the House and by the Bill under consideration, he shall have the right to sue the company, provided he is not guilty of neglect.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) Please read your amendment.

Mr. DEMERS. (Translation.) I propose to amend the clause by adding the following words : 'without any neglect on the part of the proprietor.'

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) In addition to those words, it should be expressly stated that by the fact that the animal was not in charge of a human being, the proprietor is presumed to be guilty of negligence.

Mr. DEMERS. (Translation.) That presumption already exists ; because the proprietor is always supposed to keep his animals off the highway, and to prevent them from straying on the railway track. Should an animal get on to the railway line and wander about, that is a presumption of negligence on the part of the proprietor.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) You then throw the onus of the evidence on the proprietor of the animal.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understand that the amendment proposed by the hon. member (Mr. Demers) is to the effect that as a condition precedent to recovering damages, it must be shown that the animal is on the track without any negligence of the owner. I submit that this amendment puts the onus in the wrong place. Here is a railway with an enactment against it requiring it to put in cattle guards suitable and sufficient for a certain purpose, and if it does not put them in it should be liable. I submit that the amendment suggested by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers) might be very harmful, and that a provision to say that the animal must be there without negligence on the part of the owner will lead to interminable lawsuits. While one judge would hold that the fact that the animal was not attended was not negligence, another judge might hold that the farmer would have to prove a certain thing a negative, and shrug his shoulders and say : I do not know how you can prove it, but you have to prove it. I submit that this amendment is not fair. What my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) and I want to be provided, is, that where the railway companies have no cattle-guards they shall be responsible, and to say that a farmer must prove a negative will be making a good deal of trouble in the country and creating lawsuits with the chances against the farmer, whereas my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) and I want to make the law simple and plain. It is the unattending of the animal that is the whole gist of the matter. If you ask the court to hold that a farmer has to prove that it was without any negligence on his part that the animal got there, probably the court will say : It is pretty hard on you, but there is some evidence of negligence here, or how did your animal come unattended when there is a statute which says your animal must not be unattended within half a mile of a highway crossing—and which statute I am not interfering with.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend's Bill passes, I understand that the law will be that if an animal gets on to the roadbed of a railway, whatever may be the negligence of the owner, the presumption will be that the animal is legally and properly there, and that if an accident occurs, the company will be liable ?

Mr. LANCASTER. If there is no cattle-guard.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If there is a cattle-guard, assuming the cattle-guard not to be sufficient, the company would be liable.

Mr. LANCASTER. The railway company would be responsible, unless the company proved negligence on the part of the farmer other than the negligence of letting the animal be at large. That is a negligence, we must admit ; but it is a trivial negligence. It is no such negligence as the railway company would be guilty of by not having a sufficient cattle-guard, and I do not want the big liability to be killed by the smaller and trival one.

Mr. FRASER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he considers that there are degrees of negligence ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly there are.

Mr. FRASER. And they would be so construed in an action ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Certainly there are degrees of negligence. I do not say they would be so construed by a judge in an action ; but I say there would be proof of the most positive negligence on the part of the railway company, the deliberate breach of a statute which says that it must have a sufficient cattle-guard—a most malicious, or at least wilful negligence; and against that there would be an accidental, trivial negligence on the part of the farmer whose animal happened to be at large. So my hon. friend, if he wants the Bill to be at all fair to the farmer, should provide that the fact that the animal is not attended on the highway, should be no evidence of such negligence. We must admit that the animal will be unattended once in a while, else the Act would not be required; but that fact alone should not be held to be sufficient negligence to prevent the farmer recovering against the railway company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The object of the law as we have it is to protect the general public, and the law provides two things : First, that the railway company shall provide a suitable cattle-guard, and, next, that the farmer shall not allow his cattle to run at large on the highway within half a mile of the crossing. Because we are legislating for the protection of the public ; and in order that the public may be protected, we require, on the one hand, that the railway company shall do something, and, on the other, that the owner of the animal shall do something. What is intended by my hon. friend would be to the detriment of the public, by removing all liability from the owner of the animal.

Mr. LANCASTER. Only if the railway company itself perpetrates a most wilful negligence.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not a question of half or semi-negligence ; it is a question of the public protection. It is a question whether you are going to obliterate this element of protection to the public.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the Minister of Justice if the public interest will not be promoted by compelling the railway companies to keep efficient cattle-guards at their crossings ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, and I think that is what we ought to seek to obtain; and we shall obtain that if we carry out the recommendation of the Railway Committee made at the suggestion of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. CLARKE. And if we carry that out, there will be nothing done within the next twelve months.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, there will.

Mr. CLARKE. It seems to me, representing a city constituency——

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Don't you let cattle run at large ?

Mr. CLARKE. No, we do not let cattle run at large in Toronto. It seems to me, as I understand the matter, that if an animal gets on the right of way of a railway company, and is killed, the farmer is completely out of court, and has no chance at all to make a good case against the company.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, that is not correct.

Mr. CLARKE. The court never gets so far as to ascertain whether the company had a proper and efficient cattle-guard at the crossing or not.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. CLARKE. Perhaps the Minister of Justice will tell us how and when it does ? I think we ought to legislate not specially in the interest of the farmers or in the interest of the railway company, but in the interest of the public generally; and if the law now requires the railway company to have an efficient cattle-guard at each crossing, I think parliament should insist on that being done. It is a fact, as I have been advised by many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, that since the onus of proving that the cattle were not improperly or illegally upon the highway has been placed on the farmers' shoulders, the railway companies have allowed the cattle-guards to deteriorate. One hon. member on the way from Smith's Falls to Ottawa the other day, told me that he could point out several crossings where there were no cattle-guards at all; and if a farmer's cattle, through accident, strayed out of his field and got on to the railway right of way and were killed, the farmer would have no recourse whatever. He would have to prove that the cattle were legally where they were when they were killed, and he could not do that. The law as it is at present throws the entire responsibility upon the farmer of proving that the cattle were where they had a right to be, and unless he could do that he would have no recourse against the company. It appears to those who try to look dispassionately at the matter that there is something wrong with the law as it now stands, and that under it the farmer does not get fair play; and it is an insult to him to say that he desires to have the law amended for the deliberate purpose of letting his cattle on the track in order to have them killed. He can do better by selling them than by trying to collect damages from a railway company, and I do not think that statement should be made again. I am firmly convinced that under the law at present, as it is interpreted by the courts, the farmer does not get fair play. I am in favour of the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln. If it is wrong, a year's experience will show wherein it is wrong, and then, if necessary, we can have it amended and made what it ought to be.

Mr. HENDERSON. In dealing with this matter, my view is that we should not endeavour to complicate the question so as to involve a farmer in a lawsuit on every occasion when an animal is killed. We should make the law as clear as possible, so clear in fact that the farmer himself can interpret it and know whether he can recover damages or not. I believe that the law can be made so clear that there need be no litigation, and with that view I propose to move an amendment to the amendment. Reference has been made by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) to the old pit-guard. I am not going to discuss that point because I understand that the general public do not approve of this guard. The railways are also very much opposed to it because it has a tendency to weaken the track, and with rapidly running trains, it is next to impossible for the railway companies to continue that style of guard. The law, as it now stands, provides simply for a suitable and sufficient guard. The difficulty is to determine when a guard is suitable and sufficient. I do not propose to interfere with the wording of the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). I am quite satisfied that we should enact every word of it, but I propose to add something, which I think is only fair to all parties concerned. We are not here to legislate in a way that will simply secure damages to a farmer if his animal be killed. What we want is to legislate so as to prevent animals getting on the railway tracks and being killed, and if we can do that we will be doing a great deal

more than simply enabling the farmers to recover damages. We have also the interest of the travelling public to consider, whom we desire to protect, and for whose protection it is necessary to have an adequate guard. I, therefore, propose to move, in amendment to the amendment, that the following words be added to the Bill :

Provided, however, that no liability shall accrue against any railway company for damages caused at any point where a cattle-guard approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has been erected and maintained.

If a railway company at any time puts in a guard which has the approval of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, then the company is exonerated from all damages should animals be killed. If a farmer should own a horse, accustomed to jump hedges, hurdles and ditches, which would get over the best guard you could devise, you could not expect a railway company to pay damages, should such an animal be killed in spite of all its precautions. Or if a farmer should allow a breachy steer—an animal that ought to be kept in stable at all times—to remain out in the field, and that animal should break through the fences and get over the railway guard the railway company should not be held responsible. I have sufficient confidence in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council to believe that it would only approve of the very best guard that can be obtained, either in this country or the United States or any other country, and the farmers would know that once a railway company had put up a guard of that character they would have no claim for damages. On the other hand the railway companies, having complied with the law, would feel that they had protection against any claims, and this would act as an inducement to them to put up the guard required by the Railway Committee. I can see no other solution of the question than to adopt a standard guard and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council is the most competent tribunal to decide what that standard should be. If that committee cannot determine this question, no other court can. Once the Railway Committee have decided upon a standard cattle-guard, the farmers will know just where they stand. I believe that the farmers would then be perfectly satisfied. I have conversed with some of them during the past few weeks on this matter, and I did not find one say that such a law would be unfair. When the best guard that could be found was put in, the railway companies should be protected against damages, but until they complied with the order of the Privy Council they should be held liable. I may be told that the railway companies will not put in a guard. Well, if they will not, they will be liable for all damages, but the moment they do so, they are afforded all the protection that can be demanded by them.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). This question has been so fully discussed that I need hardly say much about it. The fact that so many petitions have been sent to this House during this session from all parts of Ontario is plain proof that the farmers will not be satisfied unless some action is taken by this parliament regarding this cattle-guard business. All points have been discussed, from the farmer's point of view and that of the railways and the travelling public, this evening. Next to the travelling public, the farmers are more interested than any other portion of the community, because their cattle are liable to be killed, and if so, no damages can be recovered by them under the present law. If a proper cattle-guard be erected, as can be done and as has been done before, the travelling public will be sufficiently protected. The travelling public will be safe, because no cattle can get on the railway to be killed, and the farmers will be safe for their cattle will not be killed unless upon the intersection of the highway if they wilfully allow the animals to stray. The farmers are too much interested in this matter to allow the railways to be unprotected in the manner they have been. The men who man the railway trains, engineers, conductors, firemen and others—nine out of ten of them—are farmer's sons. Moreover, farmers make up a very large proportion of the travelling public. Altogether the farmers are more interested in the safety of the railways, perhaps, than any other class. I think it only right that at this session we should determine that the railways shall place cattle-guards. As it is at present, when a man wishes to drive cattle down the road, as I stated to the committee, he has to take two or three men with him to keep the cattle from getting on the track. Cattle driven away seek to return home, and they take the first opening and make a rush hoping to get away from their drivers. If there are no cattle-guards, they get on the track, and if a train comes along, the cattle are killed and the lives of the people in the train endangered. But, if the cattle-guards were there, the cattle would pass on across the track, and would not be killed, nor would there be that risk of killing passengers in the cars. I think this matter should be decided and decided at once.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WADE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Allow me to put the amendment. Mr. Henderson moves to amend the clause by adding the following words :

Provided, however, that no liability shall accrue against any railway company for damages caused at any point where cattle-guards approved by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council have been erected and maintained. This Bill to have force and effect from and after the first day of 1902.

Mr. HENDERSON. April.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. WADE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LENNOX. Who has the floor ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I was reading the amendment and did not see which of the hon. gentlemen rose first. The last speaker was on that side. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has the floor.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FRASER. I am bound to assume that these hon. gentlemen are merely standing up and that there is nobody to speak, and therefore——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has the floor.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call your attention to a point of order——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. But I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When a point of order is raised, both hon. members take their seats until it is decided.

Mr. LENNOX. But, I cannot state my point of order if I take my seat. The point of order is that I had undoubtedly risen and addressed the Chair, Mr. Chairman, and you asked me to resume my seat until you had read the amendment. I was bound to allow you to read the amendment, and I submit I had the right——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Allow me to state the point, and if I am wrong I will sit down.

Mr. COWAN. What is the point ?

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, I submit that having called that to your attention it is my right——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox) is perfectly right, and I recall the case now that he has reminded me of it. The hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was on his feet when I asked him to sit down.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call your attention and the attention of the committee to the fact that the amendment read from the Chair was not the amendment as read by the hon. gentleman who moved it, and, therefore, I submit, it is not under discussion. While I have the floor, which seems to be a desirable position to-night, I will make a few remarks, with the permission of the committee. If the amendment of the hon. member for Halton had remained in the form in which he read it, I would be prepared, although it is not exactly what I would like, to support something along that line. Although I do not entirely agree with his view, I think there ought to be some sort of compromise in a matter of that kind. I do not understand the farmers of this country to ask any more than what is reasonable, and they seldom, in my opinion, ask as much as they are entitled to. Therefore, I think I have the concurrence of the committee in saying that when the farmers do come and ask for something that they really need to redress a grievance, the matter should receive ready consideration at the hands of this committee. That there is a great grievance we need not argue. I think that is admitted on all sides. I wish to say one thing and say it very distinctly, and that is that I repudiate as strongly as I can the accusation made against the farmers by the argument that they want to sell their cattle by driving them or permitting them to go on the track. That argument has been advanced many times, but I think that any hon. member who says that does not understand the farming community in this Dominion. I need not say that they are an honest class and that in coming before the committee they are seeking redress for a grievance under which they have laboured for fourteen years—a great deal longer I am bound to say, than they ought to have submitted to it. The question whether there can be any instance in which a farmer could have redress in case his cattle are killed by going on the railway track at a point where there should be a cattle-guard, has been suggested by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) I hear every opinion of that hon. gentleman with great deference ; and would have been glad to hear him state any instance where a farmer could recover. But, in the absence of such a statement from the hon. gentleman it will not be deemed presumptuous in me to express my own opinion. From the study I have given the matter, I understand that as the law now is, if there are no cattle-guards and the cattle go down along the track and are killed, the farmer can not possibly recover. And for this reason, which is very plain—that, by the fact of the cattle going down the highway unattended the law was broken. Therefore, there is no lawyer who would for a moment advise the farmer in such a case to bring action.

We do not need to speculate upon the law in that regard, because the law has been so decided in more than one case in the province of Ontario, and also in Manitoba. So then we have this fact, that we have a law upon the statute-book which says that the railway company shall have suitable and sufficient cattle-guards, and yet if they do not have them, as they have not had them, they can snap their fingers at the public as well as at the farmers, that they can openly violate the law, and there is no possible redress in case of cattle straying upon the highway and thence upon the railway track. Now that is a matter which I submit cries for immediate redress.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend speaks with a great deal of authority, as coming from Ontario, because these rul-

ings do not apply in the province of Quebec, where we have not the doctrine of contributory negligence. But he says, assuming that the railway company is in default and that the farmer is not, and an animal gets on to the track and is killed—there is no recourse against the railway company. Now let us assume that the farmer is in default, that the railway company has got a suitable cattle-guard, and that the animal gets on the track and is killed, what would be the result in that case ? As I understand the hon. gentleman, he says the farmer is out of court because of contributory negligence. Is that not his opinion ?

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, not because of contributory negligence.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On the doctrine that he has not properly taken care of his animals.

Mr. LENNOX. Because it is contrary to the statute, as I understand it. It amounts to the same thing.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Practically the same thing. Now if the railway company meets with an accident and their cars are thrown into the ditch, where is their recourse ?

Mr. BROCK. None whatever.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It seems to me there are two sides to this question.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend has put two or three questions to me.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Take the converse of my hon. friend's case.

Mr. LENNOX. In the last case, you say, supposing there is damage to the railway, in what condition do the company stand ? I may say that if my hon. friend thinks that is a matter for consideraaion, it should be attended to. But my hon. friend from Lincoln is dealing with a matter which is specific and clear in itself. But I may tell my hon. friend that if my recollection of the statute is correct, if a farmer through negligence allows his cattle to get upon the railway, he is liable in case damage is done to the company. But coming back to what is more important, the farmer cannot recover at the present time in case cattle go from the highway upon the railway, notwithstanding that the company have been guilty of a direct breach of the statutes. That is the position of the law to-day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is where both parties are in default.

Mr. LENNOX. I am stating what is the fact, I am not inquiring into the cause. The fact and the law are that to-day if a farmer's cattle go upon the highway, whether by accident or design, unattended, and are killed upon the railway, the farmer cannot get any redress.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Nor the railway company either.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. LENNOX. One moment. What I say is this, there is a penalty in case the farmer's cattle get upon the highway, that is, he runs a risk of having them killed at the place of intersection, and when they are killed there he has no redress. Now my hon. friend says there are two wrongs, and there is a great deal in that argument, but not enough to stop this Bill. The farmer is wrong in having his cattle upon the highway at all, and the railway company are wrong in not having a proper cattle-guard there. Now the question is, what is the proximate and immediate cause ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Apply the doctrine of civil law and you have got an answer.

Mr. LENNOX. I am going to apply the doctrine of civil law to my hon. friend if he will wait. Now we have these two wrongs and I submit that the doctrine of the immediate and proximate cause is the one which should govern in a case of this kind. The farmer's cattle getting upon the highway may or may not meet with an accident. If there was a cattle-guard there they certainly would not meet with an accident at the point where they are killed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If they were not straying they would not be there.

Mr. LENNOX. Excuse me, if it were not for the absence of a cattle-guard they would not be killed between the two crossings upon the railway. It is plainly laid down that if a person is negligently crossing a railway track and is not acting with reasonable diligence the railway may not be liable ; yet, if the company could have averted the consequence of the plaintiff's negligence and did not, the company is liable. Now, if the railway company had done what the law prescribes it would not have been guilty of statutory negligence, and this accident between the two highways never would have occurred. Therefore I say you should compel the railway company to comply with the law, you should say to them, 'We will compel you to comply with the law, and if you do not, then you will be liable in case cattle are killed between the highway crossings.'

Mr. WADE. I think this measure is one of the most important that has been brought before parliament this session. It involves not only damage that may be done to cattle struck by a railway train, but damage that may be done to the train itself, and it involves the life of the travelling public and of railway employees. These are matters we must consider when we approach this question. For three days this matter was discussed before the Railway Committee. Upon the last day the Minister of Railways and Canals made a statement, which to my mind seemed most reasonable ; it was that the government would undertake during recess to find out what was the best cattle-guard or cattle-guards, and then at the next

session to enact a law compelling all railway companies to put in one or other of these guards. I think that in the discussion of this question one very important provision of the railway law has been entirely overlooked. Section 194 of the Railway Act says :

Fences should be erected and maintained on each side of the railway through such township, of the height and strength of an ordinary division fence, with openings or gates or bars or sliding or hurdle gates of such width for the purpose thereof, with proper fastenings at farm crossings of the railway, and also cattle-guards at all highway crossings suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting on the railway.

I mean to say that there is no gentleman who can tell us, that there is no railway man who can tell us of a cattle-guard which is sufficient to answer the requirements of that section. It is admitted to-day that no cattle-guard has been devised which is sufficient. The nearest approach to it is the old pit-guard and everybody is unanimous in admitting that that guard causes dangers which are far greater than the compensation of the safety to the animal.

Mr. FRASER. Are the words 'suitable' and 'sufficient.'

Mr. WADE. 'Suitable' and 'sufficient.' A cattle-guard is not sufficient that permits an animal to get over it. Under section 271, if cattle are imporperly on the highway and not properly attended and the railway kills them at the point of intersection, the owner has no action. That is where the highway crosses the railway, and experience has shown that if cattle are at large, if they are loose, and if they are upon the point of intersection and the train approaches, in nine cases out of ten, they will not turn to the right or the left, but they will rush madly over whatever obstruction there may be in the shape of a cattle-guard, and upon the line, and it is there that they will be killed. The first thing we have to consider about this statute is that it lays an impossible burden on the railway company, and whenever an Act lays an impossible burden on an individual or a company, that Act, to a certain extent, becomes nugatory. I submit that the root of the whole evil is in the impossibility of the railway company to comply with the provisions of the law as it stands to-day, and if you are to remedy that evil the Governor in Council, or the Minister of Railways and Canals, or the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, must lay down exactly what shall be a suffcient cattle-guard, giving its dimensions and specifications. Then, in case the company shall put in one of these guards or any such guard as may be prescribed by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and as it will then be possible for the railway company to comply with the Act, the disposition of parliament would be to force them to do it. There, I submit, is the root of the whole evil. I submit that the railway law as it stands to-day is nothing more than the common law of England. Here is the obligation resting upon the farmer on the one side to take care of his cattle, here is the obligation resting on the railway company to see that reasonable precauttions are taken not to let these cattle get upon the line of their railway. If one of these parties neglects the obligation that rests upon him that party is liable for any damages which may result, but if both parties are negligent, then, surely, neither party should have an action against the other. This section is a section which has been in the Act since we have had a railway law. It is true that the phraseology of subsection 3 has been altered, but the only effect of the alteration is to lay a little heavier burden on the railway company. Subsection 3 as it stood formerly was as follows :

Until such fences and cattle-guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are not duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains and engines to cattle, horses and other animals, not wrongfully on the railway.

The amendment of 1890 makes use of different phraseology and says that :

If the company omits to erect and complete, as aforesaid, any fence or cattle-guard, or if, after it is completed, the company neglects to maintain the same as aforesaid, and if, in consequence of such omission or neglect any animal gets upon the railway from an adjoining place where, under the circumstances, it might properly be——

That is the only difference, and I submit a careful consideration of that amendment shows that it lays a heavier burden on the railway company. Now, the amendment which has been proposed here by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) proposes, in effect, to say that in so far as railway crossings are concerned—he does not deal with fences, or any neglect so far as fences are concerned—but so far as cattle-guards are concerned, cattle shall not be considered improperly in an adjoining place simply because they are at large upon the highway. In other words, it would leave the law in the position that there is a provision which the company cannot perform. The company cannot put a cattle-guard there which would be a sufficient obstruction to cattle going upon their line. Then, if cattle going along the highway pass over this guard which is not sufficient to keep them away and they are killed, the company is liable in every case, no matter whether the cattle of the farmer were upon the highway by the grossest negligence on his part or not. I say that as between the company and the farmer it is not a fair or just provision, and it is proposed to change one of the safest principles of common as well as railway law. Then, there is the trainman upon the engine, or on the car. Has he anything

to do with this cattle-guard ? Has he anything to do with these cattle that are running at large, and yet his life is jeopardized, as are also the lives of the travelling public, because there are all manner of disasters which may overtake them. I read in the newspapers the other day of a cow which strayed near a station in the vicinity of Toronto, was struck by a locomotive, hurled against a carpenter who was at work nearby, breaking his back and killing him. Although that cow was at large through the gross negligence of the owner, we would have this state of affairs that here is a man killed by this cow being at large through negligence, yet the owner can recover damages against the railway company. I think I am in a position to speak with some slight authority upon this question. In the first place, I was born and bred on a farm, and in the next place, I have the honour to represent a county which is largely agricultural, through which, from one end of it to the other, a railway passes, another railway crosses within nine miles of its entire breadth, and still a third railway is being built. I have had some experience in operating a railway, having operated a railway for some six or seven years under an order of the court, and I make the statement with all deference to hon. gentlemen who have expressed contrary opinions that it would be a matter of the greatest misfortune, not only to the travelling public but to the farmers themselves, if we were to adopt this amendment to the Railway Act. I am sure that the farmers in my county and that the farmers in Nova Scotia do not demand anything of the sort. They are reasonable enough to see that the only way you can have safety is by keeping the burden on both sides. Hold the farmers to their duty, hold the farmers to the exercise of ordinary care and diligence in keeping cattle off the track, and hold the railway company to its duty in maintaining cattle-guards.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) says : Hold the railway company to its duty. How are the railways bound by any obligation ? How are the railway companies liable if they do not put in cattle-guards ?

Mr. WADE. I have read the section and the hon. gentleman has seen it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I read the section also, but I asked the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) to state a case if he can where the railway would be liable if they had not a cattle-guard.

Mr. WADE. I could state many such cases. In any municipality where there is no by-law prohibiting cattle running at large, the owner of the cattle would have an action against the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. At common law they could not run at large.

Mr. WADE. The principle of the common law in most of the provinces is, that the owner of the cattle must fence them in. The opposite, however, prevails in my province, and cattle are allowed to run at large unless there is a by-law of the municipality against it. I think, by their civil code, the province of Quebec is in the same position as under the common law in England in that regard. But mark you; we are making a law here not only for Ontario and Quebec and the maritime provinces, but for the whole Dominion, and for that vast section of country where cattle roam at large month after month. If you pass this law, then if a railway company had not cattle-guards over the prairie sections, the owner of a herd of cattle which is allowed to roam at large, could recover from the railway company if his cattle were killed. A railway company cannot fence along its line in the prairie sections, and so if you pass this law it will be absolutely unworkable in some parts of the Dominion, and it would land the farmers of the country in chaos, confusion and litigation.

Mr. AVERY. If a farmer is driving his cattle along a road taking them to market, and they get on a railway track and they are killed because there is no cattle-guard; what recourse has the farmer under the present law ?

Mr. WADE. Under section 271; if he is driving cattle along a road he is required to have them in charge of some person who is reasonably capable of managing them, and if he does that and his cattle are killed on the railway track through the want of a cattle-guard, the railway company is liable under the law as it stands to-day. That is a fair provision. The owner should have his cattle in charge of one reasonably capable of managing them, and if through his negligence in not complying with that provision his cattle are killed, he should be responsible for the damages that he sustains. One of the first cases that I have to try at the approaching session of court is an action brought by myself for a client against a railway company, for the value of a herd of cattle which were killed on a line of railway. I have advised my client that he is able to recover against the railway company. I say that every protection is here in the Act if we eliminate the word 'sufficient' from the section we are now considering. If the government prescribed one or more cattle-guards and said that these cattle-guards would be 'sufficient,' then I say that we will have met the whole difficulty.

Now, we come to this question of a sufficient cattle-guard. I listened with great attention to the very excellent speech made by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Thompson). He discarded the pit-guard, and I believe we all agree that the day of the old pit-guard is gone, but we have to search around to ascertain what is the best guard.

Mr. CLARKE. What kind of guard is now most largely used in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. WADE. The old pit-guards are used on the old lines of railway, but the guard which is in most general use on the new lines, and which is deemed to be the best for all practical purposes, is what is called the gridiron.

Mr. CLARKE. What is used on the main line of the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. WADE. They have the old pit-guards which were originally put in, but I understand these have been changed wherever a new one is required and the gridiron is substituted.

Mr. SCHELL. Is this gridiron guard made of iron or wood ?

Mr. WADE. It is made of wood. There is a large gridiron guard with spikes in it, but that has been found to injure the cattle, and the gridiron which has been found to work fairly well is made of wood. but it is not a sufficient guard because it does not keep the cattle off the track in all cases. Let me tell my hon. friend that the man who to-day would invent a sufficient cattle-guard which would comply with the provisions of section 94. would be a millionaire to-morrow, because I have not the slightest doubt that every railway in the Dominion would be anxious to adopt it. It is not fair to say that railway companies do not care whether the guards are there or not. To assume that, we would have to assume that the companies are utterly regardless as to whether they destroy the property of others or not; we would have to assume that they are callous as to whether they destroy life or not, and we would also have to assume that they are regardless of the destruction of their own property. The amendment to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has a great deal in it to commend itself to my judgment. After all, it is only the proposition that was put by the Minister of Railways before the committee the other day, when he said he would undertake on behalf of the government to ascertain by commission or otherwise the examination of all cattle-guards in use on the continent of America if necessary, and when one or more of the best guards were selected he would undertake to introduce an Act next session requiring the railway companies to put in the prescribed guard. Some hon. gentlemen may say : How are you to compel the railway companies to put in that guard. That is the easiest thing in the world. You can provide, that if they do not put the guard in within a certain time after the passage of the Act they shall be liable to a penalty for every day of such neglect, and the penalty can be made so high that they must put in the required guard. You could make them liable for damages if you will, but I hate interfering with the well known principle of common law. We could accomplish the result by making the railway companies liable for heavy penalties to be recovered by any person suing. If that be done we will remedy the wrong complained of by the farmers. I will take the responsibility that such a provision will be absolutely satisfactory to the farmers I represent. If we do that we will be compelling the railway companies to do what they should do. We will have then dealt fairly between the railway company and the farmers, and in dealing fairly between the two we will have had due regard for the safety and interests of the travelling public and the men who are employed upon the trains.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) explain to the committee what he means by saying that he will take the responsibility that it will be satisfactory ?

Mr. WADE. I said : Before my constituents in my own county. I suppose almost any gentleman would understand what I meant by that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Almost.

Mr. GILMOUR. In view of the fact that I represent a rural constituency and that I have had petitions sent to me with regard to this matter which I presented to this House, I wish to say a few words on this question. A lot of energy has been wasted to-night in trying to show that the law as it stands with regard to protection at railway crossings is not sufficient. I think it is generally conceded that the law at present is not sufficient, and that it is against the interests of the farmers of Canada. But it is needless for us to say that the law as it stands is not sufficient and that it should be amended as proposed by the hon. member for Lincoln, becuse if we amended it in that way we would just be putting it as far wrong the other way. The railway company should be placed in the same position as an individual. I do not think there is an hon. gentleman here who would say that they ought to be put in a worse position than an individual. Uuder our present municipal law, it enables individuals to establish what is called a lawful fence ; and if an individual puts up a lawful fence, he is absolved from any consequences that may come from that, and he can collect damages should his neighbours' cattle get over such. So with a railway company. They ought to be given the opportunity of putting up a lawful fence, and if they do that, they should be absolved from any consequences. But, under the proposal of the hon. member for Lincoln, no matter what kind of a fence the railway company should put up, if anything should happen they would perhaps be held liable. I do not think any hon. member of this House would say that is fair. I go further and say I do not think there is a farmer in the country would say that is fair. The farmers of this

country do not wish to put even a railway company in a worse position than they would desire to be put themselves. That is my position clearly in this matter. I do think the government ought to take this subject in hand, and declare what would be a lawful fence, so that the company would be put on a fair footing with other individuals. The hon. member for Lincoln deserves credit for bringing this matter forward, and I understand that the government next session are prepared to take it up and deal with it, and I think he ought to accept the statement that they will do something to put it in that position. I think his Bill might be so amended as to provide that a legal fence would be declared by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and a certain date might be fixed when the law would come in force and by which time the railway company would be absolved from blame if they put up such a fence.

Mr. McCARTHY. I occupy a somewhat similar position to that of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I have not any doubt that there exists a grievance and that by reason of the law as it at present stands. But I also think that by reason of an agitation which has been propagated throughout the province of Ontario by a newspaper, and by reason of the fact that certain hon. members of this House have been given by that newspaper a certain prominence and have obtained a certain kudos, the question has been unduly pressed, and they have apparently been afraid lest they would lose that kudos if they would accept any fair or reasonable compromise which might be suggested. It may be charged that, because I was referred to in terms anything but flattering by that newspaper last week, I speak as I do now. But I repudiate the charge before it is made. Perhaps it will be said that is because I have an uneasy conscience; but I repudiate this because I took the same position at the time it was proposed that this question should be disposed of in the House, and not referred to the Railway Committee, which was before the newspaper article appeared, that I would not stigmatize myself as a member of that Committee by saying that that body was not capable of dealing, or would not properly deal with the question. When the measure first came before the Railway Committee, I feared I would not be able to be present when it would be disposed of, and I spoke on that occasion saying that if an amicable arrangement could not be arrived at, and the railway companies would not accept any compromise, I would be prepared to support the hon. member for Lincoln's Bill; and I still occupy that position. The newspaper to which I refer did not give me credit for saying that; but said that the member for North Simcoe was a runaway. Therefore I feel it necessary to state now the position which I occupy. I agree entirely with the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) that there is a grievance, but that by legislating as the hon. member for Lincoln suggests, we would make the law go as far in the opposite direction as it does in favour of the railways at present. If that is the case, and if after three days' discussion in the Railway Committee and two or three hours' discussion here, hon. members cannot reach a fair and reasonable compromise, though both sides agree that a fair and reasonable compromise is possible, the difficulty must be to put it into proper words. What is the grievance? Only that a certain standard cattle guard is not maintained. If a standard cattle guard can be got, which is capable of keeping cattle off the railways, and that cattle guard is maintained, then the grievance is obviated and the difficulty is removed. Now, it is said that the Act as it stands at present does not arrive at that result, and in that I entirely agree, because unless the cattle, when on the highway, are in charge of an individual, it is held that they are not properly there. Consequently, the railways have in no way kept up their cattle guards. But as the Minister of Justice puts it, if the cattle, through the negligence of the farmer, being the first step of negligence, get upon the highway, and stray further, and then get upon the railway, then it is said that the farmer should profit by his negligence. I do not think he should; and in this I entirely agree with the hon. member for East Middlesex, who himself is a farmer, and who knows the feeling of the farmers. I have also had the opportunity of discussing this matter with the farmers of my constituency, and they entirely agree with what he says, that no farmer desires that farmers as a community should be allowed to take advantage of their own negligence. Nor do the railway companies I should hope, desire to take advantage of their negligence. If they do it is our duty to legislate so that they should not. But surely it is possible to arrive at a compromise whereby the farmer and the railway company should be on the same basis as individuals, and the law should be as fair towards the one as it is towards the other. If we agree in that, why should not some fair compromise on these lines be drafted?

It seems to me that the English language is not so barren that a fair compromise cannot be framed; and I am informed—the hon. member for Lincoln will correct me if I am wrong—that when his Bill was under discussion before the Railway Committee on the third occasion, on which occasion unfortunately I was not present, it was suggested that the matter should be referred to a sub-committee, composed of seven on one side nominated by himself, and five on the other side. Seven members to be appointed by himself and five members representing the opposite view, and he would not accept that proposition.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is not correct I have never heard of it before.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then I must have been misinformed. At all events, amendments were submitted along the lines of the suggestion made by myself on the first occasion the Bill was before the committee, and the hon. member would not agree to anything of the kind. Am I correct in that ?

Mr. LANCASTER. An amendment was suggested by one of the members from Essex—I think the hon. member for South Essex. I argued, as I have done to-night, that the fact that the animal was unattended should be no presumption of negligence, and I did so with regard to the clause suggested, namely, that a farmer could only recover when there was no negligence on his part. If it were provided that the fact of an animal being unattended was no presumption of negligence, I was willing to accept the clause proposed, but I did not know that the hon. member for North Simcoe had anything to do with it, and I have not seen any proposition of the kind to-night.

Mr. McCARTHY. The information that came to me was that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) had either conveyed or was asked to have conveyed a message to my hon. friend from Lincoln to the effect that a sub-committee should be appointed to be composed of seven members, selected by my hon. friend himself, and five holding the contrary view, to deal with the measure. He would then have the thing in his own hands, and the sub-committee would be bound to report. But of course, if that message did not reach him, I have nothing more to say on that point. But it seemed to me that this difficulty must be worked out on the basis of compromise, and I thought it unreasonable on the part of my hon. friend not to have accepted the offer which I supposed was made. I come now to the other suggestion, to which my hon. friend from Lincoln has referred, and for which I do not claim any credit. It was that if the cattle got on the road by reason of the negligence of its owner, he could not recover ; and I admit that the further suggestion of my hon. friend was a good one, and I think that if those holding opposite views could be got together, a compromise could be arrived at to the effect that if in the opinion of a court or a court and jury, if the case is tried by a judge and jury, the owner of the animal was found guilty of negligence, he should not recover, but that the fact of an animal being unattended on the highway should not be taken as a presumption of negligence. If such an amendment as that meets with the approval of the hon. gentleman, it seems to me the difficulty is removed. That I think would be a solution of the difficulty, satisfactory to both sides, but should it be impossible to arrive amicably at a reasonable arrangement and no compromise be arrived at, I am prepared to support the Bill of my hon. friend from Lincoln.

Mr. INGRAM. In view of the number of amendments put forth to-night and the statement made by the hon. Minister of Railways in the committee, I think that we ought to have some statement from some member of the cabinet, in the absence of the Minister of Railways, as to whether or not the government are prepared to carry out the promise made by that hon. minister in the committee. In my judgment, it would be in the interest, not only of the farming community but of the travelling public, that this matter should be seriously considered before any legislation be passed affecting it. It is not fair to say that hon. gentlemen who may take a different view from those who support this measure is opposed to any legislation that will remove the difficulty. I do not think that there is an hon. gentleman in this House who is opposed to legislation on this matter that will relieve or remedy the grievance. We are all agreed on that point, but where we disagree is as to what is the best way to remedy the grievance and do away with the complaints of the farmers. It has been stated here that this is to be an amendment to the General Railway Act of Canada and is to apply to the different provinces throughout the Dominion. But when we hear men from Manitoba and the North-west Territories and the other provinces outside of Ontario say that this Bill does not meet their views, it seems to me that it is the duty of the government and especially of the Minister of Railways to make a thorough investigation and so amend the Act that it will meet the requirements of all concerned. No doubt the railway companies have been more or less negligent in the matter, and where they have been negligent the head of the Railway Department should see as far as possible that they carry out the law. The fact of cattle roaming at large and causing accidents on lines of railway has been pointed out, and no doubt in such cases the farmers cannot claim any damage for the loss of their cattle. But, on the other hand, are not the consequences far more serious than the loss of cattle, when, in consequence of cattle thus roaming at large, they are struck by railway trains and damage is done to the property of railway companies and the lives of travellers imperilled and injured and sometimes lost ? All the cattle-guards from here to the Pacific coast will not prevent accidents of that kind. The animals are on the highway, through the negligence of their owners, and by reason of that negligence loss of life occurs and great damage to railway property, so that the actual placing of a cattle-guard would not prevent accidents in that way. But the great difficulty of passing legislation in this House is that you may possibly, if you are not very careful, frame it of such a character that it will make the farmer more negligent than he is, and thereby cause great danger to the travelling public as well as the property of the railway company. I can speak from my railway experience, and

I have known of many incidents, in which, by reason of the negligence of those who own stock throughout the country, serious accidents have occurred, and therefore I look upon this question as a very important one which should be seriously considered by the head of the Railway Department before any action can be taken. If the first minister will say that they are prepared to thoroughly investigate this matter and bring down legislation next session that will remedy the grievance, I am prepared to support the government in that course. But if they are not prepared to make any such declaration, I will have to be guided on other lines entirely, but until I have their declaration I am not prepared to state what course I shall take now.

Mr. PRINGLE. I was on the sub-committee last year that was appointed to consider this Bill. I took the view then that it was not one which should become law. One of the reasons I gave has been pretty well gone into, and that is that while it holds the railway corporation liable for negligence, it relieves the other party, no matter what negligence he may be guilty of. When this Bill came up this year, I proposed an amendment on these lines, namely, that we should insert the words 'Without any negligence on the part of the owner or person in charge of the cattle.' That amendment did not seem acceptable to the promoter of the Bill, and after considerable discussion, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that if it were allowed to stand over until the next year, some steps would be taken to see that sufficient cattle-guards were placed, where necessary, by the railway companies. Now I take the view that what we all desire is not only the safety of the cattle but the safety of the public, and that safety we will best provide by having the most efficient cattle-guards that can be procured.

In the year 1900 on some 18,000 miles of railway in the Dominion of Canada upon which there were 21,500,000 passengers carried, there were only seven persons killed through accident—less than one for every three millions of passengers carried. That is creditable not only to the railway corporations of this country, but also to the farmers, that they, on their part, have observed the law and kept their cattle from running at large on the highway. For, on looking at the statistics for the United States of America, I find that there were 530 accidents through cattle getting on the railway track. I say we should legislate in the interests of the great public of which the farmers form very much the largest portion; and we should not put upon the statute-book any measure which would be a retrograde measure and open the door, if I may use that word, for accident. For, as this Bill is framed, it would induce men to be careless and, perhaps, to permit their cattle to run at large, knowing that no matter how careless they had been, if the judge or jury say the cattle-guard is not sufficient they would recover damages. I am very sorry the Minister of Railways is not here to-night, for I would like him to make the statement in the House which he made in the committee. It was upon that statement that I voted to let the matter stand over until next session, because I believe that what we want is a proper cattle-guard, the best possible cattle-guard that we can obtain. And we want it left to the Minister of Railways or the committee to say what is a proper and sufficient guard. We find that, in the United States of America, the railway commissions of the different states inspect the cattle-guards and decide what is, or is not sufficient guard. If they pronounce the cattle-guards sufficient, that is the end of it. But, if this Bill were to become law, we should be in a difficulty as to whether a cattle-guard was sufficient or insufficient, judges or juries in different places taking different views. Therefore, I take it that it is in the interest of the public and in the interest of the farmers themselves that this Bill should be left in the hands of the government, that is, if the government assure us that they will take it up and give it every consideration, and come down next session with a Bill that will give the relief that is looked for.

Mr. FRASER. When I hear the hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), for whom I have the very highest respect, and who understands the position of the farmers in Ontario much better than others who are speaking more strongly for them, I am bound to say that it is evident opinion is not all one way. There is no cyclone in this matter; there is no reason why we should not take time to consider what we are doing. As both these hon. members said, we must look at the case fairly. The difficulty with a number of gentlemen who have spoken is that, under the fearful pressure of a number of people clamouring for a change in the law, they have forgotten that they were going to pass an Act of parliament, and have substituted this clamour and their own feelings in response to it, for the legal words and the legal facts——

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is the clamour in this Bill? If it is not in proper legal phraseology, will the hon. gentleman point out where it fails?

Mr. FRASER. The clamour is from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) and he is substituting his clamour——

Mr. LANCASTER. Let me ask the hon. gentleman if he did not say that we had introduced mere clamour into this legal document?

Mr. FRASER. I said they were substituting this clamour to give an appearance

of strength to their speeches instead of considering the cold words of an Act of parliament. You could not put clamour into an Act of parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought the hon. gentleman said we had.

Mr. FRASER. I was about to refer to what the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) said. He called upon the members from the lower provinces, because this was an Ontario matter, to join him. Does he want us to do violence to the principles of common law because there are people in Ontario who wish it? If the hon. gentleman wants that, he should provide that this Act shall apply only to Ontario; and, then, if Ontario is unanimously for it, I will not say a word against it. Now, we in the lower provinces have a fair number of miles of railway. Yet I have not received a single letter in support of this Bill, nor have I seen a single word about it from my own portion of the country. I have no doubt the difficulty arises in Ontario, and perhaps elsewhere. But we should never forget, as the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) has so well said, that it would be idiotic for us to remedy one difficulty merely by creating another. Legislation should be designed to remove difficulties, not to create new ones, that, perhaps, would be worse than the others. Wise men will seek to lessen a difficulty, or do away with it if possible, but will not pass legislation that will merely irritate the other side and create a difficulty greater than the cure. So, as one member from the lower provinces, I cannot accept the flattering invitation of the hon. member for Haldimand that, because he and others want it we should support this amendment to the law. We must consider what the effects of the change would be, not in Ontario only, but elsewhere. It seems to me that this would put the farmer in a position of unfair advantage, and as the hon. member for East Middlesex said, there is no farmer in Canada who wants that. It is not necessary for us to talk about the farmers being honest; the farmers of Canada need no defenders here or elsewhere. Under the wording of this Act, it would be possible for any man to recover whose cattle were killed. Even the present law is mixed up with this phrase of 'suitable and sufficient,' but if you will read the words as they appear in this Bill:

> And no animal not allowed by law to run at large shall be held for the purpose of such liability to be improperly on a place adjoining the railway if such animals get upon the railway from the highway by reason of such omission or neglect to maintain such cattle-guards or fences at the highway crossing.

In connection with this, you must read 'by reason of neglect to maintain such suitable cattle-guards or fences.' That, it appears to me, would make it almost impossible to defend any action, and I do not think any hon. gentleman would want that. I think we should accept what the Minister of Railways has said. But, if that is not accepted, I will vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Halton, for that is the next best thing in my opinion. I would not have taken up time but that I wished the committee to understand that we who come from the lower provinces can look at this question not only from the point of view of our own provinces, but from the point of view of the general effect of this statute.

Mr. SCHELL. I come from a county through which three railroads run the fastest trains probably in the Dominion of Canada. Upon this question of cattle-guards there has been a good deal of feeling amongst the farmers on account of the number of cattle killed. I have a number of letters which I could read from farmers who have had cattle killed, and are unable to get any recompense from the companies. The discussion this evening has turned largely on the question of negligence. Now I will cite a case to show how far the farmers are justified in complaining of the law as it stands at present. Mr. W. D. McCrimmon, of Glenroy, on the Canadian Pacific Railway line, writes that one stormy night his fences were blown down, the cattle came from the rear of the farm, passed down the road, and got on the track, and laid down on the track, and six thoroughbred cattle were killed by a train before morning; and he could get no recompense for those cattle because they were illegally on the track.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing the train was thrown from the track and several lives lost, who would be liable then?

Mr. SCHELL. I am merely discussing the question of negligence. Was that a case of negligence? I think that was a case where the railroad were clearly liable under the law, because if they had had a sufficient cattle-guard those cattle would not have got on the track and would not have been killed. I believe that in 90 per cent of the cases where cattle are killed it is in the night time when they have strayed upon the track in that way. There are very few cases indeed where cattle get upon the track in broad daylight. The root of the matter, as the member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) says, is the question of the sufficiency of the cattle-guard. So far as the farmers are concerned it is usually in the night time that their cattle get upon the track, and through no negligence of their own. Railroad men will almost invariably tell you that very few cattle get upon the track in the day time. They do not feed upon the track, but upon the side of the track. In the night time, if they get on the track, they lie on it because it is a warm place. I think the law should be made to protect the farmer whose cattle, by no negligence of his own, break out of the field and stray upon the track. Another

question we have to consider is the sufficiency of the cattle-guard. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) read extracts from the railroad people to show that they used efficient cattle-guards. Some railroads claim they have sufficient cattle-guards when they have only a few wooden slats laid upon the track. The member for Annapolis spoke about a gridiron cattle-guard. That gridiron cattle-guard is used in the United States to-day, and is recognized as sufficient by the law, but it is made of steel. The Canadian Pacific Railway had a large number of thse steel gridiron cattle-guards upon their track, and so did other roads in this country, but they were expensive, and so they substituted for the steel gridiron cattle-guards a few six inch boards put down upon the track which would allow any animal to walk over. The law said the company was not obliged to pay for animals that went upon the track so long as they had a semblance of a cattle-guard, so long as they had a few boards there. That was considered sufficient under the law to protect the company from liability if cattle strayed upon the track and got killed. These facts are well known to every railroad man. The gridiron cattle-guard made of steel is to-day practically an effective cattle-guard, but it is an expensive one, and it was dispensed with because the law admitted as sufficient a few cheap boards put down as a cattle-guard which would cost 75 cents, whereas the other kind would cost $20. That is the kernel of the whole matter. If the railroads had these gridiron steel cattle-guards in use we would not have this discussion to-night.

Mr. AVERY. A good deal has been said on both sides with regard to what constitutes a sufficient cattle-guard. I think it is high time we should amend the law and put it in such a shape that the people will know when they have a sufficient cattle-guard. It has been said that if a man is driving cattle over the road and they get killed, the owner can recover from the company. That is not the case. There was a case where the judge decided that if a man was in charge of the cattle, that was sufficient to protect the owner, and there being no cattle-guard on the railway and the cattle being killed, the owner had no recourse I think the motion of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) should be adopted, as I think that will protect the farmers of this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Exception has been taken to the amendment which I introduced, because I failed to read the latter portion of it. I was under the impression that in committee it was not necessary for a member to read his amendment, but that it was the Chair who read the amendment in putting it. Therefore in my opinion the amendment is properly before the House even though I failed to read the last few words. My intention was to fill in the date with the 1st day of April, 1903, and when my motion is put from the Chair. I would like those words to go in, in order to allow the railway companies time to comply with the requirements of the Act. I am sure the committee will be reasonable in a matter of that kind. No hon. member would expect the railway companies to be prepared to-morrow, or in two weeks, to put in the guards which the Railway Committee of the Privy Council might decide upon. They must have reasonable time, and we must, as reasonable men, deal in a reasonable way with the companies. It was suggested by the member for Annapolis that my amendment was along the line of what was suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals in the committee. I think it is somewhat different. In the Railway Committee I had my amendment prepared, but I did not catch the eye of the Chairman soon enough, and another suggestion was made before I could read my amendment. My amendment was different from that suggested by the Minister of Railways and Canals, in that I proposed immediate legislation. I favoured that, because the petitions that were sent in this year asked for legislation this session, and my desire was to comply with the prayer of those petitions. Consequently I moved an amendment in the Railway Committee, but it was held that I was not in order at the time. Perhaps I was not, I did not find fault with that ruling. But I take the opportunity of moving it here. Now I desire to say here that my policy is a standard guard. I am not so particular how that standard is obtained. I would call that a solution of this difficulty. I would prefer that it should be obtained along the line I have suggested. I think that would be the better and the more acceptable way. I think this the more speedy way, because, before parliament could be able to pass an Act next year, we would have these guards put in by the railway companies, and if the railway companies did not put them in, they would become liable under the Bill of the hon. member for Lincoln. If I cannot secure a standard guard in that way I am not going to oppose the policy of securing a standard guard in any way as soon as possible.

Mr. LANCASTER. Under the circumstances and in view of the opinion of a good many hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I think it perhaps would be the best I could do in the interests of the country, as I understand the country's interests, to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). It seems to me, that if not quite the same thing that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has suggested, it is almost the same thing and the difference is that we get a certainty now instead of an uncertainty, not meaning to impute for a moment that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would not carry out next year what

he intends to, but there is, as the hon. member for Halton has said, a great demand at present for a certainty in regard to this question, and I think the country will not be satisfied with any promise that may mean anything or nothing as far as practical results are concerned. Having in view the fact that the hon. member for Halton, as it seems to be understood by members on both sides of the House, adopted the main part, or the gist of the contention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals when he provides that if there is a standard guard provided the company shall not be liable under the amendment which I am asking the House to pass, I think the House will say that I have accepted as reasonable a compromise as I could be asked to accept understanding the rights of the parties to be as I have understood them to be. The effect will be that a company will be liable until that standard guard is put in and not liable afterwards if the standard guard is put in and maintained. The Act will not go into force until April next; that is practically what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals undertook to do next year. I can see no objection that he can make to putting that in this year provided that it does not go into force until next year. We get practical legislation through and are really carrying out what a great majority of hon. members want. It will suit the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour), it will suit the hon member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) and I think it will suit the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), although he did not go so far as these other hon. gentlemen in saying what would suit him, while he was arguing for a compromise. I hope it will suit the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), because he says that we are compromising in the sense that we let the railway company off if they provide what the Railway Committee of the Privy Council has said is a proper guard. Provided that they do that I think it is fair that they should be let off if the guard is sufficient. I think therefore they all ought to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Halton and be unanimous for once this session.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It is admitted on all sides that there is an evil from which the farming community is suffering at this moment, an evil which the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is trying to remedy by the Bill to which he has called the attention of the committee. But, at the same time, it seems to me to be admitted on all hands, also, that the remedy provided by this Bill is not adequate and will not meet the object which it is intended to serve. This proposition has been made to me very clear by the speeches of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) and my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), gentlemen for whom I have the highest respect and who can speak with authority upon such questions. It has been made clear that the farming community do not want to have one-sided legislation. They want legislation which will work both ways and which provides that the company shall perform their duties and that the farming community should perform their duties also. Such being the case, I may call the attention of the House further to the fact that it seems to me, that, at this moment, my hon. friend from Lincoln is scarcely in order in the proceeding which he asks the committee to adopt. I will call the attention of the committee to the rules of the House upon this subject. This is a private Bill introduced by the hon. member for Lincoln.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, a public Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a public Bill, but to serve an object as to which the procedure applied is the procedure of a private Bill. Certainly, it is a public Bill. It has been referred to the Railway Committee of the House. That Bill was read a second time with the distinct reservation that the House would not commit itself to the principle of the Bill, but that the principle of the Bill should be discussed by the Railway Committee, and that we should receive the report of the Railway Committee before we committed ourselves to the principle of the Bill. Now, I find that this Bill was not reported on favourably by the Standing Committee on Railways :

> Your committee have had under consideration Bill No. 2, an Act respecting telephone companies, Bill No. 3, an Act to amend the Railway Act, and Bill No. 28, an Act respecting telegraph and telephone companies, and recommend that the said Bills be not further proceeded with during the present session.

That is the report which we have before us, and my hon. friend altogether ignores this report. He has not even, so far as I have been able to follow the discussion, and I have followed it with a great deal of care, and I do not recollect that the hon. gentleman has referred to this report.

Mr. LANCASTER. In moving the House into committee I did.

The PRIME MINISTER. In a very casual way, but he has not moved to have the report set aside. While he stated that the report of the committee made certain recommendations the recommendation was that the Bill should not be proceeded with this session. He has ignored this, has put it aside and has asked the committee to proceed with the Bill as if the Bill had been reported upon favourably by the Standing Committee on Railways and Canals. I suppose if the Railway Committee had reported favourably he would have said that the Bill should have been taken clause by clause and section by section by this com-

mittee and that the Bill should be accepted. Now, my hon. friend proposes that we should do the same thing. There is no difference whatever in his procedure to-day. If the report of the Railway Committee had been favourable to his Bill he would have proceeded just as he is proceeding now, he would have asked that the Bill be taken section by section and approved by the House. But, the report has been against him. The Railway Committee have not reported the Bill, but have recommended to the House that the Bill should not be proceeded with this session. He puts that aside altogether, he does not take it into account and he asks the committee to pass the Bill as if the Bill had been reported favourably by the committee. What shall we do with this report? What is the object of it? Why did we refer this Bill to the Railway Committee? We referred it to the Railway Committee to have the opinion of the Railway Committee upon the subject. The opinion of the committee is that we should not proceed with the Bill this session. For my part I have always maintained that the best course for the House, is to support its committee unless very strong reasons can be shown to the contrary. I am informed that the reason why the committee would not entertain the Bill this year was because of the statement made by my colleague the Minister of Railways: that in his opinion the best way to deal with the question was not to support the legislation presented by the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) but to decide first what proper cattle-guards are and then to say that they shall be adopted. The Minister of Railways reported to me that he had stated to the committee that during the recess he would take means to collect information as to the best cattle-guards in existence; that he would appoint experts to ascertain that, and that next session he would introduce legislation dealing with the matter. In fact that matter was arranged between us beforehand and the Minister of Railways spoke by authority of the government. The pledge which the Minister of Railways took before the committee, I now take on behalf of the government before the House. We shall during the recess employ experts and collect information to find out what is the best cattle-guard that can be devised, and we shall then undertake to deal with the question. I think that is the best course which can be followed under the circumstances, and I would submit it to the approval of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). This is a very important question, and a question which should be carefully considered. For my part, I am strongly of the opinion that the legislation now before us, will fail of its object, and I agree with my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Gilmour) that the best way is to provide that the railway companies shall have the best cattle-guards. I submit to hon. gentlemen, and particularly to the hon. gentleman from Halton, that we will serve best the ends which all of us have in view by following the course that has been suggested by the Minister of Railways, and allow the matter to stand until information is collected during the recess, when the question can be dealt with next session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. MONK. Has the right hon. gentleman considered that if the amendment of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is adopted now, the law will be ready at hand next year. The amendment will not in any way prevent the government from putting into execution its resolution of examining into which is the best cattle-guard during the recess, but on the contrary it will facilitate the government in doing so. The amendment will thus give us a law coming into force next parliament, and will allow us to put the results of the inquiries of the government into force without legislating again. In the province of Quebec it is a very serious matter for us. I will not say that it has been agitated as vigorously as in the province of Ontario, but there is no doubt that we have suffered a great deal from this defect in the legislation. This grievance has been mentioned very often in the House. We have petitions asking for immediate legislation, and in my opinion the proper course for the House to pursue now is to adopt the amendment of the hon. member for Halton.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am aware that this grievance is not confined to the province of Ontario. We have suffered in the province of Quebec perhaps as much as in other provinces, but at the same time I would suggest that there would be more security, if, since we have to wait under any circumstances, we should wait a little longer and have before us the result of the inquiries which will be made. In the meantime we will try to find an adequate remedy for the wrong, and if we incorporate that remedy in the statute-book next session, no harm will be done. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has suggested that he would be quite satisfied to leave the selection of the cattle-guard to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. That may be, but I think we can leave it with greater safety to parliament itself. Next year we will be able to prescribe the nature of the cattle-guard in the law, and it will occur to everybody that that would be still more satisfactory than if we now adopt the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think that the right hon. gentleman has gone so far as the Minister of Railways in his statement. I understood the Minister of Railways to say that he would carefully weigh the law as it affected the different provinces, and that he would be prepared at the next session to come down with legislation that would

remedy the evil in so far as it affected the whole Dominion.

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say that I have discussed that point with the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I did discuss with him the question of the cattle-guard. If we provide a safe cattle-guard then we can very well adopt the reasoning of my hon. friend from Halton, that if there is an animal who jumps over a proper cattle-guard he should bear the consequence.

Mr. MONK. The right hon. gentleman would greatly reassure me if he would tell me that next April we will have a law in force remedying this evil.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think I can answer that. If the hon. gentleman will not delay the session then we will possibly have such a law in force next April. That matter rests with the hon. gentleman himself. If he delays the session of course the law may not be in force in April.

Mr. MONK. It would be in force at once, if I had the power.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the government is ready to remedy this evil and bring down legislation next session. Otherwise I should be compelled to vote on the question now, but if the right hon. gentleman gives that promise I will stand by the government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think I said that. With the object of securing the approval of my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) I will not hesitate to say so.

Mr. BRODER. I think there was a promise like that made two years ago, made by the Minister of Railways and Canals.

The PRIME MINISTER. Give us a trial now.

Mr. BRODER. Our experience does not lead us to much hope. The Minister of Railways and Canals has now a Bill before the House proposing to do away with the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, and what is the use of referring this matter to a body which is going to be dead and buried in a few months.

Amendment to amendment (Mr. Henderson) negatived: Yeas, 28; nays, 75.

Mr. DAVIS. I move, seconded by Mr. Scott, that the committee rise.

Motion agreed to: Yeas, 67; nays, 35; and the committee rose.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 22, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

RED DEER VALLEY RAILWAY AND COAL COMPANY.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (South Essex) moved:

That Bill No. 86 respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unfortunately absent from the city when this Bill came before the Railway Committee, and therefore no person had charge of it for the purpose of giving explanations. However, I quite readily appreciate that when a Bill has been fairly considered by the Railway Committee and has received fair treatment by that committee, very strong reasons indeed should be advanced for asking the House to refer it back. In this particular case the Bill was defeated by a majority of one. There was an actual majority in the committee in favour of the Bill. There were members of the committee who were present during the entire discussion, who were familiar with its merits, but who happened to step outside of the Railway Committee room during the time the motion was being read and when they returned for the purpose of voting the objection was taken that they had not been in the Railway Committee when the motion was being read and the objection was sustained. This charter has been renewed upon previous occasions. The promoters of the Bill only ask now that they shall receive an extension of time until the 1st of July, 1903, for the purpose of the commencement of construction and until the 1st of July, 1904, for its completion. All the time they ask is a year from next July. As an evidence of the good faith of the promoters I may say that they have started operations and have graded some eight or nine miles of the road at a cost of $25,000 or $30,000. Earlier in the life of the charter it was in the hands of some English capitalists who became financially embarrassed in connection with other ventures and did not carry this work to a successful completion. When there was a renewal of this charter, one of the conditions which was imposed upon the new incorporators, or the company, was that they should deposit $50,000 in cash in the hands of the Minister of Finance as an evidence of good faith. That $50,000 has been deposited in the hands of the Minister of Fin-

ance and it is in the hands of the Minister of Finance to-day. I think that under the circumstances, and in view of the technical objections that were taken to certain members of the Railway Committee voting, in view of the fact that these people have gone on with the bona fide construction of the road and have expended $25,000, or $30,000, in grading eight or nine miles of the road, in view of the fact that the incorporators have deposited $50,000 in cash in the hands of the Minister of Finance, and further, in view of the fact that they only ask an extension of time of a year from next July for the commencement of the work and of two years from next July to carry it to a successful completion, I do not think I am asking too much in asking the House to refer this Bill back to the Railway Committee that it may be considered upon its merits.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). I think the hon. mover of the motion (Mr. Cowan) spoke very truly when he said that there should be some substantial reason for referring a Bill back to a Standing Committee after that Bill has been fully discussed and decided upon by the committee. I do not agree with him that on this occasion the reason given is a substantial one. The Bill was discussed before the committee during the entire two hours of sitting. While the committee was at a loss for the lack of the presence of the hon. member (Mr. Cowan), the solicitors of the Bill were present, and another member of the House, certainly a very prominent member of the House assumed charge of the Bill for the occasion. There is no question but that the committee was thoroughly aware of the merits of the Bill and there was no question as to the vote of the committee. To call in question the vote of the committee is to call in question the ruling of the chairman, which has not been done so far during this session of parliament. I think all the members of the Railway Committee will bear me out when I say, that the Chairman (Mr. Hyman) has been scrupulously correct in his rulings ; and on this occasion as on others.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. If hon. members were not sufficiently interested in the Bill to listen to the discussion of its merits but were ready to come in and cast a vote on a Bill the merits of which they do not understand because they did not listen to the discussion or did not consider it sufficiently important to warrant them spending their time listening to it ; I submit that is not a reason why this House should refer the Bill back for the consideration of that committee. However, the hon. member who has charge of the Bill has seen fit to exercise his privilege to make this motion.

I believe that this motion raises the question of the merits of the Bill, and on that supposition I take the liberty of placing before the House some of the reasons why the Railway Committee rejected the Bill. It would almost seem from the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) that this was a much abused company ; that this was one of the very few railroad companies applying for charters in this Dominion who really meant business and who had not had fair treatment from the Railway Committee of this House. It may surprise the members of the House to know a little of the history of this company which begins as far back as the year 1888—and it does not begin with an Act of parliament, but with an Order in Council granting to the company, not then in existence, an area of 350,000 acres of the public lands of Canada in order that the company might be brought into existence ; and be profitable I presume to the promoters. That Order in Council is dated November 28th, 1888, and recites :

> On a report dated November 19, 1888, from the Minister of the Interior, stating that representations had been made by Mr. J. Ick Evans, of Toronto, that he has succeeded in forming a company of English capitalists who have given notice of their intention to apply for an Act of incorporation under the name of the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company for the purpose of building a railway from Cheadle Station, Alberta, to the coal mines found to exist in townships 28, 29 and 30, ranges 21, 22, 23 and 24 west of the 4th principal meridian, provided a bonus of 6,400 acres of land per mile of railway to be built, estimated at 55 miles, being about 352,000 acres, can be obtained, and he asks that such land grant shall consist of the odd and even numbered sections, exclusive of Hudson's Bay and school sections, in the following townships and parts of townships, as shown upon the annexed map.

The townships are then recited and the conclusion of the paragraph is : 'which would amount to about 358,400 acres.'

> The minister is satisfied as to the financial ability of the parties who have offered to assist Mr. Evans in this undertaking, and as the proposed railway would not only give access to an excellent agricultural section of country, but would also enable the government to sell some of the coal lands in that district which otherwise might remain unproductive for a considerable time; he recommends that, subject to the approval of parliament a free grant of 6,400 acres of land per mile to aid in the construction of a railway from Cheadle station, on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to a point in or near township 29, range 23, west of the 4th meridian, be made to the company now seeking incorporation under the name of the 'Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company,' to consist of so much of the available lands in the townships hereinbefore enumerated as may be required to make up a subsidy to this company at the rate of 6,400 acres of land per mile for the whole length of railway found necessary to build in order to reach the coal fields above mentioned, such distance not to exceed in any event fifty-five miles, and the location, gauge and grade of the railway to be subject to the approval of the Minister of Railways and Canals and with whom the contract must be arranged.

You will notice Mr. Speaker, that the basis of the extraordinary action taken on that

occasion was the urgency of the necessity of the building of this road for the development of certain coal mines, and to enable the government to sell its coal lands in this locality. The government was then satisfied of the financial ability of the man to whom the grant was made. That was on the 28th of November, 1888, and to-day an hon. member comes to the House and asks that his Bill to give the company, not until the 1st of July 1903 but until the 1st of July, 1904 to finish this 55 miles of railroad, shall be again considered by the Railway Committee of this House. Now, if it was urgent in 1888 that this railroad should be built, it is surely as urgent in 1902. I therefore say that when these parties ask for two years and some months time to build 55 miles of railroad over prairie country, they are giving poor evidence of their ability to build, even under the remarkably favourable conditions set forth in the Order in Council. For the information of hon. members of this House I may say, that the principal bulk of population which is interested in the building of this road, have been heartsickened by the action and attitude of this company. I speak of the people of the city of Calgary. At a meeting of the city council of the town of Calgary some months ago, a resolution was passed and forwarded here, asking parliament to reject any application for any further extension of this charter. The Calgary city council which represents the people principally interested in the development of that district have asked that the ground be cleared; that this company be wiped out so that other people may come forward and have an opportunity to build the road. You may say that is an extreme position to take, but I would remind the House that this company holds absolutely locked up from settlement nearly half a million acres of land so that the country tributary to the city of Calgary cannot be developed until it pleases this company to open that land for settlement by the building of the railroad. Instead of this charter being a charter granted for the development and advancement of a part of the North-west Territories, it has been a dead weight upon that development. If even yet there was a prospect that the charter was in the hands of people who meant business, I presume the people of that district would be glad to have the company own it and build the road. At this late date, fourteen years after the original charter was granted, the company comes forward and asks for two years more time to build these 55 miles, making at least 16 years from the first inception of this company which then had satisfied the minister that it was competent to build.

I say it shows a lack of willingness or ability, either the one or the other, and it makes no difference to this parliament which. It is the duty of parliament to protect the public interest by preventing lands from being locked from settlement any longer at this time, when settlement is rushing into the country, and when those lands are in demand. The rush of settlement which took place into the North-west twenty years ago was turned back, and the progress of the country was hindered for twenty years, by the holding up of lands, just as in this case; and it is as necessary to-day that the lands should be opened to public settlement, or that the railroad should be built to afford advantages to the pubiic and to give value to the lands as it was twenty years ago.

It is perhaps not necessary to follow the somewhat devious course of this company between the year 1888 and the present time; but inasmuch as these people come before us now and say, 'Oh, we only want a little extension of time,' I will trespass on the time of the House enough to show that that has been their plea ever since 1888—that it has been extension after extension; that they were always able to build the road, but they never built it. In 1888 they got their first Order in Council, granting the land; in 1891 the order was revived and amended; in 1893 it was revived and amended again; in 1894 once again; in 1895 again; and let me draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a very peculiar provision in this revival of 1895. It relates to the control they should exercise not only over the lands but over the settlers who were on the lands, before the date of this Order in Council:

> Each bona fide settler found on the land granted to the company at the time such land grant is earned who settled thereon before the 1st of January, 1891, shall have the right to retain the land occupied by him——

Mark the generosity of this noble company——

> —to the extent of 320 acres on paying the company therefor at a price not exceeding in any case $2.50 per acre.

That is, the people who settled on the land before the company had an existence, when land was worth a dollar an acre, were to pay this company $2.50 an acre for it.

> —and if he settled thereon after the 1st of January, 1891, he shall have the right to retain the land occupied by him to the extent of 160 acres

—only if you please——

> —on paying the company therefor at the price ruling under the Dominion lands regulation in force at the time he went into occupation of the land.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the generous way in which this company proposed to deal with the settlers upon their tract. But particularly I draw your attention to the value which they placed upon this land grant. They have a grant of 358,000 acres, which they themselves value at a price varying from $2.50 to $3 per acre, amounting to a total value of from $750,000 to over $1,000,000; and they are not able to build 55 miles of railway on that

land grant, but want a further extension of time. They came again in 1898, and again in 1900. Their land grant was renewed by Order in Council dated 1900, and expires on the 1st of July, 1903. Now, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, I beg to say that I suggested to the Railway Committee that the extension of time to be given the company should coincide with the date limiting their land subsidy. But they said: 'No, we cannot build in that time; it will not be of any use to us.' Then I said: 'If you cannot build within the time that enables you to earn your subsidy, you cannot build at all, and you do not want to build at all. It is simply a case of trying to hold up a land grant and of holding up the public until something turns up that will enable you to sell the charter to better advantage.' These were the reasons, as I understood, which caused the Railway Committee to reject the application of the company; and I submit that if this House has any regard for what is fair and right to the country at large, or to the people who are developing the country, they will support the action of the Railway Committee, and refuse to refer the Bill back.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as somewhat singular that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat should take the position he does with reference to this Bill. It struck me, from the remarks made by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan), that the request of this company for an extension of time for the completion of the road for two years from the 1st of next July, was a moderate and reasonable request. It seems from what my hon. friend says that a company has been in existence for the last fourteen years which has possessed the charter for the construction of the railway under consideration; but I am told that that company has ceased to exist, that there has been a reorganization of the company within the last year, and that one of the reasons why the company did not proceed with the construction of this railway was the impossibility of getting iron, which has been a difficulty in the way of many railway companies in America making extensions or improvements. Now, if this reorganized company, which I am told was not represented when the Bill was considered by the Railway Committee, has not for this reason received fair consideration by the committee, if the facts which it is necessary for the committee to have in their possession in order to arrive at a fair decision, have not been placed before them, I see no reason why the Bill should not be referred back. On the contrary, I think the refusal of this House to refer it back would be a high-handed act, an unjust and tyrannical act.

Mr. SPROULE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if they had not two solicitors there representing the company?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am told that the parties upon which the company relied to place their case before the committee were absent. This company, I am told, has already proceeded to grade a portion of this road, and has, in fact, graded some seven or eight miles, and placed $50,000 in the hands of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I will take the liberty of saying that the company has not graded seven or eight miles.

Mr. CHARLTON. Very well, that is a question of veracity between the representatives of the company and my hon. friend. That is a matter for the committee to inquire into if the Bill is referred back, and that is an additional reason for referring it back.

Mr. PUTTEE. Might I ask a question? Is the hon. gentleman aware that all these matters were gone into by the Railway Committee?

Mr. CHARLTON. Probably they were, but I am dealing with what I believe to be certain facts in relation to this matter. My hon. friend says that his friends in Calgary want the ground clear, that they want this company obliterated. Very naturally. He is interested probably in some other company that wants to get hold of the charter and the land grant. Supposing he succeeds, suppose this House should refuse to refer this Bill back to the Railway Committee——

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask if the hon. gentleman is in order in imputing interested motives to me in my opposition to the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. I was not imputing motives. I say that the hon. gentleman's friends are very anxious to have the deck clear and this company obliterated, and I am drawing an inference from that statement. Who is anxious for this, and what is the reason? Can a company be formed in place of the present one which can finish the road any sooner? Why, the new company would have to get a charter and could not take the first step until another session. The present company, however, asks for two years from next July in which to build the road, and it is not in the bounds of reason to suppose that any other company can excel this one in celerity in giving to this locality the railway accommodation it requires. Under the circumstances, the public interest cannot suffer by giving the extension asked. Any company that may succeed this one is prevented by physical means from completing the road any sooner than the time in which the present company pledges itself to complete it. The present company has given evidence of good faith by having performed certain work, by having put up money, and by asking for a limited period in which to complete the enterprise, and the fact that it could not get

iron last year, and consequently could not proceed with the work, points to the conclusion that justice will not be done if this Bill be not referred back to the committee.

Mr. CHARLES S. HYMAN (London). I am not going to take up any time in discussing the merits of the case, but as the circumstances under which the committee reported are somewhat peculiar, it is only fair that the hon. members should know them before voting. I have taken the ground in the House before now, and intend always to take the same ground, that unless there are good substantial reasons, unless there are practically some new matters brought before us, it is the duty of the House to stand by the reports of its committees, especially a committee consisting of so large a representation as does the Railway Committee, over which I have the honour to preside. When the merits of the Bill were presented, there was a good representation of the Railway Committee present —seventy-one members. When the vote on the preamble was put, the preamble was carried by a vote 36 to 35. But there were two members of the committee who, to my knowledge, had been present during the greater part, if not during the whole of the discussion on the merits of the Bill, and who happened to leave the room just previous to the question being put. They returned as the vote was being taken, and their votes, in the first instance, were recorded, so that the vote stood 36 for the preamble to 35 against. The point of order was then raised, I think by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver), that two members of the committee, who had voted, were not present when the motion was put by the Chair. I upheld the point of order, rightly or wrongly, and ordered the names of the two gentlemen to be struck from the record. The consequence was that the preamble was rejected by a majority of one, namely, 35 against, and 34 for, and the Bill was not reported. Under the circumstances, as there was an actual majority in the committee in favour of the preamble and as it was only on a technicality that the Bill was not reported, I think that another opportunity should be given the promoters to present their case before the Railway Committee.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not think that the hon. member who has just taken his seat could contend that the number of members present at the meeting of the Railway Committee referred to was not a fair proportion of the whole. There was seventy-one present, and seventy-one voted. After a very lengthy discussion pro and con, after the two lawyers representing the company had said everything they could to influence the committee in favour of the Bill, the Bill was defeated, and the adverse vote given was given largely on the history of that company as laid before that committee. As the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said, the object of granting a charter at all was to enable coal to be carried by rail to Calgary from the Red Deer country at the earliest possible date, and the House agreed to give a grant of 6,400 acres per mile, and a reasonable time for the accomplishment of the undertaking. Before that time expired, the company asked an extension which was granted. When that extension was about to expire, they asked a renewed extension. And so from year to year ever since, for the last sixteen years, we have been granting renewals of this railway charter, and nothing so far has been done. The appeals of the company were based nearly always on the ground that they were unable to raise the money required. The prime necessity for a railway in that district is to bring cheap fuel into Calgary, to which place, for many years back, coal has had to be drawn from the Red Deer country, some sixty miles. From time to time extensions were made of the period originally granted. Previous to 1897 several extensions had been given, and in 1897 the company was given an extension of two years to begin and four years to complete, but it neither began nor completed. In 1899, there was a further application made and a strong fight put up against it, but the company were given a further extension of one year to begin, during which they were to expend 15 per cent of the amount of capital stock on the construction of the road. Yet they expended nothing and none of the road is built yet. When the solicitor of the company was asked in the Railway Committee if the road was graded, he replied that he thought not, but that the company had got out plans and made specifications and done provisional surveys, which had cost it a great deal of money. He did not say, however, that they had built any part of the line, and as far as we know, none of it has been graded or built, and yet we are met again by a request for a further extension of time.

Mr. COWAN. There are between eight and nine miles graded.

Mr. SPROULE. The solicitors of the company did not say so.

Mr. COWAN. Yes, they did.

Mr. SPROULE. And the representative from the district did not say so, nor did the petition from the people of Calgary, who strongly urged that this company should not be given any further extension, on the ground that it was evidently holding the charter for no good purpose and had no intention of building the railway. For sixteen years this charter has been extended, and ever since the land grant was given, that grant has been kept for that company. At the time that land grant was given, the land undoubtedly was not worth a dollar an acre, but, at present, it is worth from

$4.50 to $5 an acre. At 6,400 acres of land a mile, their land grant would amount to 352,000 acres of land; and, allowing $4.50 an acre, you get a total of $1,604,000, to build a railway 55 miles long that, we are told on good authority, can be built for less than half the money. But these people do not intend to build it. What did we see in the committee? I asked the solicitors several times who were the stockholders of this company, and they would not tell the committee. Why? They gave only one name, that of Mr. Elias Rogers, of Toronto. We know who Mr. Rogers is in connection with some other affairs. We know that he is the moving spirit in the Crow's Nest Coal Company, which is bringing its coal a long distance into Calgary and selling it there to-day. Is it supposable that these people will open up the coal lands of the Red Deer valley and bring this coal into Calgary to compete with their own from the Crow's Nest? If they had given the names of the other stockholders, it would have disclosed beyond any question the inwardness of this company's holding up the construction of that railway and keeping this land grant in this way. It is easy for the House to see that they do not desire to build the railway, and never did. This land grant is increasing in value very rapidly, and these men desire to retain it, and, to retain it they must keep this charter alive. The hon. member in introducing this motion gave us an evidence of the bona fides of the company that they had deposited $50,000 with the government, and he declared that if they did not commence and go on with the line that money would be forfeited. But when we look at the law, we find that the money is not forfeited, but that if they do not do the work the money reverts to the company. So, even if they do not begin to build the railway,—and, so far as I can learn they do not desire to build a mile of it—there is not a dollar of that money in jeopardy. Coal is very plentiful in the vicinity of the land granted to this company, and the government are selling coal lands at $10 an acre, if they sell them at all. Before this Bill is referred back we should have much stronger reasons than those just given. There was a large attendance at the committee when their decision on this question was reached, and the matter was fully and fairly discussed. The company had their solicitors and their friends there to bring out the facts. But they dared not give the names of the stockholders of the company. They knew that if they did the committee would see the inwardness of the measure. This was the reason why the committee refused to renew it. Why should the company be allowed to hold land, away from homesteading and settlement for sixteen years, while the inrush of settlers is filling up the country and causing the rapid increase of values? The road has not been built, and this corporation is still benefiting by holding up this charter and preventing the development of a rival company to bring coal into Calgary as it ought to have been brought years ago. For these reasons the committee refused to renew the charter, and these reasons were good ones. I think the House would do a very improper thing if it referred the Bill back to the committee to have this charter extended.

Mr. B. RUSSELL (Hants). I think that, at least it can be said that this Bill has had very bad luck before the Railway Committee. It seems to me also that my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is taking very narrow and technical ground when he says that, because it happened that a couple of hon. gentlemen who were in sympathy with it and who did not, technically speaking, hear the question put from the Chair, and so were not able to have their votes counted, this report should be accepted as the deliberate decision of the committee. But that is entirely in keeping with the general ground taken against this measure, which is an insistence upon the strictly legal and logical forfeiture of the rights that this company has under its charter. Now, it seems to me that we ought not to insist upon that forfeiture, but should give the parties interested in the Bill a fair opportunity of having their case fairly and fully heard and decided by a fair vote, and not by a snap vote of the committee before we impose upon them such serious results as the forfeiture of the rights they have acquired. This was the one case, it seems to me, in which reason was given why there should be an extension of the charter. We had extended charters over and over again without even the slightest evidence that money had been expended or deposited for the construction of the road. But in this case we had the facts that there had been at least a sum of $50,000 actually deposited in the treasury as evidence of good faith on the part of the company, and there was a great question whether that money was not actually forfeited under the terms of the statute. It seemed to me, therefore, that the company should have the chance to go on and earn their land grant by building the road. The hon. gentlemen who speak against this proposal are taking quite inconsistent ground. The hon. member for Alberta says the company cannot build the railway, while the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) represents that the company have an enormously valuable asset—an asset worth three or four millions of dollars. Both these things cannot be true. If the company have these enormously valuable coal lands, it is clearly not reasonable to say that they cannot build the road if they desire to do so. But the argument which led the committee to take the action it did, which took the committee by storm in fact, was such a one as my hon. friend has made—but it was made far more powerfully by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson)—that there was something mys-

terious about this company and that they did not intend or desire to build the road, but had the sinister desire of preventing the road being built and the land being opened up. That, I say, carried the committee by storm. And no wonder, for it was presented most ably and powerfully by the hon. member for Halton, who spread the floor of the committee room so to speak, with the brains of the lawyers in the case. The committee was misled by that spacious argument, of which there is not a single proof before the House, and never was any proof before the committee. This being so, I say it is fair and reasonable to say that we should give these people, who have only been in possession of this charter, as I understand, for two years, and who only ask two months more than the hon. member for Alberta was willing to concede to them when he addressed the committee, a chance to be heard.

I think it is only fair and reasonable that we should, without undertaking to pass upon the merits of the measure, which we cannot pass upon intelligently here, give counsel for that company an opportunity of coming before the committee and proving if they can the facts which are so vehemently combatted by the hon. member for Alberta. This hon. gentleman says, first of all, that this road has not been commenced; and when I have been informed on what I regard as the most reliable authority that the road has been commenced, and when we were told that conclusive evidence could be produced before the committee, and had been before the government, to show that there had been a bona fide expenditure of $90,000, evidence which was sworn to, I do think that, under the circumstances, we are doing a very hard thing and a very cruel thing if we do not, at all events, give this company an opportunity to be heard more deliberately before insisting upon the absolute forfeiture of the rights that they have acquired by an expenditure of $90,000, and by the deposit of $50,000. As to this deposit, there is a grave question as to whether it can be demanded back, and I think it is extremely doubtful, at all events I think it is rationally argueable, that under the terms of the statute they cannot recover back a single penny of the $50,000 which has been deposited as security for the construction of the road. Under these circumstances I think it would be unfair and unreasonable for us to say, as we are asked to say, that they shall not have another opportunity of having their case threshed out before the Railway Commitee.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). In viewing a case such as this, one consideration will affect one mind and another consideration another mind. My main reason for objecting to this Bill being referred back is that at the present time an opportunity is afforded this House such as may not rise again, to settle the question as to the principle on which renewals of charters should be granted. I have felt for a long time, and I know hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House feel as I do, that we are not as careful as we should be in this House, in the first place, in giving grants of lands, and in the second place in renewing charters. I submit it is a reasonable proposition, that when a charter has been given and a public franchise has been entrusted to certain people, the duty devolves on those who have received that franchise of carrying out its terms to the letter; and if they are unable to carry out those terms, and fail to do so, then, when they come to parliament and ask for a renewal of the charter, I submit the whole burden of proof should be on those who have received this public trust and have failed to execute it, of showing that there was some insurmountable obstacle that prevented them from doing what the House expected they would do when that charter was granted. We know that when a Bill such as this comes before the Railway Committee, the rule of the committee is to allow, as a matter of course, a renewal of any charter. In my opinion this is a question which should not be made political, it is too important to the people. While I think the present administration is doing wrong, and the former administration erred in the same way, I do not think that at the present time one party can find fault with the other for having erred more than it has done itself. We have a charter which was granted some fourteen years ago, but according to the statement of an hon. member of this House, not a dollar's worth of work has been done since. It is true that statement has been challenged, and I was surprised to see that what I considered a well recognized rule, that a member's word should be accepted here, was not observed with regard to this particular Bill. When I find an hon. member in this House stating that of his own knowledge no work has been done, I am prepared to accept that statement, and am prepared to justify my voting on the ground that no work was done, and taking it for granted that no work was done because an hon. member of the House has so declared.

Mr. OLIVER. If there is any doubt on the point I would like to say that to the best of my knowledge and belief, and according to the information that I have, no substantial work whatever has been done on that railway.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. In the committee it was asserted without contradiction, that a certain number of miles had been constructed.

Mr. OLIVER. I contradicted it at the time.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. I was in the committee, and it was asserted that a certain number of miles had been constructed, and

the statement was not challenged except that some gentlemen said it was done several years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. I answered in the committee what I have said just now.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is only fair to state that the evidence before the committee last year was conclusive, that a certain amount of grading had been done; figures and statements were submitted by the engineer showing, I think, conclusively that a certain amount of grading had been done on some eight or nine miles of road.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I was saying that when we find a charter granted some fourteen years ago to certain persons who are now before the House, and when we find the applicants and promoters unwilling to say who the present holders of the charter are—I now ask the hon. gentleman who has in charge this Bill if he is prepared to state who the present applicants for this charter are.

Mr. COWAN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman wants the names of the directors or the promoters of the Bill ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. The promoters of the Bill.

Mr. COWAN. I can give them, though it strikes me that the question now before the committee is not on the merits of the Bill, but as to whether it should be sent back to the committee. I had no idea of discussing the merits of the Bill on this occasion. The information I have is that the original incorporators were Joseph Ick Evans, Daniel McFarlane, Joshua T. Johnston, Henry Percy Withers, James W. Bain, James Bicknell, and now, associated with such of the original promoters as remain are Elias Rogers and Wm. Beith.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have been informed, and it has been stated on the floor of this House, that the original incorporators have handed over their interest in this charter to some other parties, and if I remember rightly, the present charter does not bear the names of the original incorporators at all. But these parties obtained a charter fourteen years ago when land was of little value, and now when other parties are coming before us and asking a renewal of the charter, it would be a fair principle to lay down that the parties coming to-day and asking for a renewal of the charter should be put in the same position as if they were applying for it for the first time; and if they were now applying for the first time, would it be contended for a moment that what was a fair and reasonable land grant fourteen years ago would be a fair and reasonable land grant to-day when prices have increased so much in the interval ? That was the main objection I have to this Bill being referred back. I think now this House should lay down the principle that in future no renewal of any charter would be granted—I am not so unreasonable as to say that no renewal should ever be granted, but none should be granted unless, the burden of proof being on the applicants, they can satisfy this House that they originally applied in good faith, and that owing to insurmountable obstacles they have been prevented from carrying out what they intended to do. Then there is another objection I would like to refer to. It was contended by the chairman of the committee that two gentlemen had voted, making a majority in favour of the Bill, but that owing to circumstances under which they had voted their names were struck off. I am sure there is no gentleman on this side of the House, who is not of the opinion that the chairman of that committee is a gentleman of absolute fairness and impartiality.

I am perfectly sure that if that hon. gentleman, as chairman of the committee, struck off the names of two members who had voted, it is abundantly clear that they had voted improperly. Then, we come down to the simple fact that when the vote was taken properly and legally there was a majority against the Bill. This House has laid down the principle that when a Bill comes from the railway committee it should be accepted by this House unless there are the best of reasons given to the contrary. The only reason given against the acceptance of the report of the committee is that there were some members of the committee who were absent when the question was put and who would have voted for the Bill. Who can tell but that, out of the seventy members of the railway committee, if they had all been present, perchance, a greater majority would have voted against the Bill, because, if one member has the right to conjecture in one direction another member has the right to conjecture in the opposite direction. I believe we have no right to go beyond the report of the committee when it is presented here and whether the majority is small or whether it is large I submit that we are bound to take the report of the committee and stand by it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan), it having been stated in the committee that the road could not be constructed in time to secure the land grant, if the road has any assurance that the land grant will be renewed to the company if the Bill is carried in this House ?

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that since I have been a member of this House on not a single occasion has a motion of this kind been adopted and while there have been several occasions when similar motions have been made on not one has a Bill been sent back to the railway committee. Time and again, during last session, in this House, the rule was stated clearly and absolutely that the proper policy was not to complicate business by questioning the decisions which

came down to this House from the railway committee. I remember that on one occasion last session I was very much interested in having a measure referred back to the railway committee and I was able to state, as other members interested in the Bill were able to state, that they had not been present in the railway committee through no fault of their own. On one occasion last session, and I believe on only one occasion, a meeting of the committee was called for 10.30 o'clock in place of the usual hour of 11 o'clock, and on that morning there was a Bill brought up in which several members were interested. When I arrived at the committee at the usual hour of 11 o'clock I found that the committee had been at work for half an hour and that this Bill had been already reported. I brought the fact to the attention of the House and notwithstanding the fact that I and others urged that there was new matter to be brought to the attention of the committee in respect to that Bill the rule was held to that the Bill should not be sent back after having been dealt with by the railway committee. In connection with the Bill now under discussion it has been pointed out that there was the very fullest discussion before the railway committee. As a matter of fact, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), after we had been thrashing out the matter for an hour and three-quarters, stated that he thought more discussion had taken place than was necessary to give every member of the committee an opportunity of understanding the merits of the case. I may urge, and urge truthfully, that the Bill was given the very fullest discussion by the railway committee. If we have a rule, as we have, that rule ought to be adhered to in all cases and we should not make fish of one and flesh of another. Is this House going to take the position that when railway promoters are interested in having a Bill sent back the rule shall not be adhered to, but that when the public interest demands that a Bill be sent back the rule shall be adhered to ? On the merits of the Bill I may say that I am opposed, and resolutely opposed to it on the ground that it involves the voting of a land grant. It does not matter whether the land grant is large or small, I am opposed to an acre of public land being voted by this parliament, or being alienated to any railway company or to any other company of that class. It has been stated during the past five or six years many times by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and by other members of the government that no more public land should be alienated to railway companies. I may confide to hon. members on this side of the House and to the members of the government that during the general election campaign I went up and down the length and breadth of the district of Assiniboia claiming and receiving the support of the people on the ground that since my friends had come into power there had not been an acre of land alienated to a railway company, and I further pledged myself, on the strength of the statements made by members of this government, and particularly by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that so long as the Liberals were in power there would not be an acre of land alienated to a railway company. Therefore, to-day, the position I find myself in is that I am compelled by my pledges to vote against this application, because there is no question in my mind that a vote for this Bill is a vote to alienate something over 300,000 miles of land to this railway company. It has been contended, and it may be contended that this is not alienating land, that the land has already been alienated, but hon. gentlemen do not say that if we do not pass this Bill the land will be parted with. If we do not pass this Bill this railway company will not come into possession of the land. It will remain in the possession of the people of Canada. It is true that a bargain was made fourteen years ago, by which these railway promoters, for a certain consideration, were granted this amount of land—352,000 acres.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Can the hon. gentleman inform me whether that land is scheduled to this particular railway company ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a point upon which a little more stress should be laid. It may be asked: How did it come that under legislation passed by this parliament this area had been put under the control of this railway company, because they have not raised their finger to earn the land, further than the grading of possibly four, five or six miles of road, grading which, I believe, to-day has become useless, if it ever was in existence. So I say, the matter would bear a little investigation as to how, under any legislation that has been passed by this parliament, these railway promoters have been allowed to come into possession of this land because they have never carried out their part of the bargain. I was going to point out, referring to the contention to the contrary, that to vote for the Bill at the present time must be held to be a vote in favour of the alienation of this land. While the bargain was entered into fourteen years ago the time for the completion of that bargain has long since passed. There have been renewals of the charter time after time but the company have never done anything to earn the land until the present time and if we vote now to again extend the time for earning this land we are giving a vote to alienate the land which, to-day, is certainly worth more than $1,000,000. If this was a fair subsidy for building this 55 miles of railway 14 years ago, it must be held to be three times too much subsidy to vote for build-

ing the same road to-day. As a matter of fact it is an exorbitant and excessive subsidy to vote to build that 55 miles of railway to-day, which I venture to say, will not exceed in cost $500,000. To build a prairie road does not cost more than $10,000 per mile, and the building of these 55 miles would cost very little more than $500,000.

Mr. HEYD. What about the coal ?

Mr. SCOTT. Figuring the cost of the road, of course, is not taking into consideration the value of the coal land. I do not believe any member of the House will contend that the building of this road will cost more than $500,000. I also venture to say that no member of this House will attempt to say that this land is not worth at least $1,000,000. Is this House going to say, that on account of some bargain which was made 14 years ago with regard to which the parties of one part have failed in their contract and lost every figment of their rights—is the House going to say that because of that we must vote a subsidy amounting to twice as much as the cost of the railway. It has been pointed out in favour of the promoters of this Bill, that they have made a deposit of $50,000 in the hands of the government. As I said before the committee, in view of the fact that they have got an area of land which to-day is worth not less than $1,000,000 it is not a matter of very great virtue on their part that they have put in the hands of the government $50,000. But, we find on looking at the Act, that to call that a deposit is not a proper description, because as a matter of fact the company are to-day entitled to go to the Minister of Finance and to claim and to receive that $50,000. This is the legislation which was brought to the attention of the committee very pertinently by my hon. friend from Halton.

If such deposit is so made, the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General shall publish notice thereof in the Canada 'Gazette,' and upon such publication this Act shall be taken to have come into force on the first of July, 1900.

The Minister of Finance and the Receiver General shall repay such deposit to the company, if (a) the chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals has certified that to his satisfaction twenty-five continuous miles of railway measuring from the point of commencement at or near the city of Calgary have been built, and the track has been laid thereon ; or (b)

This is the peculiar section to which I wish to call the particular attention of the House.

Or (b) If on the 1st July, 1901 (last year) the construction of the railway has not been begun and 15 per cent of the capital stock has not been spent thereon.

The construction of the railway had not been begun on the 1st of July last year and fifteen per cent of the capital stock had not been spent thereon. This condition has therefore not been fulfilled, and the promoters are entitled to go to the Minister of Finance now and claim their $50,000, and I venture to say that if they do so they will be able to get back their money. Some doubt was thrown upon this phase of the question by the hon. gentleman who sits beside me (Mr. Russell). He was careful however not to state an absolute opinion, and I challenge any lawyer in this House to say that the interpretation which I have put upon this statute is not correct. I am not a lawyer, I never had a legal training, but I challenge any lawyer in the House to publicly assert that my interpretation of the language of the statute is not correct. For these reasons Mr. Speaker, I am resolutely opposed to the sending back of this Bill to the Railway Committee.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I would not have spoken had it not been for the statement of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Russell) who charged me with having taken the committee by storm ; with having spoken too forcibly and thereby misled the committee. I believe Sir, that the arguments which I presented were fair and moderate. I stated first, that the preamble should not be adopted because the city of Calgary which is deeply interested in this railway had petitioned against the Bill. We know that the country through which this line is proposed to run is alleged to contain coal suitable for domestic purposes and hence it is of great importance to Calgary that the road should be built. They saw no hope of getting this road from the existing company and they therefore asked that this charter should lapse in order that some other company might build the road. I also advanced the reason, that the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) did not approve of the preamble of the Bill. I was prepared to be guided to a very considerable extent by the representative of the constituency which was interested in the construction of this railway. Another reason I gave was that the charter was a very old one. It has been renewed over and over again, and I thought it was high time that it should come to an end. Again I stated—and this was perhaps the only argument which could in any way be supposed to mislead the committee, but I did not state it as a fact—I stated that it was common report and that according to the best information I had, the parties associated with the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Company were associated with this road. We know that Elias Rogers, the only prominent name given to us is also associated with the Crow's Nest Coal Company. We had reason to infer that he was one of the parties who was interested in this road and interested in the other coal company as well. I believed it was unfair to allow this charter to remain in the hands of a company which is also interested in developing another coal field. It may be that I was wrong in the information I obtained in this regard, but

I had very strong reasons to assume it, and I know that there are many members of this House who believe such to be the case, and that the construction of this road was delayed because the Crow's Nest people desire to press their coal on Calgary. Another reason I advanced against the adopting of the preamble was the policy of the government. I understood from the minister that it is now the policy of this government that no further land grants to railways will be given in the North-west Territories, and I believe it only fair that all railway companies should be dealt with on the same basis and that this land grant having lapsed, it should not be given to this company and refused to others. I thought as a matter of justice that that was the proper way to view the case. I do not think I misled the committee. I think these arguments were all reasonable and fair and I am quite sure that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) reviews what I said he will withdraw his charge. I did also state that practically the $50,000 was no guarantee at all for the reasons stated by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). I agree with the policy laid down by the chairman of the Railway Committee, that a Bill should not be referred back unless some new evidence is before the House which did not appear before the committee. We have no new evidence before the House today. We are told by the member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the promoter of the Bill was not present. Is it to be supposed that 160 or 170 members are to be forced to await the convenience of the promoter of a Bill if he is not present. There were two legal gentlemen there to represent the promoters, and I think they did fairly well. They did everything that could be expected from solicitors, except perhaps to tell us who the real owners of this charter were. It is alleged also that the votes of two members who were not present when the question was put were not counted. Well, there were about 100 other members who were not present when the question was put, and if we are going to take into consideration the votes of these two, we have just as much right to consider the votes of the other one hundred. The request to refer this Bill back is unreasonable. We must abide by the decision of those who were present and heard the question put. How do we know that these men actually knew what question was being put. They were outside the room, and for that matter another order than this one might have been the question on which the vote was being taken. They were fair and straightforward when the question was asked them, if they were present when the question was put and they said no; and we followed the rule adopted in this House, and their votes were struck off. I think the chairman of the Railway Committee was perfectly right, and I am sure the committee upheld him; and it would be rather a censure upon him to-day were we to reverse his decision and declare that the Bill should be sent back. I have nothing further to say in this matter. I hold the same views that I held in the Railway Committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I feel constrained to say a word or two on this question by reason of what has fallen from my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) with reference to the past and present policy of the government with reference to giving land grants by way of subsidies to railways. My hon. friend has merely said what I have heretofore stated, not once only, but on divers occasions, authorized by the government as a whole, that this government did not purpose to continue the policy which had obtained in previous years and under the late administration, of giving the settlement lands of the country by way of bonus to aid in the construction of railways. We have declared that policy, and we are determined to adhere to it; and I was unable to see, when this question was before the Railway Committee, and I cast my vote for the Bill, wherein I had deviated in the slightest as a member of the government from the position I had taken when I declared its policy in that regard. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that this is to-day an existing contract, and that the company who are asking for an extension of time are an existing company and will continue to be an existing company for a year from the 1st of July next. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that in time past, though it was 13 or 14 years ago, this company received from parliament a land grant in aid of their undertaking, and as an encouragement to them to carry it through. I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that not only on one or two or three occasions, but on six different occasions, parliament has revived that charter and has ratified and continued the land grant, and that the government has confirmed the Order in Council allocating the land when the road should be constructed. Is not this a totally different case from that of a new company coming to parliament and asking for a grant of land? I maintain that the two cases are as dissimilar as the two poles are asunder. We must recognize the binding character of the arrangement with this company in a moral and equitable sense, in a sense of fair-play and justice, if the company which is seeking the extension of time gives evidence that it is doing its best to carry out its undertaking. We are bound to remember that this company has had an assurance given to it by parliament; and if it is able to convince parliament that it is now in a position to carry this undertaking out, no man can truly say that it is a new departure to continue the charter,

as it has already been continued from time to time. I therefore beg to assure my hon. friend that he can with safety go back to the people he represents and tell them that although we have continued this arrangement, we are simply carrying out the policy which parliament has always considered itself bound to carry out in a spirit of justice and equity—an arrangement made years ago, and ratified from time to time since.

Touching the question, then, with which this committee has to deal, I take it that it is within a very narrow compass—nay, in a nutshell; and what is it? Has any sufficient cause been made to appear why this Bill should be sent back to the committee for further consideration? That is a question about which all of us, I think, in times past, I among the number, have held very strong views—that unless a clear case were made out, in which some injustice had been done, some withholding of the facts or misleading of the committee had taken place, or unless it appeared that the action of the committee was not really the action which the committee intended to take, we ought to regard the report which they lay on the Table as a final report, and sustain it. Are the circumstances which exist in the present case of such a character as to bring this Bill within the exceptions? I am bound to say that, in my opinion, it does come within one of the exceptions, and I will tell you why. There was a rule enforced—I will not say improperly—in the Railway Committee in respect to taking the vote which was never done before since I have been a member of this parliament. An exception was taken to the recording of the votes of two or three gentlemen which I never heard taken before in any meeting of that committee. Gentlemen who, to my own personal knowledge, had sat through the whole of the discussion, had listened to it, who had heard the same thing ad nauseam over and over again, and who happened to run out of the committee room just a moment or two before the vote was taken, found when they came back and voted, that they were strictly and technically subject to the enforcement of a rule which said that they ought to hear the motion put from the chair. Now, I want to ask the members of this House, who I believe are disposed to deal fairly in such a matter, is it treating the Bill or the parties interested in the Bill, fairly to rigidly enforce a rule in this case which has never been enforced before, which was not relied upon in any previous instance, and of which no member of the committee had really had any notice? The position seemed to me to be this. So far as the strict application of the rule which obtained in this House was concerned, it was a proper ruling on the part of the chairman. No person could say it was not. But we know that in the House members who have heard the discussion and are thoroughly familiar with the question, and have their minds made up, are notified of the time for the vote by the ringing of a bell if they are not in the chamber at the moment. We have not any such procedure in the Railway or any other Committee, and consequently gentlemen are placed at a great disadvantage if that rule is enforced. It has never been enforced before, but, time after time when the vote has been taken, gentlemen have come in at the last moment, and have participated in the vote and had their names recorded. That condition of things is exceptional, and justifies, to my mind, the return of this Bill to the Railway Committee.

My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) initiated the opposition to this Bill, led it very strongly, but just before the vote was taken what was the attitude of my hon. friend? It was that although he might be deviating somewhat from the wishes of his constituents, he was satisfied that his people would not seriously object to this charter being continued for another year, and he was prepared to support such an extension, but he would not listen to a proposal to allow an extension of fourteen months. He would not add two months to the time for construction. Until the very last moment, until he made his last speech—and my hon. friend made many forcible and argumentative speeches—his attitude was this. That this was a terrible business, that this grant of land was a most indefensible grant, that the company were not entitled to any consideration, that they had been for fourteen years dawdling with the matter, but yet if they would only complete the road within a year, he would be willing to grant them that extension, but would not grant an extension for two months longer.

Mr. OLIVER. I rise to a point of order. Has the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, the right to put words into my mouth, and to inform the House that these are what I have said.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to contradict, if he is not quoted correctly, but any hon. member has the right to quote what has been said by a previous speaker, subject of course to correction, and if contradicted, he must accept the correction.

Mr. OLIVER. Under your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I will have to contradict the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LENNOX. I rise to a point of order. I understood you to have ruled, on a previous occasion, that what has transpired in a committee cannot be referred to in the House. If that be correct, the hon. Minister of Railways is not in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member is mistaken. When there is no report before the House of what has been done in the com-

mittee, no allusion or reference can be made to what has taken place in that committee. But in this case, the committee has reported, and it is therefore perfectly in order to refer to what took place before it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure my hon. friend from Alberta that I would be very sorry to misrepresent his attitude before the committee, but I am not doing so. I am not pretending to give the precise language he used, but simply its reasonable purport as accurately as possible. My hon. friend's attitude, as is known to the large number of members who were present in the committee, was such as I have described it. He recognized the reasonableness and fairness of allowing this company a year from the 1st July, 1903, to complete its undertaking, with its land grant and all the enormities which are attached to that condition, but he would not allow the company an extension of two months longer. It appeared to me that so long as that was all the difference there really was between the people in Calgary, who have such large interests in this question, and the promoters of this Bill, it was not sufficiently important to warrant the committee in refusing the extension required, and I was prepared to give the further two months and the committee were prepared to do so. I do not think that a very large principle is involved in an extension of two months. I do not see any other company clamouring for the privilege of constructing this road. The people want it, and it seems to me that they would get it more quickly if we should adopt this Bill, than they would otherwise.

Mr. SPROULE. The people petitioned against it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend from Alberta, who represents the people of that locality, and who has consequently a more intimate knowledge of their state of mind, was convinced that they would be satisfied if a year's extension were given from the 1st of July next, but not if these extra two months were granted. The company, under its chartered powers to-day, is entitled to have until the 1st of July, 1903, to complete its undertaking. I do not know who the promoters are, or what are their means, and they may go on and succeed in completing the construction of the line by the 1st July, 1903. But there may be obstacles, they may not be able to secure sufficient iron early in the season, and consequently the majority of the committee were willing—for it was a majority until the two names were struck out—to give them extra time in order that they might be sure of preserving their rights and carrying out the undertaking.

I do not think it is fair to say that there was not the fullest discussion of the question in the committee, and I do not rest my judgment on that ground. I think that the committee were in full possession of all the facts, and I am sure that if the same procedure had been observed with reference to this Bill, as has been with reference to other Bills the Bill would have been carried and this motion to-day would not have been made.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course I have already spoken, but as there is a question of fact between myself and the hon. minister, if I am in order, I would like to have the opportunity of putting myself right.

Mr. SPEAKER. Question.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I was present when this Bill was before the Railway Committee, and I voted as did the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). The position which my hon. friend took in the committee, I understood, was simply this. When the Bill was up in the first instance, it looked very much as if it were going to be passed. I understood the hon. member for Alberta to say that he was opposed to the preamble of the Bill, and if it came to a question of voting for the Bill he would oppose the preamble, but as an alternative he would agree to one year's extension of time.

The hon. Minister of Railways has found considerable fault with the ruling of the Chairman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. INGRAM. He thought that the rule should not have been put into effect. Well, I approve of its being enforced. It may have worked hard in this particular case, but it will tend to prevent a practice which has often been resorted to. I know of instances when, just as the vote in the committee was about to be taken, hon. members were rushed in and called upon to vote, although they had not the first knowledge of the merits of the Bill before the committee nor the first idea of the nature of the discussion. By the decision in this instance, we have good ground for believing that in the future the Railway Committee will not be packed, just as the question is put, by persons who are interested in promoting the legislaton before it.

The hon. Minister of Railways has made rather a peculiar statement. He wants the people to understand that the government are opposed to giving large grants of land. But their conduct with regard to this Bill is hardily consistent with that policy. When a railway charter is granted, accompanied by large tracts of land bonuses, those who obtain the charter know perfectly well that, in order to earn the grant, they must comply with the conditions of their incorporation. And if they fail to build the road in the time provided, they are perfectly aware that their grant lapses. As a matter of fact, their charter becomes null and void. What then

must follow ? Should their charter be revived ? It follows that the government are necessarily responsible for its revival. The government passed an Order in Council in 1898 and passed it again in 1900, and notwithstanding what the minister has said regarding the policy of the government, it must assume full responsibility for the revival of that Order in Council granting that large tract of land. I am opposed to granting the large tract of land which is given these people by their charter. The idea of 55 miles of railway through a prairie country, which will cost at the most only a few thousand dollars a mile to build, being bonused by this enormous land grant of 6,400 acres per mile. That may have been a justifiable bargain fourteen years ago. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), who interjects a remark, will not pretend to say that it is a proper bargain today.

Mr. FRASER. If this contract is existing up to the present time I think we would be justified in keeping it on.

Mr. INGRAM. Then if the people who get this legislation violate an agreement, and that agreement becomes extinct because it has not been revived, then they have no right to the land, and the moment you revive it you must assume the responsibility of granting it. So the hon. gentleman's statement does not seem to me consistent. As to the question of referring the Bill back to the committee, I think perhaps there may be something in the contention that it should be referred back. I know it was a very close vote. I kept a strict account of the gentlemen who voted, and I am somewhat doubtful as to whether that vote was correctly taken that day. I know that certain gentlemen in that committee whose names are somewhat similar misunderstood the names when they were read out, and in one or two instances said, No and Yes. I am bound to say, however, that I was closer to those gentlemen on that occasion than the secretary, and I am not sure whether I kept a correct record or not, and I do not know whether the secretary then even took a proper record. For that reason I have no objection to the Bill going back to the committee. But as far as the land grant is concerned, I shall certainly oppose it in committee as I opposed it here.

Mr. OLIVER. Have I the privilege of putting myself right ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has a right to make a personal explanation, and of setting himself right if he has been misunderstood.

Mr. OLIVER. My attitude, when I stated that I was instructed by the city council of Calgary to oppose the Bill, was not changed by the course I took when I suggested that the committee be allowed a year. I said distinctly to the committee that I was taking long chances as between myself and the people of Calgary, and I held out no prospect that the attitude I then assumed would be satisfactory to the people of Calgary. If I may go as far as to explain what the Minister of Railways and Canals said in regard to the terms of the grant, I think he intimated that I had been willing to extend the time a year, and was unreasonable because I was not willing to extend it longer. I was willing to extend it a year because that was the period mentioned in the Order in Council granting the land. I was willing to extend the charter to a term equal to the Order in Council granting the land, which was all the people had a right to. To extend the charter further was to bring up the question of extending the land grant, and giving them a leverage at any rate, to get an extension of that land grant. I made the proposition to ascertain for the information of the committee, the bona fides of the company. If the company were not willing to build within the year then they were not a bona fide company.

Mr. WADE. Is it not a fact that the hon. gentleman moved an amendment to the Bill limiting the time till the 1st of July, 1903 ; and that subsequently an amendment was moved extending the time to the 1st of October, 1903, and a discussion took place on those two amendments ?

Mr. OLIVER. I proposed such a motion and another gentleman proposed an amendment, but neither motion nor amendment were in order, and neither was put.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Upon the principles which have been laid down by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House, and from the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals this afternoon, it does not seem to me there is the slightest ground for sending this back to the committee. The Minister of Railways and Canals has stated that there was the fullest possible discussion of this matter in the committee, therefore, so far as that is concerned there does not exist the slightest reason for sending this matter back to the committee. The right hon. gentleman who leads this House has laid down the principle again and again that when the committee sanctions a Bill this House should sustain the committee, and that the matter should not be reconsidered.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Unless cause is shown.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend says that the leader of the House qualified his statement that way. Well, let us see what cause is shown. The matter of counting votes in the committee is, I submit, a matter entirely for the committee itself to regulate, it is not a matter in which this House is justified in interfering. The vote in the committee, if it is desirable to discuss in this House the manner in which the vote is taken, was taken exactly in the same way as the votes are taken in this

House. Hon. gentlemen have talked about the unfairness of excluding members of the committee from voting, because they did not happen to be present when the question was put. Exactly the same argument might be made in this House. Hon. gentlemen here listen day after day to debates, and yet they cannot vote unless they are actually here when the question is put from the Chair. The Railway Committee enforced exactly the same rule that is enforced in this House. I venture to say that if you are going to refer this matter back to the Railway Committee simply because you are of opinion that the chairman of that committee did not do his duty, you are doing something which should not be undertaken by this House. I think that the rule followed by the chairman of the committee was a fair and proper one and that we have no cause to find fault with it. But, if there were cause to find fault with it, that is a matter to be dealt with by the committee itself. The time of the House should not be taken up in discussing for two hours a matter which is really a question of the internal regulation of the Railway Committee, so far as any real question presents itself. For, surely no one will say that the fact that this measure was defeated by a majority of one is a valid reason for sending it back to the committee. It goes without saying that that is no reason at all. The only question is whether the chairman of the committee did his duty. I think he did, and that he properly counted the vote. That being so, I see no reason to refer this measure back to the committee. If it is referred back, it will be quoted in the future as a precedent for taking up the time of the House day after day with a discussion of matters that properly appertain to the Railway Committee itself and that should be dealt with by that committee alone.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in the argument he has just offered has not shown the logical qualities of mind which he usually displays. I think I can show conclusively even to himself that the reasons he has urged why this Bill should not be referred to the committee are not adequate and binding. My hon. friend has stated the rule which—of course, I do not claim to have created it—I have observed ever since I first assumed the position I have the honour to occupy. That rule is invariably to maintain the decision of a committee unless adequate cause is shown for different action. The hon. gentleman says that adequate cause has not been shown in this case. We have the report of the committee, which is stated to have been carried by a majority of one, rejecting this Bill. When this discussion commenced, I must say my mind was very strong in favour of rejecting the motion. But an argument has been brought forward, which, it seems to me, puts upon the question an entirely different complexion. The chairman of the committee, the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) has risen in his place, and, speaking not as a member of the House, but as chairman of the committee, has stated that, though he reported the Bill as he was bound to do, in his opinion the vote upon it was a snap vote, and that the committee should be seized again of the question and have an opportunity of adjudicating upon it. The chairman's fairness is recognized upon all sides, upon the Conservative as well as upon the Liberal side; and, of course, his opinion must carry great weight. This is the argument to which I would invite the attention of my hon. friend. But I would go further. Suppose that it had happened in the case of this Bill instead of meeting this adverse vote in the Railway Committee it had met it in the Committee of the Whole House, what would have taken place ? The following day, probably, the promoter would have asked the House to reconsider its determination, and the House would have reconsidered and either reaffirmed or negatived it. More than once a Bill defeated in Committee of the Whole has been brought forward by the promoters who has asked the House to reinstate it upon the Order paper. Shall we be told that a proceeding so simple, so just, so fair, shall not be allowed because this vote took place not on the floor of this House, but in the Railway Committee ? This position is so strong that my hon. friend anticipating it, has tried to force himself into another position. He says it is for the committee to rectify the error if an error has been made. But the committee has no power to deal with it. The jurisdiction of the committee has been exhausted, and it cannot again deal with the question unless the report is sent back to it by this House. I submit that in a deliberative assembly no more than in a Court of Justice a mere snap vote should not finally settle a matter. Sharp practice should not prevail. I do not make any imputation against anybody. But, if certain members who were anxious to vote upon the question, who had attended the discussion but happened to be called away had been present when the vote was taken, the report would have been different from what it is. It seems to me that it would be an act of injustice not to allow the promoters of the Bill to have it go before the Committee of Railways and Canals and have its merits threshed out. As to the merits of the Bill, I have nothing to say. That is a matter which does not come before the House, and will have to be dealt with by the committee. If the committee come before us with a report favourable to the Bill, it will be time to discuss the merits of the measure. Up to the present time the question is one of procedure only. It is asked, and I think with good reason that the promoters shall have an opportunity of discussing the merits

before the committee. My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has said that if this carried it will be the first time such a vote has ever been carried in the House. The hon. gentleman is quite right. But I would say also that this is the first time when a proposal of this kind has been supported by the chairman of the committee whose report was under discussion, and that is to me, sound and good reason why it should carry.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYD. Hon. members can 'Oh' as much as they please. I have a right to speak, I have something to say, and I propose to say it regardless of what may be said upon the other side. A great deal has been said about what took place in the Railway Committee. Some two hours were spent in discussing the measure and seventy-one men were there and voted upon it. And the exception that was raised, that some members did not hear the question put, notwithstanding what was said here, was raised in the committee. And the decision of the chairman was such as from his position he was compelled to give. Now the point is this, and it has been shown here and the hon. gentleman who is the promoter of the Bill has not brought forward anything to the contrary—that this is a new company practically that has charge of this Bill, and that they are coming here, fourteen years after the time a charter was originally granted, to get that enormous amount of land which, since then, has greatly increased in value. And what caused that increase? The settlers who have gone into that country and settled round about that land have made it valuable after these fourteen years, and now a new company, because practically it is a new company, are coming here and asking for a land grant from this government, notwithstanding the policy and the doctrine which has been laid down and announced up and down this country by hon. gentlemen opposite. The vote you are going to give here to-day, and no doubt we will see that you take a vote, will mean that any man who votes to send this Bill back to the Railway Committee votes for giving that land to this railway company. If you vote to send this Bill back you will repudiate the declaration of your leaders and of all those who sought the votes of the people on the pledge that no more land would be given to railway companies. If the suggestion of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is good, this company may come back fifty years from now and ask for land which is worth from $25 to $50 an acre more, and get a charter from this government. While railways have been a help to that country, they have also been a curse in some respects. Who are the men who held them up to the scorn of the country but hon. gentlemen who are now sitting on the Treasury benches opposite? The right hon. leader of the government knows well that he and other leaders of the Liberal party, when he sat on this side of the House, condemned the action of the government of that day, notwithstanding the fact that they had some just cause that time, 14, 16 or some 20 years ago, to give the land which had no value, but, when you, by your vote to-day, as you shall vote, send that Bill back to the Railway Committee, and if you do, you will come back to this House——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BOYD. Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, from deviating slightly from the rule. When hon. gentlemen come back to this House and give to this new company this enormous amount of land which the settlers have made valuable to the extent of five, six or ten dollars an acre by occupying the land around it, they will do something which the people of this country will condemn.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, in reference to the argument as to the proper course of procedure in the matter now before the House, that is, as to whether or not this question should be referred back to the Railway Committee, the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has laid down the proposition that nothing can be considered in this House—I am referring to a past utterance of his—except what appears upon the record as it comes before parliament. In this case, I am sorry to say, he is violating the very good and sound constitutional practice which he enunciated to parliament and which will be evident from a few words I will read from a past utterance of the right hon. gentleman :

> The rule which is invariably followed on the floor of this House is that the House maintains the decisions of committees unless adequate cause be shown to the contrary, and unless cause be shown on the record.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) is referring to a previous debate.

Mr. BELL. I unquestionably am. The right hon. gentleman referred to a previous debate.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bell) may discuss the point of order.

Mr. BELL. I am referring to exactly the same precedents that have been referred to by the right hon. gentleman and by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) on the occasion to which I have referred, and which arose in connection with a precisely similar motion to have a report referred back to a committee. The right hon. gentleman laid down the rule and supported it by his vote, that the House could take no cognizance of anything

whatever except it appears on the record that came from the committee. He specifically debarred himself, or any one else, from using such arguments as he has used to-day, when he objected to the statement of any hon. gentleman being taken, and characterized it as the ipsi dixit of this hon. gentleman or that hon. gentleman, saying that it was a matter of statements being made pro and con, and which could not be considered at all. He practically shut this House out from the consideration of anything that did not appear on the record. I maintain that if this is the case, the right hon. gentleman is entirely precluded by his own action, by his own sound constitutional statement, which I was very glad to accept upon that occasion as being authoritative, from making such an argument as he has addressed to the House to-day.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I would not have spoken at all except for the statement of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) that any hon. member who votes for sending this Bill back to the Railway Committee endorses the principle of giving land grants to railway companies. I am distinctly opposed to the government giving a single acre of Canadian farm land to any railway company and tying up that land in connection with a railway enterprise or a railway charter. I am going to support the motion to send this Bill back to the committee simply because a rule was enforced which never had been enforced before, at least, not in the last six years. I think I have been in that committee at every session which has been held in the last six years, and I have never seen that rule enforced before. In fact, I think the rules have been rather loosely enforced on some occasions. I can remember that on many occasions when votes were taken hon. members have simply come to the door of the Railway Committee room and said 'yes' or 'no,' and their votes have been recorded. This is the first time in six years that this question has been raised. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has endeavoured to make it appear that the case is similar to one which might arise in this House. Now, I say that in this House every hon member knows if he does not come into the House before the question is put by the Speaker, he loses his opportunity of voting, but in the Railway Committee, for six years past, we have had members coming into the committee any time when the vote is being polled, and recording their votes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The same practice has been followed for twenty years.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for a long time chairman of the Railway Committee, says that the same state of affairs has existed for the last twenty years. As far as farm land grants are concerned, I am opposed to them. But, as far as the present circumstances are concerned, it is sufficient to know that there has been a rule enforced which has not been enforced before, that members have been taken by surprise, that this has been a snap vote, and therefore the Bill should be reported back to the committee. I trust myself that no land will be granted.

House divided on the motion (Mr. Cowan).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	LeBlanc,
Archambault,	Lemieux,
Béland.	Logan,
Bernier,	Lovell,
Blair,	Loy,
Bourbonnais,	Macdonald,
Brown,	Mackie,
Brunet,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Bureau,	McCarthy,
Calvert,	McColl,
Carbonneau,	McCool,
Champagne,	McCormick,
Charlton,	McIntosh,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Cowan,	McLennan,
Culbert,	Madore,
Demers (Lévis),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Matheson,
Dugas,	Maxwell,
Emmerson,	Meigs,
Ethier,	Monet,
Farquharson,	Morrison,
Fielding,	Murray,
Fisher,	Parmalee,
Fitzpatrick,	Paterson,
Flint,	Préfontaine,
Fraser,	Pringle,
Geoffrion,	Reid (Restigouche),
Gibson,	Riley,
Girard,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gould,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Guthrie,	Russell,
Harwood,	Simmons,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Essex),
Horsey,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Hyman,	Tarte,
Ingram,	Thompson,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tisdale,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tolmie,
Kidd,	Turgeon,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wade,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Wright.—87.
Lavergne,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Avery,	Lavell,
Bell,	Legris,
Birkett,	Lennox,
Blain,	Lewis,
Borden (Halifax).	McCreary,
Bourassa,	McEwen,
Boyd,	McGowan,
Brock,	Monk,
Broder,	Morin,
Bruce,	Northrup,
Cargill,	Oliver,
Clare,	Osler,
Clarke,	Puttee,
Cochrane,	Richardson,

Earle,	Robinson (Elgin),
Ganong,	Roche (Marquette),
Gilmour,	Rosamond,
Gourley,	Scott,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Henderson,	Smith (Vancouver),
Heyd,	Sproule,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Stewart,
Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Kemp,	Tolton,
Lancaster,	Wilmot,
Lang,	Wilson.—53.
LaRivière,	

Motion (Mr. Cowan) agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE—EXPENDITURE ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I beg to move, seconded by Hon. Mr. Tisdale :

That the Committee on Public Accounts be empowered to make inquiries into the nature of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways from the year 1895 up to the present date.

In proposing this motion, I may say that it is an appeal from the decision of the Public Accounts Committee——

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) says that this motion is an appeal from a decision of the Public Accounts Committee. I call attention to the fact that the notice he has given does not read at all in that way. His motion has no reference at all to anything that has taken place in the Public Accounts Committee. It reads :

Mr. HAGGART—Gives notice that on Monday next he will move, when notices are called, that the Committee on Public Accounts be empowered to make inquiries into any expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways from the year 1895 to the present date.

This is a substantive motion, and there is no reference in it to anything which may have taken place in the Public Accounts Committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman has not read the report.

The PRIME MINISTER. But I have read the notice of motion, and the hon. gentleman in the opening words of his speech tells us that under cover of his motion he intends to appeal from the decision of the Public Accounts Committee. He has given no notice of that.

Mr. SPROULE. He is merely giving a reason why he is moving the motion.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then, if this is a substantive motion it must go on the Order paper and cannot come up at this stage. In either case the hon. gentleman is out of order. If he moves a substantive motion he should have given notice, and it would appear on the Order paper, but if he wants to have an appeal from the decision of the Public Accounts Committee, which I do not think he has a right to, I call attention to the fact that he has not given notice of such a motion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Surely I can characterize my motion as I like. I said it was an appeal from the report of the Public Accounts Committee, and as such I am debarred from bringing it forward in any other manner than when the motions are called. I contend that I am perfectly in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under rule 31 two day's notice has to be given of a motion. Then such a motion would go on the Order paper in the place assigned for notices of motion. That procedure has not been followed in this case. Two day's notice has been given, but the motion does not appear on the Order paper. It is out of place to proceed with the discussion of this motion now. I call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact, that following the practice laid down by Sir James Edgar in 1896, I decided that all motions for an appeal from the decisions of the Public Accounts Committee, or for concurrence in reports of the committee, instead of being put on the Order paper with the other notices of motion, should be brought up when motions are called. But this is quite a different motion. Let us look at the procedure. At the beginning of this session a motion was made for the formation of the Public Accounts Committee, and later on a motion was made to refer to that committee the report of the Auditor General and the public accounts for the last fiscal year. The committee has a right to proceed with the examination of that Auditor General's Report, and those public accounts, but a substantive motion such as this now made by the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) is not in order when motions are called.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, 1898.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, 1898. He said : This Bill proposes to make a very slight amendment in the Act in question. The Civil Service Retirement Act takes the place of the Superannuation Act in the case of new officials, or of such old officials as have elected to come under its operation. A certain sum of money is deducted annually from the salary of the official, which with interest is placed in a fund created for the benefit of the official, to be paid by the government upon his retirement or upon his death. Sections 8 and 9 of the Act of 1898 describe the manner in which this payment shall be made. Section 8 reads :

8. On the retirement or dismissal of any person, the amount to his credit in the retirement fund shall be payable to him : Provided always, that if he is, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, unfit to manage his own affairs, such amount may be dealt with for the benefit of such person, or of his wife or children or other next of kin, in such manner as the Governor in Council determines.

Section 9 reads :

9. If a person dies while in the Civil Service, the amount to his credit in the retirement fund shall be paid to his legal representatives.

It will be seen that if a man dies in the service the provision is, that the money shall be paid to his legal representatives, and hence it would be necessary that there should be letters of administration taken out and considerable expense incurred. It too often happens, I am afraid, that the civil servant at the time of his death has very little property on which to administer, and it has been thought better that instead of obliging the family to take out letters of administration, that, as respects this small sum to his credit in the hands of the government, it may be paid to such person as the Treasury Board would indicate. It is a change which I think will commend itself to the judgment of the House.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I had a communication recently from one of my constituents who had been in the civil service for many years and who resigned his position voluntarily to enter commercial life. He had been paying into the superannuation fund during all the years he was in the service, and having honourably retired from the service he asks that the sum he contributed in this way should be refunded to him. Will there be any provision made in the amending Act of the minister to cover such cases ? It seems to me that it is a hardship to a man who has served faithfully in the public service and has contributed for years to the superannuation fund, if that money is retained by the government. I think the sum contributed by him during the years he has been in the public service should be returned to him. If he were dismissed from the service, it would be returned.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Only in certain cases.

Mr. CLARKE. I am advised that in the case of a civil servant being dismissed from the service, the money he has paid into the superannuation fund is returned to him. I would ask the minister if the case I mention is provided for in the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bill which I have presented to the House deals with the Civil Service Retirement Act. My hon. friend's question relates to the old Civil Service Superannuation Act, which is a different measure. It is to a certain extent a hardship when a man has contributed for a number of years to the superannuation fund and dies in the service, that his savings are not paid to his family, or, if he retires voluntarily, that they are not paid to himself. But that was a principle of the old Superannuation Act, that a man had to live in order to get the benefit of the Act. A man might have paid into the superannuation fund for many years, and, shortly before the time when he might have retired from the service and received a pension, he passed away ; and under the old Act his family could not receive a penny. My hon. friend is slightly inaccurate when he says that a man who is dismissed from the service has his contribution paid back to him. That is true only in a limited sense. It was provided for in the Act which we introduced in 1897 or 1898 to deal with persons who had been dismissed from the service for political partisanship. It was felt that, as those gentlemen were not guilty of malfeasance, though they had taken a course that was erroneous, they were punished sufficiently by their dismissal, and ought not to lose the money which they had paid into the superannuation fund. Therefore, a special Act was passed which, though not applied to them in terms, was distinctly stated to be intended to apply to them. In no other case has the money been refunded. Under the new system, in case of a man's death the money is recognized as belonging to his family and is paid to them ; or, if he retires from the service, the money will be paid to himself, or, if he is unfit to manage his affairs, to members of his family. There have undoubtedly been cases of apparent hardship under the old Superannuation Act, but I am afraid it will be difficult to make any change in the light of the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POLICE MAGISTRATES IN THE YUKON.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend chapter 41 of the statutes of 1901, and to provide that the salaries of the police magistrate at Dawson and the police magistrate at White Horse shall be $4,000 per annum.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts and to provide as follows :—

1. That the salary of the third judge of the territorial court of the Yukon Territory shall be $5,000 per annum.

2. That a judge of a county court resigning at any time after becoming disabled by permanent infirmity or resigning after twenty-five years' service, may be granted a pension equal to two-thirds of his annual salary; provided that if he has served less than five years, his pension shall not exceed one-third of his annual salary.

Motion agreed to.

REGISTRAR OF THE EXCHEQUER COURT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the registrar of the Exchequer Court shall be $2,400 per annum.

Motion agreed to.

THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—THE TERMS OF PEACE.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, before the House proceeds with Orders of the Day, I wish to give notice that I propose to-morrow, Deo volente, to move upon going into supply the following motion:

This House is of the opinion that British supremacy should be maintained and firmly established in South Africa; to which end Canada has cheerfully contributed men and money. Having in view the effect of a policy magnanimity and mercy at the cecession of Canada, and at the close of the civil war in the United States, and for other reasons, this House is also of the opinion that a like policy of magnanimity and mercy may properly be extended to a brave foe now opposing British arms, and that in the interests of peace, and of future tranquillity, harmony and homogeneity, it is expedient to offer universal amnesty, as a condition of peace and submission to British control, to all persons in arms against British authority, in Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange Free State, the Transvaal, and all other portions of the British dominions in South Africa; and upon this opinion, respectfully presented, with the prayerful hope that it may aid in securing a favourable and honourable settlement of South African hostilities and difficulties, this House invokes the considerate judgment of His Gracious Majesty the King.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call the attention of the right hon. premier to the fact that a return which was ordered by the House on the 26th of February has not yet been brought down. It is a return showing the total number of employees of the various departments who have been dismissed; and the motion was amended by adding the words, 'not already brought down.'

The PRIME MINISTER. I will take a note of it.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

SUPPLY—PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

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

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply I wish to move:

That the Committee of Public Accounts be empowered to make inquiries into any expenditure on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways from the year 1895 to the present date.

My reason for introducing this resolution is this. In making inquiries into the expenditures for the years of which the public accounts have been referred to the committee, it is found that there are many incidents connected with the accounts which it is impossible to inquire into fully without going beyond those years. For instance, in connection with the purchase of locomotives on the Intercolonial Railway, an inquiry was made before the committee as to the weight of the locomotives. We found out the weight and then wanted to know the condition of the road over which the locomotives passed, but we were debarred from inquiry into that particular question on the ground that it might embody an inquiry into expenditure beyond the year referred to the committee. But the Public Accounts Committee, which is purely inquisitorial, is not bound by the rules which apply to the courts of law, but has the fullest opportunity of putting questions in any shape or form, leading or otherwise, and may even inquire into a person's private concerns, if thought necessary. But this rule has been disregarded, and disregarded for the first time in our parliamentary history.

Before that committee, we had a party who had been in the employ of the government, but had left it in order to enter into a contract for the supply of material to the government, and the question was put to him: What was the contract you made with the sub-contractor? A minister of the Crown immediately rose and told the witness he had no right to answer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman referring to something I said?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not at all, the Minister of Finance was there at the time, and he interjected the remark that the witness had no right to answer the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I did not say he had no right to answer it, but that he was not obliged to answer it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The chairman ruled that the witness need not answer, and that is the first time such a ruling was

ever made in our Public Accounts Committee. According to the practice, both in the British parliament and this, up to the present, the Public Accounts Committee is given the fullest right to inquire into any particulars with reference to the accounts, even though that should involve divulging a private transaction. Not only that, but a witness may be compelled to give evidence, even though he thereby would admit that he was guilty of crime. And the courts in England are always very careful not to allow any such admissions to be taken as evidence against the witness, because he only made them under compulsion.

But we have changed all that in the Public Accounts Committee this session. Objection was made to a certain question on the ground that it had to deal with the accounts of another year than that which had been referred to the committee. I am therefore compelled to ask the House for the power to inquire beyond the particular year the accounts for which were referred to the committee. Never before has the right to do so been questioned, either in England or in Canada. We had no object in inquiring into anything which was not incidental to the accounts of the year as to which we were authorized by this House to inquire, but the moment we put the question we were met with the reply that it might involve an inquiry into the expenditure of something which was done in the past or between the end of the last fiscal year and the present date. The committee was equally arbitrary in another instance. Even when a member of parliament states upon his word of honour the reasons why he wishes to subpœna a witness to give evidence, his request was refused, and we are only allowed to bring the witnesses before the committee which the government think proper.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Might I ask my hon. friend, if he will allow me: Did my hon. friend desire to have the House pass an order to the effect that the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway for the past five years shall be inquired into by the Public Accounts Committee?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does he pretend that the motion to go into Committee of Supply is a proper occasion upon which to ask the House to consider and pass such a motion as he now makes?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I took what I thought was the proper course. There is a report from the committee to the House, and there is no motion to adopt the report. The motion to adopt the report was never moved by the chairman, or I would have moved an amendment, so that there was no other course left me than the one I took. I thought I had followed the regular practice, but according to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, I did not. Then there was nothing left for me but to move the motion on the order to go into Committee of Supply. I adopted the form which was adopted on previous occasions, and I was following strictly the procedure when I made my motion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. After you found you were on the wrong track, why did you pursue another wrong course?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I followed the precedents set from time immemorial, and to-day I hear for the first time that the course I took was irregular.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As I stated before six o'clock, I was inquiring in the committee into the position of the Intercolonial Railway and trying to show that locomotives had been purchased before the road was ready for them to run upon it because of their weight and unfitness for the road and the traffic. I asked one of the witnesses before the committee what was the weight of the locomotive, and he told me the weight. I asked him if this locomotive had run between Point Lévis and Montreal, and he replied in the negative. Then I asked the question what state the bridges were in on the Drummond Railway, which had been lately purchased by the government, and whether tenders had been asked for the building of new bridges or whether any contracts for that purpose were out. I was met by the opposition of the Minister of Railways and the chairman of the committee, who said that we had no business to inquire into anything that occurred or might have occurred since the public accounts had closed at the end of June last, or into the reference in the Auditor General's Report. I remember the latitude given to the committee when I was a member of the government. I remember Sir John Thompson's statement to this House and to the country, that if anything was to be inquired into with regard to the public accounts or anything that might reflect on any minister, or anything which it might be thought necessary in the public interests to inquire into, the greatest latitude would be given by the government. The ruling of the committee in my case may have been correct, and this matter may have been something which had occurred after the date covered by the reference to the committee. But immediately, for the purpose of setting myself right, I moved that the committee should apply to the House for power to make inquiries into these matters from 1895 up to the present moment. The committee

rejected the motion. I moved that the report of the committee be immediately sent to the House. It appears, under your ruling, Mr. Speaker—to which I bow as everything that is correct and proper—that in my ignorance I moved a resolution which has not the effect of gaining the object which I sought. I would like to know any other means within the rules of the House by which I could possibly reach that object and send this back to the committee. There is no other course left me but the one that I am now taking, and that is to seek the authority of the House to inquire into these questions. Surely, in the Public Accounts Committee, which is an inquisitorial committee, as I said before, and which is designed to afford every hon. member the power to inquire to the fullest extent into every expenditure made by the government, I was within my rights when I asked for the power to inquire into everything that would be incident to an expenditure which was under discussion. But I am met by a member of the government, who states that I have no right to discuss any of these questions, who refuses me the right to summon witnesses; and, for the first time in the history of this parliament or of that parliament from which we derive our rules, a minister tells the witness that he has no right to answer a question. 'Don't answer the question, you have no right to answer.' And the witness is justified, because it will be divulging something which is his own private affair.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) allow me to ask him a question ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman refer to something which transpired when the committee was investigating the Public Works accounts ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did not the Minister of Finance correct my hon. friend this afternoon by asking whether the position he took was not this—that it was the privilege of the witness not to answer the question—not that he had no right to answer it, but that it was a private matter and that it was the privilege of the witness to decline to answer ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is a nice technical distinction between telling a witness : You are not to answer, and the statement that I made, that he was told he need not answer. It shows an amount of ingenuity that would do credit to a police court lawyer. Fancy the Minister of Railways and Canals getting up before this House and drawing such a distinction as that. When the witness was asked the question he was warned by a minister of the Crown—and two of them were there at the time—' You need not answer the question, it is your privilege to answer it if you like.' That was done again and again in my hearing. I never heard of such a proceeding before. The committee was fully empowered to inquire into the question, no matter whether it affected the witness' private business or not. I never heard of such a limitation upon a committee of inquiry. As I said before six o'clock, even if it involved the criminal action, it is obligatory upon the witness to answer, unless he is excused by the committee. But the chairman rules that witnesses need not answer questions, as if he had the power to do so. No power devolves upon the chairman but to keep order. It is for the committee itself to decide whether a witness shall or shall not answer a question. The idea of a chairman of a committee ruling upon a question like that is new to me——

Mr. FRASER. May I ask the hon. gentleman one question ? Was not he the member who asked me as chairman of the committee to say whether or not the witness was bound to answer ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. FRASER. Most certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is possible. I will not make a statement in direct contradiction of the hon. gentleman. But I have here the evidence of the committee as it is reported to the House :

Q. What I want to know is whether there were any tenders asked for or contracts awarded for the purpose of building any bridge on the Drummond section of the Intercolonial Railway this year ?

A. Shall I answer that, Mr. Chairman——

That is the appeal of the witness to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN—I think that if he refers to this year, the effect of the question would be to make an inquiry before this committee we are authorized to do.

We are authorized by parliament to inquire into the public accounts.

Mr. FRASER. Is that the matter the hon. gentleman was discussing ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. gentleman will excuse me—it was the other question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I am discussing the powers exercised by the chairman, and I have shown by the report of the evidence how the witness appealed to the chairman and how the chairman assumed to decide the matter. I say the chairman has no such power. The proceedings before that committee are the most perfect farce that ever was enacted before any committee of

this House. Fancy the Minister of Railways getting up and stating virtually that your only power in making inquiries before that committee is to learn whether the money was paid for the particular service named or not. The question of policy, the question of expediency—all this he refuses the committee the right to inquire into. Therefore, there is no other course left for me, desiring as I do to maintain the power and the dignity of this House and to see that the committees are properly conducted, but the course I have taken. I have endeavoured to get this question before the House in a manner which I thought proper. It is late in the session, and there is no remedy open to me except the one I am taking. I only ask that the Public Accounts Committee be instructed to make inquiries from 1895 up to the present moment into any matters which they think pertinent to the subject submitted to them. It has been done a dozen of times in the past in the Public Accounts Committee. There is no reason why they should not do it again, and especially for the reasons which I have stated this evening. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move :

That all the words after 'that' be struck out, and the following substituted therefor :

That the Committee on Public Accounts be empowered to make inquiries into any expenses on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railways from the year 1895 to the present date.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before recess I asked my hon. friend from South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) if he would seriously say that he desired that this committee, at this stage, should be empowered to make the investigation which he proposes, and he answered that he did. If he had not answered the question in that way, if he had not said that he desired that this authority should be conferred upon the committee, I should have been constrained to believe, from the conduct of the hon. gentleman in this House and his conduct before the committee, that this was the last thing that he desired to have done. Is there a gentleman in this House who believes, after what the hon. gentleman has said here to-night, that there could be a more impossible method, a more unreasonable method, of achieving the object which he alleges he has in view, than to move this resolution on going into Committee of Supply ? If the hon. gentleman had wished to appear before parliament and the country as seeking to make an investigation which he was precluded from making by the action of the government, if he had desired to pose before the country in an attitude which would have enabled some one to draw political inferences against the government, he would have pursued precisely the opposite course to that he has pursued. I cannot understand how an hon. gentleman of his experience, who has been a long time a member of parliament, and has been a minister of the Crown, could imagine that such a course of procedure would impose upon the credulity of the most credulous man in this parliament. The hon. gentleman knows that there was another method which he could have pursued before that committee; if he desired such an investigation into the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway there was a course he could have taken, but that course he has studiously abstained from taking. The hon. gentleman could have moved a substantive motion, which would have been reached in due course, and to facilitate which the Prime Minister would have afforded him every opportunity. He could have put in the Orders a resolution to the effect that he desired that the committee should be instructed and empowered to hold an inquiry into the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway prior to or, if he liked, subsequent to the year the committee was considering. That would have been a proper and legitimate course for the hon. gentleman to take if he wished to attain the object he professes to have in view. And the subject could have been dealt with on its merits without blocking the proceedings on a motion to go into Committee of Supply. Why has the hon. gentleman not seen fit to do that ? Because he has preferred to resort to a little cheap tactics which he thinks is going to impose upon somebody who does not understand the matter. He has been pursuing an investigation before the Railway Committee for weeks and months, and has not got anywhere. He has not found out anything, he has not accomplished anything. But he has a grievance, and his chief grievance is that he has not got any grievance. It is absurd for the hon. gentleman to suppose that this parliament cannot understand the position as well as he does himself. He knows better than to imagine that there has been any disposition on the part of any member of that committee, or of any minister of the Crown, to prevent any legitimate inquiry that the hon. gentleman desires to make. He has been spending weeks in pursuing the inquiry, and what has he achieved ? Every subject he has investigated, the more he has probed into it, the more defensible the transaction has become. He is simply in this weak and lamentable position, that he has not got anywhere, and he hopes to be able to go before the country with the pretension that he would have discovered something against this government if the Minister of Railways and Canals had not blocked him in the inquiry, and had not prevented him from investigating the accounts of the railway. That is the attitude the hon. gentleman is in, and he will pardon me if I say that he occupies to-day a very flat, and a very weak, and an entirely indefensible position from any point of view.

Let me tell the House what took place before the Committee on Public Accounts. The hon. gentleman asked the committee to sustain him in a motion that all the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway should be referred to this committee, both past and future ; not alone the accounts of this year, but the accounts of the last four or five years; not alone the accounts of the past four or five years, that was not sufficient for his purpose, but he wanted to reach out into the future, and he wanted to know what was going to be done in the future. Imagine the hon. gentleman asking the Committee on Public Accounts to take up transactions that are pending and unfinished during the current year. The hon. gentleman has had a long experience in parliament, but I will venture to say that he cannot lay his finger upon any instance in which so insane a proposition was ever submitted to the committee. Well, Sir, what took place when the hon. gentleman moved this motion ? There is not an hon. gentleman upon that committee who is present here to-night but who will know that I am making an entirely accurate statement when I say that I think the committee did not exhibit the slightest disposition to preclude him from looking into the accounts and into the transactions of past years, and that it was not disposed to limit the inquiry in the present year. There had been particulars, abstracts and papers brought down covering the whole time of my administration of the Intercolonial Railway. However, I said that if there were any particular directions in which he wanted to have the accounts of past years laid before the committee if he would tell us in what they were, if he would indicate in some way what he desired, and the particular inquiry he desired to pursue, I would facilitate him in every way and would not offer the slightest objection to his motion passing.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is not the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Blair) drawing upon his imagination, when he says he made that statement ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend was present at the committee, and he must have heard what I am now stating.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I never heard it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will be borne out by an hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House, and I appeal to that hon. gentleman, who I know has closely and intelligently followed the proceedings before the committee—I refer to the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker)—to say if I did not unhesitatingly offer, if the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) would indicate the particular line of inquiry he wanted to pursue that I would support his motion to ask this House to give authority to the committee to deal with these accounts and have these accounts referred to it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), in answer to that offer, took this course ; the hon. gentleman said that his object was to get at the transactions connected with the purchasing of locomotives by the government. He said that during the past few years we had purchased a number of very large locomotives, that we had put them on the Intercolonial Railway, and he had asked one witness a question in reply to which that witness had said that there is one portion of the railway, the Drummond County Railway, upon which these locomotives could not be run because they were too heavy for the bridges upon that line. The hon. gentleman said that he wanted to have an opportunity of seeing whether, in the year now running, we were entering into any contracts, or arranging for contracts to increase the strength of these bridges or changing them so that they could carry heavier locomotives. He did not inquire as far as the locomotives were concerned that were purchased before the year, the accounts of which we are now investigating, had been entered upon. My hon. friend said that he wanted to be able to show that the locomotives that we bought were too heavy to be run on the Intercolonial Railway this year. I said to my hon. friend that as far as the present year was concerned, I did not think it was a proper subject to refer to the committee, but that so far as past years were concerned, the accounts of which we were investigating, I was perfectly willing that the accounts respecting these years should be gone into ; but let him say that that was the particular thing he wanted to inquire into and we would ask the House to authorize the committee to have these accounts laid before it. My hon. friend did not act upon that suggestion, and why ? Because he wanted to be able to come to parliament, make a speech which would find its way into 'Hansard' and be published in the opposition press throughout the country to the effect that we were stifling investigation and preventing a proper inquiry. But later, when my hon. friend had made another speech and when some remarks had been made by hon. members who asked me if I could not make a statement as to the present year, I said 'yes.' I made a statement, and the statement I made covered all the ground. I stated that in so far as entering into, or authorizing any contracts to be entered into with respect to bridges upon the Drummond County Railway was concerned, we had not either made any contracts nor were we proposing to make any contracts at present. I said that the statement which my hon. friend was making to the effect that we had bought the Drummond County Railway as a railway which was capable of carrying locomotives of this kind was not a correct statement, because when we bought the Drummond County

Railway it was stated that we acquired it as a road which, with the expenditure we had made provision to make upon it, would be up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway, and I maintain that the Drummond County is a railway up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. I affirmed and sustained my proposition by saying that immediately we had adopted the policy in 1898 of putting on heavier rolling stock and locomotives, then we had to ask parliament to make provision for increasing the capacity and strength of the bridges all over the line of the Intercolonial Railway. We are doing that to-day. I said to my hon. friend that although we had entered into no contracts the present year for the purpose of strengthening the bridges on the Drummond County Railway, we would be obliged in the near future to do that in order to have our road from one end of it to the other strong enough, so far as bridges are concerned, to carry the heaviest locomotives and trains we have placed on the railway. My hon. friend got an answer to his question. We did not hear anything more about it until my hon. friend asked for the adoption of a resolution, and he renews the request here to-day.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was not the resolution moved in the committee before the hon. gentleman made that statement?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, never; it was at the very same meeting.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister forgets. He made the statement at the next meeting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not forget anything about it. I recollect very well that the discussion which I have related here took place on the precise occasion, on which the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) moved that resolution. Now, Sir, my hon. friend, although he refuses to accept the reasonable suggestion which was made by me at the committee, now asks this House, as an amendment to the motion that we go into Committee of Supply, to authorize the Public Accounts Committee to make an inquiry into any expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway and on the Prince Edward Island Railway from the year 1895 to the present day. I ask in all reason whether it is possible to conceive of a more unreasonable motion than that which the hon. gentleman has asked his friends on the other side to support, and is at the same time, of course, asking the House generally to entertain. What was it that my hon. friend stated in parliament three or four days ago? He made the statement, and he repeated it on Friday last, that the inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee into railway affairs would no doubt terminate on Monday, and when we did not finish the investigation yesterday by reason of the fact that there were a few witnesses who had been summoned, my hon. friend stated that he then expected the inquiry would be concluded on Wednesday. He has asked the right hon. leader of the government to have the railway estimates deferred until this committee had made its final report, and yet in the face of a statement that this inquiry is at an end, and everybody knows it is at an end who has been attending the committee, he comes to this parliament and seriously and deliberately asks us to subscribe to a resolution which would transfer to the jurisdiction of that committee and impose the duty upon that committee of investigating every one of the Intercolonial Railway accounts from 1895 down to the present day. I do not think that the motion is one that will commend itself to any considerable portion of the hon. gentleman's friends. I do not think that the members on the one side or the other of this House can afford to commit themselves to any such proposition as that. It is not reasonable. If the hon. gentleman had any particular point, or item, or class of account which he wanted to investigate, he would not be obliged to come here to get the authority of the House to make his inquiries, because the committee would at once have allowed him to make any investigation that could be considered fair and reasonable. But the hon. gentleman has chosen to take another course. If he had not asserted so strongly to the contrary, every one would have concluded that he took this course because he knew it was futile, because he knew it could not result in anything, and because he himself wished to have his motion defeated.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). If this motion is defeated, as I am afraid it will, the House of Commons of Canada will not have spent a very useful day. What, between granting mountains of coal to people who have to build a small railway, and refusing to allow an investigation into that most advantageous concern, the Intercolonial Railway, which has been defended with so much wrath and with so much irritation by the Minister of Railways that he could scarcely command his language; the Commons of Canada will have spent a most unprofitable day indeed, so far as the interests of the people are concerned. If the representatives of the people desire to throw some light on the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, which during the last five years has proven to be a miserable concern for the public, why should we be debarred from so doing? Does the Minister of Railways think that the people of Canada will not uphold us in our effort to find out why it is that for the past five years the Intercolonial Railway has become a sink hole, into which has disappeared—most of the time uselessly—the money of the Canadian

people ? The Minister of Railways seemed to be in a state of frenzy. So furious was he that he could not control his language, and in his rage he qualified the act of his colleagues of the Privy Council as the act of an insane man. Why was the Minister of Railways so furious ? Is there something dark in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway that he will not allow us to investigate. Is it because, as was stated last election, the minister judged fit to go to the United States to get his engines and cars built, instead of spending the money in Canada and encouraging our industries ? If that be the reason—and I have no doubt it is one of the reasons—it explains to us why the Minister of Railways should combat with so much violence the reasonable demand made by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart). If there be nothing wrong in the administration of the government railways, surely the minister should have been glad to let light in upon it, and surely he should have been glad that we should try to find out why the Intercolonial Railway has been a losing concern for the past five years. But, when we come to examine the reasons given by the Minister of Railways against this motion, we are still more surprised. The members of this House who are not altogether governed by party exigencies, and who look into questions a little upon their merits, will be surprised to know that the minister based his criticism of the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart) upon the opportuneness of the time the hon. gentleman had chosen to move his motion. That was a weak ground of opposition, indeed. We know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) tried in good faith to bring forward his motion this afternoon at a time when it was reasonably to be expected that the motion would be in order. You yourself, Mr. Speaker, were not perfectly sure on that point, for you took the trouble to investigate authority before pronouncing yourself. And when the ex-minister (Hon. Mr. Haggart) presented his motion to the House, the right hon. the Prime Minister himself rose and took a technical objection. And in view of that, the Minister of Railways has the audacity—I cannot qualify his conduct otherwise—to say that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) should have given the ordinary notice of motion. He has the audacity to make that statement when there is not a single member of this House who is not aware that we have only one day more reserved for the consideration of such motions, and that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) had done as the Minister of Railways suggests, there could not possibly be a consideration of the motion this year. Every one of us knows that the list of motions on the Order paper cannot possibly be disposed of this session, and I myself, who am interested in a motion that will be the first to be called, entertain the gravest doubt that we will be able to finish the discussion of it. That is the absurd reason given by the Minister of Railways why this motion should not be presented now, and in his violent language he takes my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) to task; and calls upon the people to cry shame upon him because he did not do what, on the face of it, would be an absurdity if he had done. Is it not as clear as the sun at noon-day, that the Minister of Railways does not want this motion submitted in any shape or in any form to the consideration of this House ? That is how I understand his tactics. I do not hesitate to say, Sir, as one of the members of the Public Accounts Committee, that that committee is a most unsatisfactory one, important as it is, by reason of the difficulties which are thrown in our way when we seek to make an investigation of the public accounts of this country. In view of this, is it surprising that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) should avail himself of his constitutionl privilege as a British subject to air his grievances when this House is moved into a Committee of Supply? And it is because he avails himself of that constitutional privilege that he calls down upon himself the malediction—there is no other expression for it—of the Minister of Railways. But, Sir, the attitude of our irate and domineering friend, the minister, submitted to no doubt in his own province, where he learned to whip his followers into obedience ; the attitude which he takes today is very different from his attitude of last session, when the member for Hants (Mr. Russell) on going into Supply brought before the House, not a grievance, but a motion congratulating the government upon having given preferential trade to Great Britain. I did not hear the Minister of Railways make any complaint then ; I did not hear him call the hon. member for Hants an insane man. Oh no, he thought the member for Hants was perfectly right in doing what he condemns the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) for doing to-day. Sir, the people of the country know that we are trying to throw light upon the administration of a public concern in which we have sunk over $60,000,000, and which, under the management of the present Minister of Railways, has repaid us in nothing but deficits, and it seems to me a most natural course on the part of the members of this House in the interest of the people at large to find out the reason by an investigation running back 5, 6, 10 years, if necessary. We are here to investigate these matters—how it is that the money has been spent upon that railway, and why it is that, when the other railways of this country for the most part are paying and remunerative concerns, this one, which is the national railway, is a source of loss to the country. Speaking for myself individually, and representing as I do a constituency where there are a large number of workmen, of people who pay

the taxes like my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, I would be very glad to find out why it is that during the past five years, while the other railways of this country got their cars and engines in Canada, we have been obliged—shameful confession of weakness—to go to the neighbouring republic and spend there vast sums of money, instead of patriotically spending that money in our own country and helping our own labouring men. Although I have not followed attentively the work of the committee, particularly in regard to the incident referred to by my hon. friend, if it be true that the Minister of Railways and Canals—the irate man, the furious man, the angel of justice—has gone to the United States to purchase locomotives for a railway over which these locomotives could not go, and with bridges not strong enough to bear them, then we have a complete solution of the whole difficulty, and I can well understand why the Minister of Railways and Canals has laboured so extraordinarily to block this investigaion.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis). Mr. Speaker, having been present at the meeting of the committee in question, and there being some conflict between the hon. gentleman opposite and the Minister of Railways and Canals, I thought it would be only right that I should say a few words as to what took place in the committee in my hearing. But, Sir, being of a somewhat timid and retiring nature, the explosion which I have listened to has really knocked all my ideas out of my head. The hon. gentleman opposite has been complaining because the Minister of Railways and Canals has been excited. I hope his friends will be able to congratulate themselves that they have in their ranks a gentleman who can always control himself, and can use the choicest language. I believe the hon. gentleman belongs to my noble profession, which accounts for his calmness in debate. That is the reason why he can use the choice language which he has applied to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, because we have a saying in our profession that when your cause is bad, always abuse the attorney on the other side.

Now, I do not see for my own part why there should be any warmth indulged in on this occasion. I listened to the discussion before the committee, and I left it with full conviction that the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment not only had no cause for complaint, but that he left the committee feeling assured that he had not any. He seemed to wish to work up a grievance. He wanted a resolution passed by the committee that they should report to this House and ask for power to investigate beyond the year for which they were authorized to investigate, and he was told by the Minister of Railways and Canals: 'If you will point out any one transaction in connection with the administration of the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway concerning which you will say, as a member of the House, that you have reason to believe that any wrong has taken place, I am prepared to support your resolution; or, further than that, if you will state any line of accounts or of dealings in connection with the railway concerning which you will pledge your word as a member of the House that any wrong has been done, in your judgment or belief, that shall be investigated, and every paper shall be brought down.' Could anything more than that be said? But the hon. gentleman flatly and distinctly refused to make any such charge. He said he had a perfect right to have everything brought down for the purpose of investigating, to find out whether anything was wrong or not—in other words, had a right to go on a fishing expedition to see if he could find out anything that was wrong or that was not wrong, or anything that could not be explained or that could be explained.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would like to ask my hon. friend if I did not say further than that, that if he wished any branch of the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway to be investigated, let him indicate what they were, even if he did not make any charge at all, and I would consent to the authority to have the accounts brought down?

Mr. WADE. That is certainly my recollection of what took place in the committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he heard this further, that the Finance Minister said, in reference to the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals, 'and get the authority of parliament to do so.' Did you hear that?

Mr. WADE. I will answer the hon. gentleman, that I heard both the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Railways and Canals say that it was necessary to get the authority of parliament to have the investigation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear; hear, hear.

Mr. WADE. Do not make a noise too soon. But they both distinctly said they would join with the hon. gentleman in assisting in getting that authority from parliament for the investigation; and when that offer was made by the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Minister of Finance, and when hon. gentlemen opposite refused to take advantage of it, when I say we might fairly be justified in assuming that they did not want the investigation at all, but simply wished to fire off some cheap fireworks. Now, the position that was taken by some of us who were not very deeply concerned in this matter was this,

that when the committee was instructed to investigate the accounts for a particular year, if it was necessary to go beyond that year, some reason should be put before the committee and before this House why that should be done. I submit that is the practice that has been pursued by this House and by every other parliament of the empire. We were told by one of the hon. gentleman's friends that in the year 1892 a certain investigation had been ordered by the House without rhyme or reason; but when we came to investigate the proceedings for that year—and we did not investigate all of them—we found that in each case there had been directions to investigate specific matters, and reasons had been given for those investigations. So in this case I say that if the hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman is in a position to come before this House and ask for an investigation into the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway, and to state that he has reason to believe that any transaction in connection with it has been wrong, I for one will support him in his demand for an investigation, and will assist him to the best of my ability.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And that was the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals, too.

Mr. WADE. I do not think I understand the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am saying that your statement is perfectly correct, and in accord with the statement of the Minister of Railways before the committee.

Mr. WADE. Then what is the trouble?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WADE. If we are quite willing to investigate anything that may be charged or alleged on the other side, is not that enough? Does the hon. gentleman suppose for one moment that we purposed going into an investigation of all the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway from 1895 to the present, when there is not one man on the other side who has the courage to stand up and formulate anything, even in the nature of a charge, against the administration? It is all very well for my hon. friend to talk about buying locomotives in the United States. Why not buy them in the United States if you have to do so? Has he any charge to make in that connection? If he has, let him make it, but let him not make these silly insinuations.

Then my hon. friend talks about the Intercolonial Railway not paying. Did he worry very much about its not paying under the former administration?

Mr. MONK. I did.

Mr. WADE. We were operating very little more than one-half the railway then that we have now, and the deficit was considerably more than what it is now. Will he compare the service we have now with that we had them? I think not. He would be ashamed to see the service we had under the former administration on the Intercolonial Railway at present, and yet he is not allowing any credit to this government——

Mr. MONK. I do not know if all the members from the province of Quebec will agree with the hon. gentleman on that point.

Mr. WADE. Would the hon. gentleman himself agree with me? He would be ashamed to see the service on the Intercolonial Railway now, which existed during the time the late government was in power. He complains that the Intercolonial Railway does not pay. Let me put this question to him frankly. Is he prepared, as one of the leaders of the opposition, to demand that the government shall put that road upon a paying basis and exact the same rates as are charged by the other commercial roads?

Mr. MONK. I am prepared to expect that the government should place that railway on a paying basis, and it can be made to pay.

Mr. WADE. My hon. friend is a lawyer, and I dare say a far better lawyer than I am, but I shall not allow him to evade my question in that simple manner. The question I put is not whether the government should make the Intercolonial Railway a paying road, because that is a very vague question indeed, but I ask my hon. friend whether he, as one of the leaders of the opposition, demands that the government shall exact the same freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway as are exacted upon the commercial roads in the Dominion?

Mr. MONK. If that be my hon. friend's question, I reply that it is not necessary that they should. All that is required is to manage the road in a proper manner.

Mr. WADE. Does that answer appeal to any man within the sound of my voice, who knows anything about railroading? Does any one suppose that you can run a railway and not charge the ordinary commercial rates, and run it successfully in competition with other railways that do charge these ordinary rates? Surely my hon. friend does not intend to impose upon this House to that extent.

Mr. BRODER. You are paying no interest on your capital and ought to be able to do it.

Mr. WADE. I do not think that anybody suggested that we were paying interest on our capital. Nobody spoke about that. I asked whether my hon. friend wanted the rates increased so as to equal the rates charged by commercial roads. In addition

I would ask further: Do hon. gentlemen opposite want the service curtailed? Do they want a cheaper service? Will they make some specific charge? I remember in the days when we were going into confederation, we were told what an advantage it would be to us in the maritime provinces to have the Intercolonial Railway built. We were told how cheaply it would cary passengers and freight between the maritime and the upper provinces and what a great advantage that would be to us. If these statements were all wrong, if it is in the interest of the Dominion that that road should be put upon a strictly commercial basis, let these hon. gentlemen say so and let us fight it out on that line.

But I ask what has that to do with the matter of investigating the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway from 1895 to the present. It is simply an attempt on the part of these gentlemen to throw dust in the eyes of the people, but they will not succeed in the slightest degree. The time has gone by for that. If there is anything the opposition have to charge against the management of the Intercolonial Railway, if they will formulate anything in the nature of a charge, I am prepared to support them to the fullest extent of my ability in obtaining a proper investigation. But they do not want any investigation, they simply want to make this proposition here in order to appear before the country as people who tried to do something and were prevented.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. member who has just spoken (Mr. Wade) followed the same line here that he did in the committee, a line, which, in my judgment, is entirely wrong. Both he and the Minister of Finance took the ground that the members of the Public Accounts Committee had no right to ask that a witness be called before that committee, nor had they any right to go back beyond the year for which the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report were referred to the committee, unless they are prepared to make a charge in that committee, on their responsibility as members of parliament. If the hon. gentleman knows anything about parliamentary practice, he must know that such a charge can only be made in this House and not in the committee. Both the Minister of Railways and the Minister of Finance also took the ground that this was a fishing inquiry, which should not be allowed. But what is the Public Accounts Committee for, but for fishing inquiries. All the accounts of the year are sent to that committee, and we are instructed to examine them in order to ascertain if the public money has been properly expended. And the committee has the power to subpœna witnesses, to examine them under oath, and compel them to give evidence. In that committee we are doing the duty which the House imposed upon us, when the House referred to us the Public Accounts and the Auditor General's Report for the purpose of investigation. Of necessity therefore our inquiries are in the nature of fishing inquiries. We do not start by making charges. That is not the function of the Public Accounts Committee. What we desire is to inquire into all expenditure—to carry on a fishing expedition, and that is particularly the duty of the committee. We do not make a charge, because that committee is not the place to make them. The committee is not for the purpose of inquiring into charges. There is no charge made when the House sends the accounts to the Public Accounts Committee and tells us go into them. But we were not allowed to call a witness we required. The first obstruction we met with was the refusal of the majority of the committee to allow us to call witnesses. Why was our request refused? No doubt because something might be brought out which would enable us to carry the investigation further and show up wrong-doing. That is the only presumption which we can draw. Why did the majority of the committee not allow Mr. Archibald, the engineer of the road, to go before it? Was there anything to conceal? So far as my memory goes, that was the first time the Public Accounts Committee was refused the right to call before it any witness it desired, in order to get any light on the question under consideration. If there was nothing to hide, there could have been no object in refusing to allow Mr. Archibald to go before the committee. And we have the right therefore to presume that there was some wrong-doing behind, which these hon. gentlemen did not desire to be brought to light. What right has the committee to summon witnesses? Exactly the same right as the House of Commons. It is laid down unmistakably that the Public Accounts Committee has the right to summon any witness required to give information with regard to any item under consideration. Then, when we brought witnesses before the committee and asked questions designed to bring out information which we deemed it to be in the public interest to make known, they told the witnesses that they need not answer the question. The hon. gentleman was like a lawyer instructing his client. Is this the duty of a member of the committee? He abandons his place and becomes a counsel for the witness rather than a member of the committee. But there is the rule that governs witnesses brought before this House and the same rule applies to witnesses before the committee.

A witness who neglects or refuses to obey the order of the House will be sent for in the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms. Any person refusing to obey this or any other order may be declared guilty of contempt of the House and brought before it in custody that he may be dealt with according to its will and pleasure.

And the same applies to a committee of

the House, only the course is for the committee to report to the House, and the House has the right to take action. Then they refused to allow the inquiry to go beyond the year of the public accounts that were referred to us. What has been the course for years with regard to such a matter? The course has been to refer the question to the House and for the House to give the committee the necessary power. Here is a case, to be found at page 350 of the Journals of the House of Commons for 1891:

Mr. Sproule, from the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented to the House the fifth report of the said committee, which was read as followeth:—

The following resolution as a recommendation:

Resolved, that all accounts for salaries and extra services or otherwise with the Post Office Department in regard to the following persons, namely: J. G Poston, A. C. McDonald, M. P. Wright, E. A. LeSueur, Miss Kate E. Falconer, Miss J. Craig, Miss A. Graham and A. E. Meighen, together with all cheques given in payment of such accounts, and any and all cheques, vouchers, receipts and other papers in any way relating to their respective services, for the fiscal year 1887-88 and 1888-89; and all the cheques, accounts and receipts for payments of every kind in connection with the Emerson, Deloraine and Gretna immigration stations in the North-west, for the financial years 1886-87, 1888 and 1889, be produced forthwith for the use of the Public Accounts Committee.

And in another case we went back nine years. The House never refused a request of this kind. But here the committee refuses to go into the inquiry except for one year, and when we desire to report it to the House and ask the authority of the House to enter upon the whole inquiry, we are refused. And when we attempt in this House to revive the question and to get the necessary authority of the House, every subterfuge is resorted to, the hon. gentleman's motion is ruled out of order——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the word 'subterfuge,' as applied to the action of any member of the House, is not a proper word.

Mr. SPROULE. All I can say is that every effort of ingenuity that the hon. gentleman could suggest is made use of to prevent us getting this question before the House, to prevent us, in fact, from properly discharging our duties as members of that committee. If there is nothing to hide, why are we refused this right? Why are witnesses told not to answer questions? Why is not the engineer of the road brought before us? Why cannot we get the information that the Public Accounts Committee has the right to get? Why all this attempt to prevent information being made public, if there is nothing to hide? The only conclusion that we can come to is that there is something to hide, and that this is the reason why we find ministers going beyond their duty and refusing to allow the committee of this House to perform the duty assigned to it by this House of Commons.

Mr. FRASER. There is no need of quarrelling about this matter, but there is need of knowing where we stand. Reference was made to myself, and I wish to state just how this matter came up, and what I think about it. I thought, and I still think, that the committee has only a delegated power, that, like any other committee of parliament, it is to do certain things which are named by this House, and beyond that it has no power to go.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman if it is not the fact that from time to time the House sends further instructions to the committee?

Mr. FRASER. Decidedly.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what we want.

Mr. FRASER. This House has power to order a committee to inquire into the public acounts from confederation down to the present time, if it sees fit to do so. But that is not the question. My point is that there were certain things referred to that committee. Beyond the things thus referred to it, the committee had no power to go. It was absurd to ask that committee of its own power to inquire into a single dollar outside the book of the Auditor General and the public accounts that were referred to us. That was my decision. And the only way we could get further instructions was for the committee to come back to the House and ask for those instructions.

Mr. SPROULE. That is what we are doing.

Mr. FRASER. This is the right place to get those instructions. But, I stated in committee as chairman, when the point was raised, that I did not propose, for one, that this parliament should be able to snub us for going beyond the powers they gave. Now, what has been asked here? I venture to make the statement—and I have looked over all the votes and proceedings from confederation down to the present time, but if I have overlooked anything I should be glad to be corrected—that never was it proposed that accounts from one year to another relating in a general way to one or to all departments should be submitted to the Public Accounts Committee. Let me give some cases showing what I mean. The whole point at issue here is whether the House should give general instructions to the committee to inquire into all the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway from 1896 down to the present time, or whether certain specific accounts are to be submitted to the committee. Now, for example:

Mr. Wallace, from the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, presented to the

House the fourth report of the said committee, which was read, as followeth :—

The following resolution as a recommendation :—

Resolved that in regard to the sum of $600, charged in the public accounts for 1885 and 1886, as paid to one Fournier, as caretaker of the immigration office at Emerson, it being alledged that said Fournier was not such caretaker, and that the office in question then and since has continued under the management of one Têtu, your committee recommend that they be empowered to investigate all amounts paid to or through said Têtu, or in connection with any office or public service under his charge.

There is a specific charge and a specific statement of accounts. Will any hon. members say that this House would ever in order to get at that question of account of $600 paid to one Fournier, adopt a resolution that the public accounts for the year 1895-96, in connection with the Department of the Interior, under which this immigration branch is carried on, were to be investigated by the committee ? That would be as sensible a resolution as the one before us. Now anybody can see a very good reason. There is not a lawyer or a layman here but can see that the reason why you must be specific is that it saves time, and you will not have to go to a lot of useless expenditure in getting witnesses about a matter that is not specific. Here is another :

On motion of Mr. Somerville :

That all accounts in the Department of the Interior for salaries paid and for extra work done during the years from 1884 to July 1, 1896, inclusive, together with all the cheques and other vouchers for payment of the same, be produced forthwith before the Select Standing Committee.

There is a specific thing. Then I find another one here by the hon. gentleman himself. On motion of Mr. Sproule it was ordered :

That all accounts for salaries and express services or otherwise with the Post Office Department in regard to the following persons, namely : J. G. Poston, A. C. Macdonald, M. P. Wright, E. A. LeSueur, Miss Kate E. Falconer, Miss J. Craig, Miss A. Graham and A. E. Meighen, together with all cheques given in payment of such accounts, and any and all cheques, vouchers, receipts and other papers in any way relating to their respective services, for the fiscal years 1887-8, and 1888-9 ; and all the cheques, accounts and receipts for payments of every kind, be produced forthwith for the use of the Public Accounts Committee.

That is the hon. gentleman's own resolution. He must have been very far astray or his motion would have been this : Resolved that all accounts in connection with the Post Office Department for the fiscal years named be forthwith produced and handed into the committee. But he did not do that then, he could not do it, and he knew it, because parliament would never have permitted it. Parliament understands that you go on one year at a time with your accounts. Now after giving five successive years in the Public Accounts Committee, after considering five sets of accounts for five years, all the hon. member has to do is to rise and move that the whole accounts for the last five years be submitted to that committee again in addition to the work they are doing this year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman look at the journals for 1891, page 355 :

On motion of Mr. Wallace, seconded by Mr. Roome, ordered : That all accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau, also, the accounts, vouchers, and cheques for the following payments for the years 1888-9 be referred.

Mr. FRASER. Very well, I will take that instance to prove my case, I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WADE. He only read half of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. With your permission, I will read the whole of it.

Mr. FRASER. Here it is :

That all accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau.

That would be the same as saying here that all accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the engines, or for any particular year, which would be perfectly legitimate.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FRASER. Excuse me, the equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau is a particular building, and you can get at it any time ; it is not the whole supply for the department throughout :

Also, the accounts, vouchers and cheques for the following payments, as found in the report of the Auditor General on appropriation accounts, for the following years : 1888-89, J. L. McDougall, $26.60 ; J. B. Lynch, $70.55 ; J. Gorman, $26.90 ; F. Hayter, $73.95 ; 1887-88, J. L. McDougall, $103.65; James Patterson, $50.00 ; F. Hayter, $222.35 ; 1886-87, J. L. McDougall, $50.78 ; F. Hayter, $218.15 ; 1885-86, J. L. McDougall, $17.75 ; John Gorman, $86.67, be produced forthwith.

Where is there anything like that in the hon. gentleman's resolution ? I appeal to him as a man of very great ability, as I consider him—where is the similarity ? I would not be so particular if the hon. gentleman had not mentioned the names of the parties, but if he would say all accounts, as the minister offered him, in connection with so many locomotives of such a year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is too fair now to do anything wrong. The statement was made that I only read half the resolution. It is the first part of the resolution which says that every account in reference to the Printing Bureau should be referred to the committee. Besides that, it says also the following accounts.

Mr. FRASER. Nobody denies that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The inference was that I concealed a portion of it.

Mr. FRASER. I do not know what is the matter with the hon. gentleman opposite. I never saw him so peppery in my life.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not like to be accused of garbling anything.

Mr. FRASER. I cannot understand it, they are not themselves at all. The hon. member for Lanark cannot sit still. His motion is circular and ambidextrous, vaulting and changing. Let us look at this as reasonable men ought to :

All accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For the two years.

Mr. FRASER. There is no year mentioned at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon, immediately afterwards you will find it is for 1888-9.

Mr. FRASER. I will read the words relating to the Printing Bureau again, and these are the only words :

That all accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau, also the accounts, vouchers and cheques for the following payments.

That is all, there is nothing about the Printing Bureau.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Read the whole of it.

Mr. FRASER. When I was a boy I was considered a fairly good reader. Let me read it again :

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spell it for him.

Mr. FRASER. It is not fair for any hon. gentleman to call in another reader.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Spell it.

Mr. BROCK. You are wrong.

Mr. FRASER. No, no. Now, I will read it again for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), after he has satisfied himself by the cool headed reading of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) that he or I, one or the other, is correct. Does the hon. gentleman want me to read it again ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. FRASER. After the trip the hon. gentleman made to have himself reassured by the cool headed, clear brained member for Hamilton he will be satisfied that I am right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I will read it again.

That all accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau ;

Semi-colon.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Also, the accounts, vouchers and cheques for the follwing payments, as found in the report of the Auditor General on appropriation accounts, for the following years : 1888-89, J. L. McDugall, $26.60 ; J. B. Lynch, $70.55 ; J. Gorman, $26.90 ; F. Hayter, $73.95 :

Colon.

1887-88, J. L. McDougall, $103.65 ; James Patterson, $50.00 ; F. Hayter, $222.35 :

Colon.

1886-87, J. L. McDougall, $50.78 ; F. Hayter, $218.15 :

Colon.

1885-86, J. L. McDougall, $17.75 ; John Gorman, $85.67, be produced forthwith——

Mind you.

--be produced forthwith for the use of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the seventh report of the said committee.

There is not a word there except that the accounts and payments for equipment and supplies for the Printing Bureau—and if the year is not mentioned it must mean the year—be produced also with the accounts I have named.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You say it is confined to the year 1891. What was the need of a resolution calling for the production of the accounts for the year ?

Mr. FRASER. Probably the hon. gentleman and some of his friends were refusing to bring them down, and we had to move that resolution. I care not what the reason may be ; I am quoting the words of that resolution and I am explaining them as any English words ought to be explained. I will leave it to any hon. gentleman if they do not mean exactly what I say. There is not a word about the year. What foolish people there were here in 1891. I was here, and I was one of the idiotic members that thought that ought to be done. We had not learned then that we could go over a whole series of years, bring down all the papers and submit to the poor overworked Public Accounts Committee the accounts of the Dominion of Canada, amounting to $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 a year, for the last five or six years. The hon. gentleman will not deny that his resolution is untenable. He might have added to the resolution that the public accounts relating to every dollar of payments from 1885 to the present time should be inquired into. You cannot draw the line in one case and not in the other, and consequently you might as well go back to 1890. I know we will be a long time here, but I am afraid our grand-children would be here if we were to undertake to go into all these accounts from that time to the present. I have mentioned a case only to show how wrong the thing is. I do not think hon. gentlemen opposite, if they wisely consider the matter, would desire that a resolution should be adopted for the first time deviating from anything we ever did

in parliament or that ever happened in any other parliament. I make the statement subject to correction by those who are better students than I am, and who may have studied it more closely, that there has never been a resolution like this introduced into any parliament in Canada, and I am certain that no such legislation was ever introduced into the parliament of Great Britain, because we have been following the British parliament as closely as possible in this respect. If, in the committee, you name a certain account, or any number of accounts and say, first, I believe there is something wrong about this, or, secondly, I desire that we shall inquire into this to ascertain whether there is anything wrong or not, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) says that you shall have any specific account that you name. Does not the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) know that that is reasonable, that it is fair and just? Does he desire that we shall establish in this parliament a precedent that no parliament has adopted? Had we not better keep to the land marks that have been found useful in the past? For myself—I may be wrong and I speak subject to correction—I say that I do not think so lightly of the chairman's position as that it implies that he is simply to keep order. I did not accept that when the point was raised as to contracts made since the report of the Auditor General was published and the accounts to be paid in this present year, showing what amount of money was to be expended this year. I had to decide that was not within the scope of our reference, and I think I was right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You were right in that.

Mr. FRASER. I did not think it was within the scope of our reference, and I do not think that hon. gentleman opposite will say that I drove any partisan ruling to the length of excluding anything which it was the right of the committee to inquire into. I have read this and I submit to hon. gentlemen opposite that we ought not to pass the resolution which the hon. gentleman has made here. I am sorry that the midland leader of the opposition is not here. I really was amused, and I was no more amused than I think were some hon. gentlemen opposite. We may make mistakes in parliament. We may sometimes get a little worked up, we may perhaps make statements with a good deal more emphasis than is necessary, but it was to me the most laughable scene that I have ever witnessed when, with twice the energy, twice the exertion and ten times the hard saying that were necessary, we saw that hon. gentleman calling in fault the Minister of Railways and Canals, reading him a lecture in tones that were so stentorian—as loud as my own, and that is saying a good deal—that they could be heard in any part of Ottawa. If we rebuke, let us rebuke decently after the manner and method as proposed by the apostle.

Mr SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). I think the question before the House is one simply of principle. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) chose not to treat the question as one of principle, but rather sought, I think, to enter into a discussion here, to-night, as to whether the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), or other hon. members of the committee had succeeded in the Public Accounts Committee in proving anything at all after all their labours. I do not propose to follow the minister in that line; I do not think it has anything to do with the question before the House. The Minister of Railways will probably hear a good deal about what is passing in the committee before this session is brought to an end. Let me say to the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) that while he professes to be so precise and accurate, he gave utterance to a most extraordinary statement when he said that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) left the committee perfectly satisfied with what took place. Nothing could be more contrary to the fact than that statement. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) must know that immediately on the committee refusing to pass the resolution, the hon. member (Mr. Haggart) asked that the proceedings be reported so that he could bring the question before the House. A moment afterwards the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) suggested that we should divide the committee on the question, and the chairman ruled that it was too late, because the resolution had been carried to report the matter to the House. The hon. member for Lanark then said: I will bring it before the House in its present shape. In face of that, how can the hon. gentleman for Annapolis say that the hon. gentleman from Lanark left the committee perfectly satisfied. I merely mention that to show how an hon. gentleman can either misconceive or forget what took place in the committee.

Now, Sir, the Minister of Railways undoubtedly did say that if the member for Lanark would point out any particular subjects he would consent to investigating them. The Minister of Railways and Canals said that once; he said it twice; I think he said it a third time; but every time he said that, the Minister of Finance, who was at his elbow, added: 'upon the order of the House.' It is quite true that the Minister of Railways was very generous, but his language was qualified by the words of the Minister of Finance, and we who were about the table heard the qualification and the member for Gusborough (Mr. Fraser) heard it also. Although the member for Gusborough now tells us that we ought to be content with what the hon. Minister of Railways promised, we have to take the lan-

guage of the Minister of Railways as qualified by the Minister of Finance. Even without that qualification, it was not our duty to accept the proposition made by the hon. Minister of Railways. We were there investigating—practically auditing—the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway for the year in question, and it was not for us to leave to the Minister of Railways to decide whether we should investigate any subject out of that year or not. If we had the right we did not require his consent, but when the minister refused his consent the resolution was moved in the committee to request authority from the House for us to go outside the accounts of the particular year in question. The question now before the House is, whether it is reasonable to give the committee authority to investigate beyond the accounts of this particular year. On that subject I propose to say a few words. We do not ask to go into all the dealings of the government during the last five years; we simply ask authority to look into the administration of the Intercolonial Railway during the period of years in which the Minister of Railways has been pursuing a particular policy. There is hardly a single item in the whole accounts now under investigation that is not closely related to certain other expenditures in almost every year since the present government has been in power; there is hardly an item in the present accounts that is not affected by expenditure that is going on to-day. That is shown by the very question upon which this whole trouble arose in the committee. The enormous amount of money which the minister has expended for heavy locomotives was under consideration, and the member for Lanark in trying to show that that expenditure was unwise and improvident, proceeded to examine the witness as to the expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars two years ago for these heavy locomotives, and as to the fact that they could not yet be used between Quebec and Montreal, because the bridges on the Drummond County road are not strong enough to carry them. Is not that connected with the wise or unwise expenditure of money in 1900? Surely it is proper criticism to show that the Minister of Railways had bought these locomotives two years before he could use them. Take almost any item in the accounts and the same principle is involved. Take the expenditure in the city of St. John, N.B. Year after year for several years the Minister of Railways has incurred enormous expenditure there, amounting to about $1,000,000, and you cannot to-day properly discuss one dollar of that whole expenditure without reference to every dollar which has been spent in St. John. An elevator has been built, and surely it is a question as to the expenditure in 1900, whether that elevator has been properly built or not. Why, Sir, the Minister of Railways has charged in 1900 some $17,000 for marsh land that he bought in St. John to build sidings upon; he charged to that year $46,000 for material with which he proposed to lay twelve or thirteen miles of sidings, but to this hour there is only one mile of siding built, although $46,000, in addition to the $17,000 for land, was expended in 1900. Surely in criticising that expenditure we should have the right to go into the question as to whether the minister has even this year got these sidings laid. The minister admits, I believe, that he has only laid one mile, and are we not entitled, as of right to ask by what authority he spent over $60,000 in 1900 for sidings that are not in existence to this very hour. Is it reasonable to say that the committee can investigate railway accounts which run from year to year, and that we must be confined to the actual dollars and cents that are spent between the 30th June, 1900, and the 30th of June, 1901, without having power to inquire into the hundreds of thousands of dollars which have been spent before and after? That is the position we are in. We want to know if the House will consent to that state of affairs. When a witness is under examination and we are asking him questions about the expenditure in 1900, we want the power to ask him such questions as will show whether that expenditure was reasonable or not. We send for a witness from Moncton; we have him before us; we enter into his examination. In the course of that examination some facts are developed which lead directly to an inquiry into what has been done before or since. Immediately the hon. gentleman says: 'You have gone out of the year; you must apply to the House for permission to ask that question.' What is the good of such an investigation? The hon. gentleman says: 'Tell us what you wish to go into, and I will let you go into it.' The question is not what the minister will let us do; the question is what we should have the power to do.

Let me put another case. In 1900 the hon. gentleman brought down an estimate and got the authority of this House to spend $39,000 at Sydney. How much did the hon. gentleman spend? He spent something like $137,000 on his authority to spend $39,000. He charged $41,000 of that to another item, and he came down in 1901 and got the authority of the House for $57,000 of what had been spent a year before. There is thus an expenditure in 1900 with authority extending over two years. Are we to be confined to just the particular year, or must we on every occasion come down to this House and explain all the circumstances, and ask the authority to ask a particular question of a particular witness; and must we let that witness stand over until the next meeting of the committee until we get that authority? We are not seeking a general sweeping power to go into all the proceedings of the government. We are asking authority

to investigate the accounts in connection with a particular railway, the government railway, for the period during which it has been administered by the hon. Minister of Railways, and to see whether the dollars and cents that were spent in 1900 were properly spent, having due regard to what has happened before and since.

Now, I say that is a perfectly reasonable proposition to make to the House. I say the House ought to grant such a power, and unless they do the whole inquiry of the Public Accounts Committee, so far as it is an attempt to inquire into the administration of the railway, is a palpable farce. It cannot be otherwise. A witness comes before us. After a great deal of labour we get perhaps particular facts. Those facts lead up to further expenditures. We are stopped unless the minister chooses to say, 'You can go on.' Now, that is not right. Surely, that is not a reasonable position for a committee to be in. Why should the government object to our going back to these matters? Has there been any attempt made on the part of the committee to unwarrantably use their position? I think the Minister of Railways will say that the committee have been perfectly fair to him—every member of it without exception. We have not sought unreasonably to investigate his proceedings. There has not been one subject brought before the committee that we were not warranted in probing to the bottom, and I think it is not right, either in regard to the railway or to any other subject that has been brought up, that we should be subject to the interruptions and the objections to which we have been subjected.

I wish to refer to another case which has been alluded to on both sides of the House—a similar question as regards a witness who was called in relation to the accounts of the Minister of Public Works, and which illustrates the kind of objections we have met with in the committee. Mr. Rochester was an employee of the Public Works Department——

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend will allow me to call him to order. The motion before the House is strictly confined to the expenditure on railways, and I think my hon. friend will admit himself that it is not in order to go into anything outside of that.

Mr. BARKER. I do not wish to pursue the matter if I am not in order; but it was referred to on both sides of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. If it was, I will not press my objection.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Rochester is an employee of the Public Works Department. He was engaged at $200 a month on the construction of the Yukon telegraph. He kept the books of Mr. Charleson. While he was so employed he conceived the idea that he could sell telegraph poles to the government at a certain price. He continued to keep the books for the government, but he dropped his salary temporarily, and he was given by Mr. Charleson a contract to supply poles to the government at $2 each. As soon as he had completed that contract he resumed his salary, and a little later on he was given a higher position at a considerably increased salary. Mr. Rochester had no transactions in the Yukon either with the government or anybody else as a trader except that one contract to supply poles to the government. He admitted that he had no other transactions and was not going to have. This gentleman was before the committee and was asked what the poles had cost him. The instant that question was put two ministers said: 'You are not obliged to answer that question.' The chief of his own department, the Minister of Public Works, was present, and this witness was cautioned that he was not obliged to answer a question that a member of this House chose to ask. I do not know what the Prime Minister will say about that. It does seem to me a most extraordinary position that an employee in the public service should be cautioned in the Public Accounts Committee that he need not answer a question. Why, Sir, what was the position of that gentleman? At the time he proposed to Mr. Charleson to supply poles to the government he was a servant of the government. He knew he could obtain the poles for less than $2 apiece, and instead of telling the government, his employer, that they could get poles at less than $2 apiece, he droped his salary for four months and entered into a contract with the government. Now, I think the man should have been obliged to answer that question. I think it was a most improper thing to warn him against answering it. The man himself did not refuse to answer until he received the hint from two ministers that he need not answer it. That does not indicate a desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to have that full inquiry into the public accounts that we on our side of the House think the public interest demands.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Israel Tarte). Let me say only one word in reference to the Rochester incident. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was not in the committee the first time the question was put to Mr. Rochester. Without any hint or intervention from any one of us, Mr. Rochester, when the question was put to him first, declined to answer. He was sustained in his refusal by the chairman, and in my opinion, very properly.

Here are the facts. Mr. Rochester was engaged by Mr. Charleson to go up the Yukon as a conductor of work. He was a man of long experience in lumbering and in the bush. Mr. Charleson made an ar-

rangement, under which he was paying $3 for poles for the construction of the line. Mr. Rochester came to Mr. Charleson one day and told him he could supply the same poles for $2 each. Mr. Charleson thought that would be a good bargain to make, besides having the poles supplied by a man of long experience whom he knew thoroughly, and he made a contract with Mr. Rochester for $2 a pole instead of $3. Mr. Rochester who had been receiving $200 a month, ceased from that moment to be in the employ of the government. He did not receive a dollar from the department, as an employee, from the moment he became a contractor for the poles. That cannot be denied.

Mr. BARKER. He went back immediately afterwards.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly, there was no reason why he should not. But during the time he was contractor, he did not get a dollar from the Department of Public Works. He then farmed out his contract to a man named Johnson, and in the committee he was asked how much he gave Johnson for the poles, and declined to answer. The first time the question was put, Mr. Rochester declined, without any hint or notification from anybody. When I interfered—and I do not deny that I interfered and told Mr. Rochester he was not bound to answer, it was simply to remind one of the members of the committee that the witness had rights which could not be taken from him. I take it that Mr. Rochester was perfectly in his right in declining to answer. My department gives out every year many contracts. Will any one say that a contractor is obliged to tell me or any committee of the House how much he pays for his material or for any sub-contract he may farm out? I have been for years a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and I never heard before a question of that kind put. When contractors are awarded contracts, they pay for their materials, men and labour or they pay their sub-contractors just what they see fit. It is no one's particular business what they pay. If my hon. friend had attempted to prove that $2 was too high a price, he might have sought for evidence to show at what prices the poles could have been obtained. But he did not attempt to do that. He could not do it, and Mr. Rochester was perfectly right in declining to say how much he had paid for his men and materials or sub-contracts. The ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) was several years the head of a large department, and I would ask him if ever, on any occasion, he compelled a contractor to say how much he was paying for his material, men or sub-contracts. Such a question is never put. No one has any right to put it. We were paying $3 a pole, and Mr. Rochester furnished us the poles at a dollar each less. If there is any crime in that, I am responsible for it. But I submit that Mr. Rochester was perfectly right in declining to say how much he paid his sub-contractors. Whether he has made or lost money nobody has anyright to know.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). The further this debate progresses, the clearer seems to be the fact that there is an impassable gulf between the members on your right, Mr. Speaker, and those on your left, regarding the principles on which legislation should be carried on in this House. We, on your left, labour under the impression that we are here as representatives of the people. Our idea is that the people of Canada have elected 215 representatives to meet in this chamber and legislate in their interest. The majority, of necessity, are bound to elect a certain committee to preside over the affairs of the country, but that committee, according to the view of gentlemen on this side, are but the servants of the people, and when we the representatives of the people meet here annually, we find that our servants have expended $40,000,000 to $65,000,000 of the public money, and we have a perfect right to know where that money has gone. But hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have the idea that as soon as, by a brute majority the estimates are passed, the money so voted becomes the absolute property of the ministers, who can do as they see fit with it without being called to account.

When the Public Accounts Committee is constituted, at the beginning of the session, I quite agree with my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) that it has only a delegated power and can only act to the extent of the powers conferred on it by this House. But it happens that the power conferred by this House, according to practice, is the power to investigate certain specific accounts. I quite agree with the chairman of the committee that when a member of the committee asks to have an investigation go beyond the period covered by the public accounts which were referred to the committee, he is perfectly justified in declining to allow the investigation to go further, but the fact that that committee finds itself unable, for any reason, to do the work which it has been appointed to perform, is a most conclusive reason why this House should clothe it with full power and authority to make whatever investigation may be necessary in the interests of the people. Let me cite an analogous case. Supposing the directors of a bank, after they had presented their balance sheet for the year, and had it audited and passed satisfactorily, were attacked at the subsequent annual meeting of the shareholders, and supposing certain shareholders said they would like to know how it was that the accounts were in such and such a condition, two or three or four years ago, could any one imagine the directors refusing to allow any investigation beyond the current year? Can it be supposed that the shareholders would

submit to any such refusal, or if they did, would not public confidence in the bank be irretrievably shaken ? We appeal to hon. gentlemen to allow us to investigate the accounts. But we are met by the challenge : If you will charge that such and such a minister has done wrong, or that a certain minister has stolen such and such moneys, we will give you an investigation. But surely it is not to be assumed that a minister is a common criminal. Surely we are not going to say that everybody who is handling public money is a thief. We do not pretend to make any such charge, but we do say that an immense amount has gone through the minister's hands and the accounts are so connected that we cannot possibly investigate this year without inquiring back from one year to another, and we ask that this House should give us the right to investigate all those accounts and summon witnesses. If any hon. member should abuse the power he enjoys of having a witness called, and thus unnecessarily causes the expenditure of public money, the committee has every right to decline in future allowing such member to call witnesses.

Although the Public Accounts Committee is a comparatively large committee, everybody knows that the supporters of the government do not contribute one iota to its investigations. It is all very well to talk about hon. gentlemen opposite having an equal interest in the matter, but we know from experience that hon. gentlemen opposite, having more confidence in the ministers than we on this side, do not contribute in any degree to the investigation of the public accounts.

Therefore, Sir, the whole burden of the investigation of the public accounts falls upon hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, that is a thankless task, and a task that no hon. gentleman on this side enjoys. You may be sure that any hon. gentleman who spends his time studying the public accounts and in attending the Public Accounts Committee to pursue investigations and conduct examinations is engaging in that task solely in the public interest. And the question is whether, if hon. gentlemen on this side are willing to give their time and their energy to investigating the accounts of public expenditure, hon. gentlemen opposite will assist them, or whether they will hopelessly block their inquiry. I do not intend to go into the various side issues that have been dragged into this discussion. It seems to me a very simple question, and I cannot understand why it is necessary to go into the dozen or more of outside questions that have been discussed. It cannot effect the question before us what the views of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) are with regard to the management of the Intercolonial Railway. Nor can it help us in deciding this question to discuss whether the present system is better than the old system or not. The simple question is this—the Public Accounts Committee, finding that it has no authority to carry its investigation beyond a certain period, one of its members asks that it be allowed to carry its investigations over a longer time. Shall that power be given to the committee ? We may be unable to secure that power from hon. gentlemen opposite who have a majority in this House. But there is a higher tribunal than hon. gentlemen opposite, and to that tribunal, to the people of this country, we shall appeal with confidence. The people will feel that their interests were protected by those who wished to carry on the investigation, and that their interests were opposed and overruled by those who refused this power of investigation and who say that, because during the accounts of one year nothing seriously wrong was discovered, therefore, for all time to come, no matter what suspicions may be aroused, no hon. gentleman shall be allowed to investigate the accounts unless he is ready to assume the grave responsibility of saying the minister is a thief or that some particular individual in connection with the department is a common criminal.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). As a member of the committee before which substantially this resolution was proposed, and as one who did not support the resolution, I desire to make one or two observations. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) I think, gave away the whole case in the observations he made. If I understood him correctly, he based the argument in favour of the large and comprehensive resolution now before the House upon a principle which would naturally call for at least all the accounts of the previous year. The hon. gentleman, although drawing into the arena of the discussion a large number of irrelevant facts which threw no light upon the question, made the argument upon the supposition that, during the discussion of accounts of the past year actually referred to the committee, arose items which required for their explanation some of the accounts of the previous years, therefore a resolution of this kind ought to be permitted. In other words, if it was necessary to have the light of the previous accounts on those of the present year, therefore, we ought to have all the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway for a period of five or six years. I think that the offer made by the Minister of Railways and Canals and concurred in by the committee that if any particular account were required by the committee, if the hon. gentlemen conducting the investigation deemed any account necessary to throw light upon the subject before the committee, those accounts would be laid before the committee without hesitation. The ground has been changed entirely by the resolution asking this House to dump upon

the table of the Public Accounts Committee all the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway covering a period of five or six years. The hon. gentleman stated that there was a question of principle and a question of reasonableness. On the ground of reasonableness, I would base the whole argument against the passage of the resolution now before the House. It is unreasonable because of the period of the session at which we have arrived. It is unreasonable on account of the vast number and complexity of the accounts upon which the committee would have to enter. It is unreasonable because not even a prima facie case has been made out by the investigation so far conducted why these accounts should be produced. As to principle, I do not see any fundamental question of principle except the principle of procedure that has been involved, and upon that hon. gentlemen have lost all claim, for, though the records of the House for years have been investigated, no case of a demand parallel with this has been found. If papers are referred to the committee it is always upon the recommendation of the committee that accounts relating to special sums are needed. Hon. gentlemen opposite have mentioned a large number of matters and some of them quite out of order, I think. They have brought forward their own recollection of evidence which will be laid before the committee in a few days as the words were taken down. This is not fair to the House, for no matter how honestly they may intend, they may unintentionally give a prejudiced view of that evidence—and I must say that in one or two instances my own recollection differed from the version given by the hon. gentlemen. Take the case of the Rochester contract, The ground upon which the committee declined to enter into a consideration of the witness' private affairs was upon the strictly legal ground that the question asked and the facts it was intended to educe were not relevant to the inquiry before the committee. No committee, no court, no person with the slightest ideas of justice, in a matter of that kind, would for a moment permit valuable time to be taken up with evidence that was absolutely irrelevant to the inquiry.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that the witness Rochester distictly gave as his answer that it was his own private business.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Which was true.

Mr. FLINT. It was his private business. That was his reason for not answering the question. But that would not necessarily have been sufficient if the question had been relevant to the inquiry. Very frequently evidence may be relevant, but it may be excluded on account of some higher principle. However undesirable evidence may appear from the standpoint of the witness, if it is held that the question is relevant and admissible upon general principles, his private feelings and private interests must give way. But the fact that the evidence was absolutely irrelevant, the fact that even if it had brought out what the hon. gentleman expected, the information would have had no bearing upon the inquiry or upon the result of it, was the reason for refusing to press the question. In fact, all the evidence the hon. gentleman required was before the committee—first, that Rochester had a contract, second that under it the poles were got for a less price than the government had been previously paying, and, third, that the gentleman had admitted that he had made a profit out of the contract. The amount of the profit, the price he gave for the poles, the details of his contract with another person, were irrelevant and improper to be introduced before the committee, because they could not have the slightest effect upon the inquiry. But that was not so much the point under consideration as the desirability of passing the resolution of the hon. gentleman from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). It is solely on the ground of reasonableness and convenience that I object to the passage of this resolution. It would be impossible for any committee to discharge the great functions assigned to it by the House if we should act upon the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman in the case of the Public Accounts Committee, that all the accounts covering a large period of years and for all the sums expended by the department should be laid before the committee. The committee is not formed for any such purpose ; the committee has not the time nor the powers, the physical powers at any rate, to enter into such an investigation. But if a prima facie case is shown of some wrong doing, or some gross mismanagement, or some negligence which demanded further inquiry, then every person would feel impelled by a sense of public duty to insist upon the accounts bearing upon these points being laid before the committee. But the hon. gentleman appears to be seeking for a grievance, and for that purpose he has brought forward this resolution. I would call attention to a phase of the question which perhaps hon. gentlemen have not considered. The resolution is brought forward no doubt with a desire to ascertain facts beneficial to the public ; and in a secondary sense, every one supposes that the facts are sought for in the view that they might possibly throw some discredit on the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, show mismanagement in that regard, and expenses of an unreasonable character. What would follow ? Hon. gentlemen holding another view, hon. gentlemen having reason to believe that past expenses upon the Intercolonial Railway, while the Conservative party were in power, might also be dis-

cussed, the motion would be amended by adding that all accounts from 1890 be also laid before that committee. I ask hon. gentlemen where would the committee be, where would the House of Commons be, if they acceded to such a demand ? Legislation would practically be blocked, it would be impossible for any gentleman to give the necessary time to make an investigation covering so long a period. If it was shown before this committee that the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway were of such importance that a long and thorough examination of the policy and management of the railway, covering a period of ten or fifteen years, was required, there is a much better way to accomplish that end by means of a special committee of experts, with counsel on both sides, taking the whole summer and autumn to investigate and report. But to shovel upon the Table of the Public Accounts Committee this enormous mass of accounts without any definite object in view, except to fish for some evidence of mismanagement, would be an injustice to the committee, an injustice to the House, and unfair to the administration of that great public work.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). It seems to me that after all that has been said hon. gentlemen opposite fail to understand the duty we owe to those whom we represent. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Flint) speaks of a royal commission as being more suitable than the Committee of Public Accounts to make this investigation. Now, I assume that the public understand this matter in an entirely different light. They are told that we have the Auditor General, a gentleman who is to a large extent removed from the arena and influence of politics, and who is in the first instance responsible to the people for the proper audit of the accounts of the Dominion. After he has audited those accounts, as I understand the matter, the Public Accounts Committee, if they are an instrument of parliament for any purpose, have a subsequent duty to perform regarding these accounts ; they have to make an investigation more thorough and more searching than that of the Auditor General, in order to instruct the people of the exact position of affairs, and to show whether they have been administered honesty and judiciously. I understand the function of a government to be, not to block the inquiry in any way, but, whilst endeavouring to show that they have done what is right, at the same time to afford every facility for a reasonable investigation of those accounts. It has been said, and I think very justly, that no great attempt is made by those supporting the government to investigate these accounts or to facilitate the investigation. In fact any one who attends the Public Accounts Committee must be struck by the anxiety of more than one gentleman supporting the government, not to facilitate the investigation, but in the direction of burking the investigation so far as they possibly can. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat speaks of a fishing inquiry. The hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Wade) seems to repudiate the idea that this is in any sense a fishing investigation. While I do not adopt the phrase 'fishing inquiry,' I do say that it is an investigation for the purpose of finding out the state of the accounts. We are not discharging our duty if we assume that they are correct ; we are not bound, in the discharge of our duty, to assume that the ministers are dishonest, but we are bound to call upon the ministry to furnish sufficient evidence that these accounts are correct and honest, and in investigating that matter we are bound to ask the government for, and the government is bound to furnish us with, every reasonable evidence to satisfy us and the public in that regard. Now the hon. member for Annapolis, who comes forward occasionally and adds his weight to the argument, told us incidentally in connection with a fishing inquiry that we had no bait. I do not know what he means by that, I do not know what kind of bait would be proper with which to angle the hon. gentleman from Annapolis. I do not know what kind of bait is required in order to draw forth the information we want. I understand that when we formulate a request for information in a matter, that ought to be sufficient, and hon. gentlemen representing the administration should be the last to throw an obstacle in our way. But to-night we are met with the contention of hon. members opposite that we have no precedent for anything of this kind. I have not been able to remain in the House during all the time the discussion has been going on, and I do not know to what extent quotations have been made. But I will refer the House to a precedent. In 1886, on the 19th of March, we had a motion by Mr. Davies, and it was ordered, that :

> The items of the expenses for the year 1884 on the Dalhousie Branch of the Intercolonial Railway, contained on page 259, part II of the public accounts of that year, were referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

That is one precedent that seems to be fairly analogous to the one that we are dealing with now. This was a motion concerning the expenditure in the year 1884 ; and in 1897, on the 19th of May, we find that, on motion of Mr. Lister, it was ordered:

> That all accounts for timber, lumber, &c., furnished to the government for use on the Welland canal, from and including the year 1885 together with all advertisements and notices inviting tenders, the tenders received, and all contracts entered into for such timber, &c., together with all letters from officials of the government to the department relating to the same, and copies of all returns to the House respecting the same matter, be referred to the

Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts for examination and investigation.

Now, to-night we have heard a reference made to the examination of Mr. Rochester. I was in the committee at the time that Mr. Rochester was under examination, and although I am almost as modest and bashful as the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), I did feel called upon to intervene at the time and I have a very clear recollection of what took place. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has spoken to-night. When we made the statement in reference to Mr. Rochester that he was a gentleman in the employment of the government, and when we ventured to say that he was a servant of Canada, he (Mr. Tarte) repudiated it and said that he was not a servant of Canada. We said that he was a servant of Canada and that therefore he was obliged to furnish us with a correct and clear statement of all the transactions in which he had been mixed up as far as the government was concerned of which he was a servant. We said that at all events he was a servant of the administration. He was hired and paid a regular salary by the administration. During that time, and the government seemed to have allowed him to do so, he went into a little speculation on his own account. In the course of that speculation he entered transactions in the government accounts and he also entered in the same accounts what he was pleased to term his private affairs. He was not alert on that point. He was asked some questions by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in the committee and he was not evidently prepared to take the position that they were private affairs. But, what do we find ? We find that the ministers of the Crown, men whom he was supposed to serve in their capacity as representing the people of Canada, telling him not to answer. They said : You are not compelled to answer those questions ; those are your private affairs. I submit that when we come to this stage of public life in Canada, when we have ministers of the Crown, whose accounts are under investigation, professing that they have nothing to fear, that they desire a full and fair investigation, suggesting to a witness not to answer, when a man working for them, who, in keeping his accounts mixes his private accounts with his public accounts, who acts upon that suggestion and refuses to answer, we have a disgraceful state of things in the Dominion of Canada. But, we went a good deal further than that. I raised the question before the chairman of the committee and the hon. Minister of Public Works, who intervened and prevented the question from being answered, undertook to defend his course. I should say that I had claimed that if an objection was taken it could only be taken by the witness, and could not be suggested by any member of parliament, or by any member of the committee, and much less could it be suggested by any hon. gentleman whose accounts were under investigation. I submit that the intervention of the Crown was unfair. The hon. Minister of Public Works got up to defend it and among the other arguments he used was this : He said that if a witness is being cross-examined and the judge thinks it is unfair, it is the duty of the judge to interfere. Why, Mr. Speaker, are hon. gentlemen not driven to desperation for an argument in a case of that kind ? I ask the House who are the judges in this matter. The hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, are on trial in this investigation and the committee are their judges and should decide whether a witness should answer the question or not. I submit that if we are to have responsible government in this country at all, if it is true that the members who are sent to parliament are charged with the duty of investigating these accounts, it is also true that the people have a right to know whether or not public accounts are honest. If that is true, then, it must come to this sooner or later that whenever a responsible member of parliament, whether he is on the opposition or the government side, shall ask that further evidence be given in an investigation of the public accounts it must be granted. So, I submit to the administration that unless they are going before the people to admit beyond all question and cavil that they have something to fear and that they do fear the result, unless they are prepared to take that alternative, they have no other course open to them than to grant an investigation into this matter.

Mr. C. S. HYMAN (London). Mr. Speaker. The hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Lennox) seems to object strenuously to the use of the term 'fishing expedition', yet his whole argument, as presented to the House, practically is made upon the principle of a fishing expedition. Whatever effect his argument may have had upon members on this side of the House, I am very glad to know that he has convinced the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Rosamond). The hon. member for Hastings (Mr. Northrup) said that the people ought to know how their money is spent and I quite agree with that principle, and I have only a few words to say in regard to the motion before the House and in regard to a particular point which has not been touched upon. The motion made by the hon. member for South Lanark is :

That the Committee of Public Accounts be empowered to make inquiries into any expenditure on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways from the year 1893 to the present date.

Now, it would seem from the motion, that the Public Accounts Committee have not been able, during their sittings, to make in-

quiries into the public accounts from 1895 to the present day. As every hon. member of this House knows, and knows perfectly well, the Public Accounts Committee in the different years from 1895 to the present time have been seized with the power of making the most searching investigation into all the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway. In the year 1896 they had full and adequate power to make a full inquiry into the working of the Intercolonial Railway in 1895; in 1897 they had full and adequate power to make an inquiry into all the accounts of that railway for the year 1896, so in 1898, so in 1899, so in 1900, so in 1901, and so in 1902. We may fairly take the view that as in the case of sustaining a report made by a committee of this House; that unless some new facts are elicited we should sustain the ruling of the committee. We may fairly say that before we consent to go back through a whole number of years to allow a fishing expedition, there should be some responsibility thrown on the member or members of this House who desire to take such action. It is only fair to ask that there ought to be some specific statement made on the responsibility of a member of parliament in support of such a demand being made on the House. Neither the Minister of Railways nor any member on this side of the House objects to a proper inquiry, however full may it be. We have no objection to a proper inquiry into any specific subject, and that has been stated over and over again by the hon. minister. There is no objection to inquiry being made over all these years into the purchase of engines or into the purchase of anything else, but it is surely a fair ground to take, that unless some hon. member on his responsibility demands an investigation into a specific matter, this House should not sanction the kind of inquiry which the amendment proposes we should sanction.

House divided on the amendment (Hon. Mr. Haggart.)

YEAS :

Messieurs

Avery,	Lancaster,
Barker,	LaRivière,
Bell,	Lefurgey,
Bennett,	Lennox,
Blain,	McGowan,
Boyd,	McIntosh,
Brock,	McLeod,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,
Clare,	Northrup,
Cochrane,	Osler,
Earle,	Richardson,
Ganong,	Roche (Marquette),
Gilmour,	Rosamond,
Gourley,	Sherritt,
Hackett,	Simmons,
Haggart,	Sproule,
Henderson,	Taylor,
Ingram,	Tolton,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Vrooman,
Kemp,	Wilson.—43.
Kidd,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Béland,	Logan,
Belcourt,	Lovell,
Bernier,	Loy,
Blair,	Macdonald,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Mackie,
Bourassa,	MacKinnon,
Bourbonnais,	MacLaren (Huntingdon)
Brown,	McCarthy,
Brunet,	McCool,
Bureau,	McCreary,
Calvert,	McEwen,
Carbonneau,	McGugan,
Costigan,	McIsaac,
Cowan,	McLennan,
Delisle,	Madore,
Demers (Lévis),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Matheson,
Dugas,	Meigs,
Edwards,	Monet,
Erb,	Morrison,
Ethier,	Oliver,
Farquharson,	Paterson,
Fisher,	Power,
Flint,	Préfontaine,
Fraser,	Puttee,
Gauvreau,	Reid (Restigouche)
Geoffrion,	Riley,
Gibson,	Robinson (Elgin),
Girard,	Ross (Ontario),
Gould,	Ross (Rimouski),
Harwood,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Heyd,	Russell,
Holmes,	Schell,
Horsey,	Scott,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Smith (Vancouver),
Hyman,	Stewart,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Sutherland (Essex),
Johnston (Lambton),	Sutherland (Oxford),
Lang,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tarte,
Laurier (L'Assomption)	Thompson,
Lavergne,	Tolmie,
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Legris,	Wade,
Lemieux,	Wright.—91.
Lewis,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Christie,	Roddick,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
McColl,	Ward,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Fielding,	Borden (Halifax),
Archambault,	Leonard,
Bickerdike,	Cargill,
Fitzpatrick,	Pringle,
Power,	Wilmot,
Guthrie,	Hughes (Victoria),
Mulock,	McLean,
Beith,	Clarke,
Carroll,	Casgrain,
Tobin,	Kaulbach,
Campbell,	Calvin,
Bazinet,	Ball,
Champagne,	Carscallen,
Davis,	Clancy,
German,	Smith (Wentworth),
Stephens,	Kendry,
Kendall,	Robinson (Northumberland),

Roche (Halifax),	Hale,
Sifton,	McLaren (Perth),
Galliher,	Seagram,
Malouin,	Alcorn,
Gallery,	Lavelle,
Bruneau,	Birkett,
Douglas,	Halliday,
Copp,	Culbert,
Maxwell,	Porter,

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) has not voted.

Mr. PRINGLE. I am paired with the hon. the Minister of Justice. If I were not paired, I would have voted for the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

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

Harbours and rivers—Yukon Territory, $50,000.

Mr. MONK. Who is the engineer in charge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The engineer now is Mr. Paul Mercier. He was last year with Mr. Taché. He is going up again to finish the work we began last year and the year before.

Dredging, $619,000.

Mr. WILSON. We should have some explanation of this very large item. The word 'plant' is mentioned in the estimates several times. It would seem as if we needed to build a great many dredges to require all this plant.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The word 'plant' means a new dredge; not plant to build a dredge.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the minister entertain the same views as he did a while ago ? Suppose we allow some of these items to pass without discussion, will the minister hold next session that we have no right to inquire into the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never held these views.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman a short time ago, because we allowed an item to pass without discussion, said that we had no right to re-open the discussion upon it. If the hon. gentleman holds that view now, we want to know it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never heard that view.

Mr. MONK. Have we now a sufficient supply of dredging plant to do our own dredging, or are these items for dredging to be done by contract ? I believe myself that we ought to be able to provide ourselves with sufficient dredges; but if we do that we should not need to have any dredging done by other people.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry to say that for this year I shall be obliged to hire some dredges. My hon. friend would be surprised at the list of demands made upon my department for dredging. The water is falling in all parts of the lakes and rivers, and trade is expanding. It is the part of my department in which I receive the greatest number of demands. I hope that by next year we shall be sufficiently equipped to do our own work. The two or three new dredges which we are building now I hope will enable us to do the work ourselves, and at a cheaper rate than we have done it at in the past.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to know if this vote contemplates dredging around the piers at Cape Tormentine for the convenience of the winter boats ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the order was given three or four days ago for a dredge to go and do the work at Cape Tormentine, which is a very necessary work indeed.

Mr. MONK. I notice that for Quebec and Ontario the same amount is asked for this year for dredging by contract that was asked for last year, and yet we are spending a great deal of money for the purpose of providing ourselves with dredging plant.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $75,000 is not for contract work. It is to pay the wages and the working expenses of our own dredges. It will also include some outside dredges.

Mr. McCREARY. Before the item for dredging in Manitoba passes, I would like to say that I observe with pleasure that the minister has added $4,000 to the vote. I presume that is to improve the dredge 'Sir Hector' at the mouth of the Red river. That dredge was constructed I think about 1882. It is in a very bad state at the present time. The coal barge is out of repair, and things are in rather a deplorable condition. It may be news to some of the members present that we have in the province of Manitoba some very large lakes, like Lake Winnipeg, which is in extent in Canada next to Lake Superior, also Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis. Then, there are the rivers running into those lakes. Recently there has been established on the shore of Lake Manitoba very important gypsum works, and there are other industries on Lake Winnipeg, and we feel seriously the need of more dredging to be done on those lakes and rivers to enable steamers to get about. I would like the minister, in the supplementary estimates, to include enough to put the dredge 'Sir Hector' into proper shape and to provide a new coal barge. A very strong petition was sent in from the Board of Trade of Winnipeg asking that a snag boat be put on the Red river in order to clear the river of trees and stumps and boulders from Lake Winnipeg to the boundary line. There are im-

portant stone quarries on the shores of Lake Winnipeg, which could be made available for both Manitoba and Dakota if the river were navigable to vessels drawing five or ten feet of water ; but these vessels cannot get up the river unless it is cleared of these obstacles. Some dredging should also be done on Lake Manitoba, part of which is in my county, and in which there are no harbours. The Northern Pacific built a branch line to Delta on Lake Manitoba, and built a wharf there 1,800 feet long ; but vessels are unprotected on account of there being no harbour. I think the minister would do well to put a little more into his estimates this year and more next year for the purpose of dredging these lakes and rivers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fully recognize the importance of the representation which the hon. gentleman has made to me both this year and last year. I hope my colleagues will allow me an amount in the estimates for building a snag boat, and I trust that next season that will be in working order.

Mr. WADE. I would like to ask the minister if the fact has been brought to his attention that during the recent extraordinary floods on La Haye river an enormous amount of silt has been brought down and forms an obstruction to navigation over a considerable area, and particularly at the anchorage where vessels go to load lumber, and if it is his intention to do anything to remove it. I understand that some dredging of the river is in contemplation as soon as the dredge which is now being built is completed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have given instructions that some means be taken to remove the accumulation to which my hon. friend has referred, and I hope they will be successful. With the powerful new dredge which we are building at Sorel for the maritime provinces, and which I hope will be ready for the next season, I expect to give a satisfaction that we could not possibly give hitherto. That dredge, if I may say so, will be, I hope the most complete and most perfect in the world, as we have taken advantage of all the progress that has been made in the building of dredges. This dredge is being built on Canadian soil by Canadian hands and with Canadian material; we imported only one man from England, and I hope it will prove that we can build dredges and ships in Canada just as well as they can be built on the other side of the line or on the other side of the ocean.

Mr. MONK. We only want to confine our remarks to the general principles of the administration of the department. I would suggest that my hon. friend have his office open at stated hours, when we could interview him and complain of the wants of different localities. We want to get through the estimates as quickly as possible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not adverse to being criticised, because I fully recognize that complaints lead to very good results sometimes.

Mr. MONK. I would like to have some dredging done in my county. I presume the minister will be able to receive my complaint in regard to that matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I received a few days ago a petition from Judge Davidson for dredging in my hon. friend's county. My hon. friend asked for part of it last year, and this year, at the request of Judge Davidson, I will do the rest.

Mr. MONK. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. BOYD. Before the item passes, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. minister to the promise he made last year that he would have some dredging done on the west shore of Lake Manitoba. The hon. minister also promised that a wharf would be built. I understood that he had an engineer examining that work, but that is all that has been done. I would like to ask him what he proposes to do. A great deal of fishing is done on the lake, and there are settlers, such as the Icelanders and some half-breeds, located at various points, to whom it would be a great accommodation if other means were provided them of getting their supplies across than the one vessel that is now on the lake. Heretofore they have had to put up a staging in the shape of wharfs for themselves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately we have no dredge available. I have tried to buy the dredge of Mr. Lemoine, used for the cut we made to regulate the water, but have not been able to do so on account of some difficulty in getting a deed. But I think I will be shortly able to get that dredge. My hon. friend last year called my intention to the importance of this dredging, and I said I would do it, and I now give a reason why I have been unable to do it. If in a week or two we have a dredge I will have the work done.

Dredging—British Columbia, $30,000.

Mr. EARLE. Is any portion of this to be applied to the dredging of Victoria harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are using the new suction dredge that used to work on the Fraser river, now in Victoria harbour.

Mr. EARLE. The hon. minister only applies this to the filling of the flats and not to the general dredging of the harbour. Just previous to the last election, he pledged himself to do work for the filling of the flats, but the harbour has been silting up for years, and representations have been made

to the department over and over again to have dredging done in the harbour. As the tonnage of the harbour is very large, it would be only right that some portion of this vote should be applied to the general dredging of Victoria harbour.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I wish to correct my hon. friend. It was after the elections that I pledged myself.

Mr. EARLE. My memory is very good, and I know that just before the elections the cry was : Elect Riley and get the dredge. If you elect Riley, you willl have the dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You will have both the dredge and Riley.

Mr. EARLE. No doubt we will have the dredge, but I want to call attention to the fact that the general dredging of the harbour requires to be done besides special work.

St. Maurice district—Improvements to boom works to facilitate the floating and storage of logs, &c., $50,000 ; slides and booms generally, $5,000.

Mr. MORIN. As I understand it, the government builds the booms and repairs them, does the government charge the lumbermen for the floating of logs through the slides and for holding the logs in the booms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and we made out of these St. Maurice booms and slides $21,000 last year. It is one of the rare works that bring us financial results. We are earning more money than we are expending.

Mr. MORIN. Does the hon. minister charge so much per 1,000 feet or so much per piece ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So much per log on saw-logs and so much per cord on pulp wood.

Mr. WILSON. How much money is invested in these booms and slides at this particular place where you have such large profits ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Those booms were in existence, some of them, before confederation. We have expended about one quarter of a million dollars on them but the trade is increasing very rapidly. It is a part of the country where the trade is expanding every year. Large manufacturing establishments are being erected there.

Mr. WILSON. Speaking in a general way, have these booms and slides been paying concerns ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On the St. Maurice they did not pay up to the last ten years, but during the past eight or ten years they have been paying. On the Gatineau they are also paying.

Mr. WILSON. Before that did they pay running expenses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. BROCK. When you say that you earn more than you expend, did you spend $50,000 and earn $71,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Our earnings are more considerable than our working expenses. This is capital expenditure.

Mr. BROCK. And you are merely earning over your working expenses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. BROCK. But nothing on the investment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MORIN. Why not let the lumbermen build their own booms and slides ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works were built before confederation and have been going on since. In some parts of the St. Maurice there is good navigation just as on the Gatineau. Navigation has to be protected against the lumber, and we are simply going on with what we found when we came to office.

Mr. MORIN. Slides and booms do not impede navigation.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Take the Ottawa river and the Gatineau. If the logs were allowed to go free, these rivers would be filled and steamers could not run at all. You have to build booms and slides to keep the logs in a certain direction and leave a space for boats.

Mr. MORIN. That is all right, but the government could very easily compel the lumbermen to build the booms, and slides. I am not in the habit of having anything to do with the slides and booms. And I do not see exactly where the navigation comes in on the Gatineau river. You go about two miles to one rapid and fifty yards to another, and a little further on you come to another power. I do not see any navigation about it, unless you use bark canoes.

Mr. BOURASSA. There is a feature about this question of slides and booms which should not be forgotten, and that is the interest of the settlers in the valleys of the rivers where these slides and booms are maintained by the government. I think the policy of the government should not only be continued but extended, because, when the slides and booms are left in the hands of private companies, they are apt to manage them in such a way that small operators cannot come in and buy timber from the settlers. My own constituents have had experience of that kind. The re-

sult is that there is a great desire that the government should establish slides and booms on all the rivers, not only on account of the navigation—that is only one side of it—but on account of the fact that the booms and slides, which left in private hands, are used for the promotion of private interests. Of course, they cannot refuse passage to other people, but in the practical management they give all the advantage to their own company. This may be natural enough, but it has the effect of depriving others practically of the use of these rivers for timber purposes. In the case of government booms, there is a government officer in charge and he seeks to do justice to all. Thus, not only do all the lumber companies get justice, but the settlers have the advantage of competition in the buying of their timber, their pulp wood especially. That is why I say that, instead of merely maintaining this policy, I hope the government will extend it. Moreover, this is not a case of additional cost to the government, for, on such rivers as the Gatineau and the St. Maurice, the fees pay the expenses, and I hope that the same will be found true on the Rouge and the du Lièvre also.

Public Works—chargeable to income—roads and bridges—Ottawa—Maria Street bridge over the Rideau canal, reconstruction, $5,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister please explain this item ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That money is asked to complete the approaches to the magnificent bridge erected at Maria street to help toward making Ottawa the Washington of the North.

Mr. INGRAM. What does the hon. minister mean by 'approaches' ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The grading of the approaches at both ends.

Mr. INGRAM. The street ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And the earth works.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood that the money we voted last year was to be the last to be expended. Did the Canada Atlantic Railway pay their share ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. What will be the total cost of the Maria street bridge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS ? It will cost in the neighbourhood of $110,000, including the share of the Canada Atlantic Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. What proportion did the Canada Atlantic Railway pay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Their share was $17,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not know whether, upon this item, we are free to discuss this matter of making Ottawa the Washington of the North. But I know that the public money has been used to beautify certain streets. I am not aware who has the say as to which streets shall be improved, but if report is true, the men who are acting as commissioners and directing the expenditure of this money have large interests on certain streets that are improved under their direction. If that is true, if the members of this commission have property on certain streets and have the power to direct this expenditure of public money to improve those streets, I think affairs are conducted in the wrong way. There should be some person above these men, or in some other way they should be deprived of the power to say where this money should be expended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The matter to which the hon. gentleman refers does not touch these estimates. The grant to the Ottawa Improvement Commission is fixed by statute, and I have given notice of a Bill touching that subject, which will bring up the whole subject. What the hon. gentleman speaks of is a fair matter for discussion, but it does not touch these estimates in any way.

Mr. SPROULE. Then, what compels us to spend this large amount of money that has been voted for this bridge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1885 there was an arrangement made between the city of Ottawa and the Department of Public Works by which the government undertook certain works, including the Maria street bridge. I am merely carrying out the policy that was agreed upon years ago.

Mr. SPROULE. Will this finish the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is completed now.

Mr. INGRAM. How did the hon. minister arrive at the proportion to be paid by the Canada Atlantic Railway ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We asked for tenders, and then we made a division of the cost, based upon the additional length of the bridge rendered necessary by the fact that the Canada Atlantic Railway tracks had been put under it. We tried to make the fairest possible division.

Mr. MORIN. Two or three years ago, I asked the Minister of Public Works for $200 toward the building of a bridge in my county. The minister replied that we did not give a cent toward bridges. But here I find $5,000 for a bridge in Ottawa, $16,000 for the Portage du Fort bridge, and so on.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend will, perhaps, remember that this Portage du Fort bridge was an interprovincial bridge built long ago by the

Federal government. I am only rebuilding a work that was constructed by my predecessors. My hon. friend will admit, and hon. members generally will agree, that the federal government's duty is not to build small bridges all over the land. That is not our duty, that is not our right; it belongs to the municipal councils and the provincial governments.

Telegraph lines, land and cable lines, Gulf of St. Lawrence. To repair and improve roadways and increase operating facilities generally to the eastward of Godbout, $1,000.

Mr. GANONG. I would like to ask the minister if he has still in mind the necessity for a telegraph line in the county of Charlotte, to which I have frequently called his attention. I think the minister will admit that I have been fairly persistent in bringing to his attention the question of public works in the county of Charlotte. I see there is no item in the main estimates covering that amount, and I would like to know if the hon. gentleman will have an item in the supplementaries to cover telegraphic communication between Deer Island, Campbobello and the city of Eastport?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say what the supplementary estimates will contain, I might, after they have been discussed in council.

Mr. GANONG. The minister will admit that I have frequently brought this matter, as well as others, to his attention. It is a very important work. I have occasionally had to make some little criticisms, not on the expenditure of money in my county, but on the manner in which it has been expended. I trust those criticisms will not influence the minister to any extent against doing justice to my county in the way of public works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend may rest assured that any adverse criticisms that he may have made will make no change in my treatment of his county. I recognize fully the right of the opposition to criticise the appropriations of my department.

Mr. GANONG. I am glad to hear that statement from the minister, it will be a great relief to the minds of some people in my county who have heard contrary statements.

Mr. MORIN. Could the minister tell me how far the telegraph is extended below Quebec, and to what place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Our telegraph system has now reached Belle Isle.

Mr. MORIN. Do you know the distance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think between Quebec and Belle Isle the distance is about 800 miles.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia, $5,000.

Mr. EARLE. A short line of telegraph is asked for from the terminus of the Skeena river line down a few miles to a place called Aberdeen. Is there any provision made for the construction of that this year ? It is a short distance from the canneries, and my information is that if they had a few miles of telegraph there it would be a great convenience.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have made arrangements to build that small piece of line, which will cost in the neighbourhood of $1,500 or $2,000.

Surveys and inspections, $25,000.

Mr. HACKETT. These surveys are supposed to be general all over Canada, and this amount is to cover them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the minister if he has received a petition from the people of Percival River, in West Prince, asking for a survey preliminary to building a pier at that place ; and also if he has received a petition from the people of Victoria West, in West Prince, for the same purpose. They simply ask for surveys, they are not asking for an appropriation of money at present. They desire to have the site surveyed and to have the approval of the department before commencing any work there. Those petitions came, one from the people of Percival River, lots 9 and 10, and the other from Victoria West, lot 13 ; will the minister have those surveys made, and have reports from his engineers in connection with the propriety of building those works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember having received a petition from the Percival River people ; doubtless one has been sent if the hon. gentleman says so, but I cannot carry in my mind all the details. As to Victoria West, I remember having received a petition. There will be no objection whatever to make these two surveys. My chief engineer is within the sound of my voice now, and I will instruct him to make the surveys.

National Art Gallery, Ottawa, including the purchase of paintings on the advice of a committee of artists, $4,000.

Mr. EARLE. I have not visited the art gallery this year, but I have been told by some who have seen it that it is in a most filthy and miserable condition, and is hardly worthy of the name of an art gallery.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I fully recognize that it should be in a better condition. Up to last year I only had $2,000 for that so-called national gallery. Hon. gentlemen on both sides will admit that we should have a decent place for that purpose. Last year we improved it a little,

and I hope it will be improved still more with the limited means at my disposal.

Telegraph line between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, $2,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Just one word. I am not criticising this item at all, but I want to impress upon the hon. Minister of Public Works that promise that he made the other evening when this matter was so ably discussed by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) and the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Lefurgey), that he will see that some relief is afforded the people of Prince Edward Island in connection with this telegraph business. I would simply remind him of his promise and express the hope that relief will be afforded.

Telegraph line, Ashcroft to Dawson, $87,500.

Mr. MONK. I want to ask the hon. minister in reference to these telegraph lines, whether they are to remain under the control of the Department of Public Works, or, as it is in England, pass to the control of the Post Office department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far these works have been under the control of the Department of Public Works for the excellent reason that the Department of Public Works has built them and for the excellent reason that this country is not situated as England is. We have telegraph lines in this country for the purposes of trade and navigation especially. These are my humble views. It may be that they are not shared by everybody.

Mr. MONK. Are they the views of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far the question has not been discussed, except in the newspapers.

Mr. BENNETT. I may remind the hon. gentleman that the Toronto 'Globe' took the stand that these telegraph lines ought to be handed over to the Postmaster General. However, we will understand that for the coming year the hon. Minister of Public Works is in control of the lines and will hold on in his department.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see why, having built these lines in a successful manner, we should not keep them in charge. While I should attach weight to the opinion of an important paper like the 'Globe,' as an old newspaper man I think I am as well informed as the 'Globe' is on this question.

Mr. INGRAM. You have possession now, anyway.

Mr. EARLE. In regard to the Dawson line, I would like to ask the hon. minister whether there would be any possible reduction in the rates for telegraphing ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to be able to say that we will reduce the rates, but I cannot hold out any hope just now. The line is an expensive one. I think it will be less expensive next year than it was last year, because, as my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) knows, the first year of the working of a line like that is a most expensive one. It is a very difficult country indeed. When I tell the committee that during last winter we had at times as much as 27 feet of snow on the lines, it will be seen that it is no small matter to be able to keep such lines open. I cannot extend any hope just now. Perhaps I am not feee to say everything that I would be free to say later on. I intend trying to convince my friends to extend the line in certain directions which will make it pay better and give better accommodation. I am negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway with the view of extending the line without too much cost. I do not know whether there will be any result or not.

Mr. MONK. What has been the total revenue of the telegraph lines in the direction of the Yukon during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In one minute I can give the information to my hon. friend.

Mr. EARLE. Can you give the length of line that is constructed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have in the Yukon 2,100 odd miles, I think.

Mr. EARLE. From the coast ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, from Ashcroft, and including the Port Simpson line—2,100 miles in round numbers.

Mr. EARLE. Can you give the cost and the number of messages handled ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the information under my hand, but I am going to ask for a supplementary vote and all the information will be brought down.

Mr. MONK. Then I will not insist if all the information will be brought down.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down all the information when I ask for more money.

Mr. MONK. Then, I will supplement my question. I would like to have the total revenue from the North-west lines, including the Yukon, and the total capital expended on those lines to date. Would the hon. minister make a note of it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports, and travelling expenses of other officers on inspection and preventive service.

Customs Laboratory—To meet expenditure in connection with the testing of sugar, molasses, &c., including pay of officers appointed or employed for that purpose.

Board of Customs—To meet expenditure in connection therewith, including $800 salary of Commissioner of Customs as chairman of the board.

Salaries of officers appointed or employed for compiling statistical returns of imports and exports, $121,500.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson.) I explained the other night briefly when the committee rose that the $5,000 extra that is asked for is made up in this way: One of these officers who was formerly paid out of the inside vote was transferred to the outside vote, and an additional special officer has been appointed at $1,000 salary whose expenses are $700. That, with a few increases which are required, makes up the extra amount.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman promised to give some information about the port of St. Thomas. I would like to have it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I asked for the information; in fact, I knew about it. I suppose it is information in a general way which the hon. gentleman requires; otherwise, he would have to tell us more particularly what he wants. He asked for information in reference to the collector at the port of St. Thomas. Unfortunately there were, upon inspection, irregularities found in the conduct of that office of such a nature that while no loss has accrued to the department, everything having been paid up, yet the service of the officer were dispensed with and another officer has been placed in charge.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the bondsmen made good the shortage?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes. Shortly after I took office I found that private bonds were given, and when any loss occurred very great pressure was brought to bear from the bondsmen who in some cases represented that it would be ruinous to proceed against them. I thought the better plan was to adopt the system followed by mercantile institutions, and so arrangements were made with the four Canadian guarantee companies to guarantee our officers. Now, when we appoint a new officer, the guarantee company that takes the risks for that province is notified, and from that moment they become security. In the particular case referred to there was no loss to the country.

Mr. INGRAM. Was he guaranteed by a guarantee company?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. What rate is paid to the guarantee companies?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. We get a special rate, but I cannot remember it just at the moment. The percentage, whatever it be, is deducted from the salary of the officer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does not the minister think that it would be better for the government to guarantee their own officers? My idea is that the losses are very small indeed, and if the government carried the risk they could afford to do so at a reduction of about one-half the rate which the officers now pay to the guarantee companies. I think that suggestion is worth being considered by the minister.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I have an idea that such a system is adopted by the Post Office Department, in part. We have found our present system satisfactory and the officers do not complain. I think myself that the officer would prefer to go to a guarantee company rather than to ask a friend to go guarantee for him. I am very happy to say that considering the number of officers we have, the loss is comparatively small; but the fact that the guarantee company is interested makes an officer more cautious if he were disposed to be lax in his methods.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Postmaster General has in part adopted the plan which I suggest, and I know that under that system the postmasters are not called on to pay as much as they formerly did. Even in that case, I believe the Postmaster General collects more than necessary to meet the losses because the defalcations are so few.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I think the rate of the guarantee company is 40 cents on the hundred dollars.

Mr. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) I think it would be injudicious for the government to guarantee their own officers, because in case of defalcations great pressure would undoubtedly be brought to bear on the government to deal leniently with the offenders. When the officer knows that he has to deal with a company which conducts its business on business principles, it has a very deterrent effect.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not approve of personal bonds, but I fail to see why all this money should be handed over to the guarantee company to enable that company to make a fortune. To my mind the government could conduct this business itself, and charge a far less percentage to their officers.

Miscellaneous, $35,000.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. That increase of $5,000 is absolutely necessary for printing and stationary. In connection with the new statistical branch there is a great deal of cost for printing, but I trust the country appreciates the benefit that is de-

rived from it. I consider it to be a great benefit to the country to have the statistical information promptly furnished as it is now.

Expenses of maintenance of revenue cruisers and preventive service, $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. In connection with this vote, although it may not be quite relevant, I wish to ask what is to be the policy of the government this summer in reference to admitting American tugs to coast in Canadian waters ? On the 27th of February, I asked the minister : What tugs of American register were permitted to ply in Canadian waters in the coasting trade last year; and he replied : None were so permitted. I accepted the answer of the minister at the time, although I knew it was incorrect. The minister had evidently been misinformed. Surely those tugs must have been permitted with the consent of the minister. I can tell the minister the names of the tugs and the concerns who own them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. How many of them ?

Mr. BENNETT. I had three reported to me, at all events. Of my own personal knowledge I know of one, because I saw the boat repeatedly. These tugs are of American register but are owned by powerful friends of the government, and they are permitted to come in and coast in contravention of the law, while at the same time a Canadian tug cannot cross the border line and do business on the American side. If the government are going to sit in council and immediately after the close of the session, or when parliament is in session, are going to say to their party friends, 'You can bring your American registered tugs into Canada and engage in coasting,' let it be known, so that all can be placed on the same footing. But do not make invidious distinctions by simply selecting the friends of the government. You hit your own party friends on the Georgian Bay last year in this respect, because there are Liberals up there who are owners of tugs. The result was that there were days when Canadian tugs were tied up at the docks while American tugs were plying on the waters of the Georgian Bay. I say, with all deference, that the minister was incorrect in the answer he gave, because I know he was. I ask the minister if it is going to be the policy of the department to allow these American tugs to come in there and do business. I say that it is unfair to men who have spent the best parts of their lives in working up from subordinate positions until they obtained certificates as masters or mates or engineers, that they should be obliged to walk around the streets with their hands in their pockets for the want of work, simply because American tugs are allowed to come in and take the bread out of their mouths. I ask the minister if it is his policy to allow this to go on again this year.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I say it was not our policy last year to allow it, and our policy has not changed. It is contrary to the coasting law for American vessels to come in and trade between Canadian ports, and the answer I gave to the hon. gentleman, which he thinks is incorrect, is the only answer which I can give him. I do not think a permit could be given without the knowledge of my department, and I asked my commissioner particularly and got the answer from him. I do not think there is any deputy in the government better informed or more reliable, and that is the answer I must adhere to. I answered the question frankly. I said a permit had been given to a scow which had a sand pump to come in ; but our policy is not to allow American vessels to violate the coasting law. It was not our policy last year, and will not be this year. If there has been anything done in that respect, it has been done without any permission from the department, and if the hon. gentleman will give me any information as to the violation of the law that has come under our notice, I shall be very much obliged indeed. We have just issued a new circular. It was reported that certain Canadian vessels would take a tow of logs from a Canadian port and tow them out to American waters, and there drop the tow and allow it to be taken up by an American vessel, which would tow it part of the way and then another Canadian vessel would bring it in. We had an exhaustive inquiry made into the matter, and it may be that it is something of this kind to which the hon. gentleman has reference. Last year there were no permits issued. The year before that I think there was one granted in an exceptional case—a case in which a saw-mill was being removed from Michigan to Sarnia. The circular which we have issued states that if a foreign vessel comes in to take a tow of logs, there must be an export entry with the clearance, and the vessel must, of course, clear for an American port. She would not be allowed to receive a clearance for a Canadian port. So that if there was an evasion of the law last year, we have taken steps which we think will prevent anything of that kind this year. As I said before, if the hon. gentleman will give me any information of any evasion that has taken place that we have not detected, I shall be only too glad to receive it.

Mr. BENNETT. I can assure the minister that there can be no doubt that there was an American tug last year plying on the Georgian Bay between Canadian ports. I can give him privately the name of the tug and the name of the owner. I had the information from a captain who, on clearing a Canadian tug had handed to him by mistake the clearance which the customs officer intended for the American tug. It stated that under instructions from the Department

of Customs the tug was permitted to clear from that port, and that tug was a tug of American register, and every one knows it.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Was she clearing to another Canadian port ?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, from a Canadian port on the Georgian Bay to another Canadian port on the Georgian Bay. I have seen the tug myself repeatedly. It is a matter of common notoriety, and I was told that there were others up the lakes, although I have no personal knowledge of them. However, as the minister has stated that there will be no such permits issued this year, that will be an assurance to the tug owners of the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I do not wish the hon. gentleman to misunderstand me. He asked me what the policy of the government was. I would not wish the Governor in Council not to have power in an odd case to grant a permit where Canadian interests would not be damaged, such as in the case of the erection of a sugar refinery in the county of Bothwell, where it was necessary, if the work was to go on, to have a scow with a sand pump. We would make inquiries whether there was any such vessel to be had in Canada. If we found that there was, we would not give the permit ; but in the case where Canadian interests can be served and no appreciable harm can be done to any Canadian interest, we are warranted in granting a permit, and I would not wish my hon. friend to take my pledge in any other sense. I do not know that there will be any permit granted this year, but if under exceptional circumstances one is granted, I do not wish to be charged with having misunderstood my hon. friend. But the policy of the government is that the work between Canadian ports shall be done by a Canadian marine. We want to build up a Canadian marine. The hon. gentleman stated fairly that under the coasting laws of the United States our vessels are not permitted to do anything of that kind between their ports, and we propose to maintain the same policy in Canada. It is our duty to do so ; it is the law of the land.

Mr. McGOWAN. I would like the minister to explain the importations of linseed oil into this country. We imported from Great Britain 735,900 gallons, of which the total value was $427,270, or the average price per gallon was 58 cents. From France we imported 536 gallons, total value $307, average price per gallon 57½ cents. From the United States we imported 21,562 gallons, total value $8,925, average, 41¼ cents. But when I take the market quotations of raw linseed oil on the Chicago market, from July 1st, 1900, to June 30th, 1901, I find that the price per gallon, by the car load, was 76 cents in July, 75 cents in August, and the lowest was 67 cents. And the average price for the twelve months per imperial gallon was 73·35 cents, and per wine gallon, 61·13 cents. These figures are taken from the Chicago 'Paint, Oil and Drug Review,' and are therefore authoritative. It seems extraordinary that American oil should have passed through the customs in this country at 41¼ cents per gallon, and paid the duty on that valuation, when the average price in Chicago was 73·35 cents per imperial gallon and 61·33 cents per wine gallon.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Will my hon. friend let me have the figures, and I will make inquiries.

Mr. McGOWAN. Certainly. Taking the customs valuation, let us see how much advantage Great Britain got under the preferential tariff. I find that in 100 gallons from the United States, the average cost of which was 41·25 cents per gallon, or $41.25 per 100 gallons, the duty paid was $10.32. On the same quantity from Great Britain the duty paid was $9.67, thus leaving only 65 cents on 100 gallons in favour of Great Britain. It seems to me that there is something extraordinary about these figures.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If my hon. friend will call around to the office, I would like to discuss this matter with him. If any oil is undervalued, it is our duty to see that such undervaluation be put a stop to.

Mr. McGOWAN. And the hon. minister must remember that the American oil is of a higher class than the English oil, and ought to be worth more. There is certainly no reason why the customs value of American oil should be only 41¼ cents when the average price in the Chicago market on carload lots is 73⅓ cents.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I understood that the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) wanted to make some remarks about coal oil when these items were up.

Mr. BOYD. When the Minister of Inland Revenue's estimates were under discussion, the inspection of coal oil at Port Arthur was brought to his attention, and he said that it was not his officers who were responsible for the oil that had passed in at that port, but the officers of the Customs Department. What I wanted to know was, how it came that this inferior oil was allowed to pass, and to pass in such a large quantity, and what precautions have been taken to provide against a recurrence of this thing ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I was not in the House when the discussion to which my hon. friend refers took place, but the matter was brought to my attention afterwards. It appears that a cargo of coal oil was brought to the North-west which caused a good deal of inconvenience. We

ascertained that it reached Fort William in a tank vessel and we immediately corresponded with our officer there, because it is the duty of the customs officers to apply the test as fixed by the Governor in Council. Our officers have been supplied with the instruments, and it is their duty to apply the test to imported oil. This was American oil, and I have a report from my officer at Fort William to the effect that the oil passed above the flash and the gravity test. I had a conversation with those interested in the oil business, and they are quite concerned over the matter, and are at a loss to explain further than to say that in all manufactured articles it is possible there may be a miss once in a while. I am told that they have made every effort to prevent such a thing occurring again. My officer is not to blame, because the oil passed the test, and exceeded what is required, both in gravity and plank.

Mr. BOYD. That is all we can hold the Minister of Customs responsible for, except on the general policy of the government, and that we discussed when the items of the Minister of Inland Revenue were being put through. If what the hon. minister states about his officer is correct, it will be absolutely necessary for either the Inland Revenue Department or the Customs to see that instruments are obtained which will give a more perfect test. The information I have is that the same class of oil was sent broadcast throughout Dakota and Minnesota, in the adjoining territory. But, as I say, I do not wish, at this hour, and after the explanation given by the minister, to go further into the discussion at the present time.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I will add that a special circular has been sent since this took place to all the customs ports at which oil is received, directing the officers to be exceedingly particular in the test. I do not seek to weaken the statement already made that the officer did make the test, but this is to remind them that it is a matter which we wish them to be very particular about.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The instruments may be very correct, but the officers may require particular training to use them efficiently. There are a good many officers who though you place the instrument in their hands do not know how to use them.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am surprised that the minister has informed us that this shipment of oil passed the test. To my mind, the officers are simply wasting their time in making tests of oil if such oil as this could pass. Since this subject was discussed before, I have learned on good authority that that particular shipment to this country was entirely a mistake, that they had no expectation that such oil was coming in and that such oil was never sent before. But if such oil passed the test, what is the use of making tests at all ?

Mr. McCREARY. Might there not have been some adulteration of the oil between the time it passed at Port Arthur and the time it reached the consumer ? Hon. members may think we make too much of this question of coal oil, but I would remind them that it was a vitally important question with us up in the west. We have to use coal oil in many of the small towns and in practically all the farm houses, for we have not the electricity to the same extent that we have in the older provinces. In the recent election in Lisgar, during three or four weeks, at almost every meeting one of the most important questions discussed was that of the quality of the coal oil. Unfortunately, I was not in a position to give the information that most of the farmers desired. I would suggest to the hon. minister that he should supplement the test at Port Arthur. It seems to me strange that this one shipment of oil should be the only shipment that was wrong. This oil seems to have got into every village, every hamlet and every house on the prairie. I submit to the minister that he should see to it that further examination is made. I understand that there is on the statute-book a law with regard to the adulteration of food under which a public officer can take samples of food offered for sale to see if they are all right. I know that under municipal law we have a system of that kind. The officer can take a loaf of bread out of the bakers' cart or a quart of milk from the milkman and submit them to a test to see that they are what the law calls for. I do not see why the same rule should not be carried out with regard to coal oil. The minister whose duty it is to look after such things should have a law passed, if there is not one already, under which his officers could go to any wholesale or retail dealer, take a sample and test it to see whether the oil that is supplied by him has been adulterated, and impose a penalty if it is found that the dealer has been imposing upon the public.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. I conferred with the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, who understands the technical part of this matter better than we do in our department. I understand that instructions have been sent to their analyst in Winnipeg to have samples advanced. The deputy minister has been looking for that report every day. I was not able to see him to-day and do not know whether the report has been received or not. No doubt, there will be something in the supplementary estimates, either under Inland Revenue or Customs, on which this question can be further discussed, and we shall then probably, be in a position to give more information. I do not pretend to any technical

knowledge of the subject, but, in conversation with a man in the oil business, I was informed that it is possible that the weather might have affected the oil to a certain extent.

Mr. McCREARY. Wind.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. No, the temperature. Whether it is that in cold weather the oil congeals more and the heavy oil sinks to the bottom of the tank and when it is drawn off it is thicker and will not rise on the wick—whether that is the case, or whatever effect the weather may have I do not pretend to understand. I would leave that to my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Simmons) and some other gentlemen who are better informed than I am. However, the Inland Revenue Department are giving their consideration to the matter and tests are being made in the direction my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) speaks of. I trust we shall be able to give further information before the House rises.

Civil government—contingencies—Department of Finance and Treasury Board, $7,590.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That item was dealt with in an earlier discussion on civil government. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) asked me to let it stand, as he desired to discuss some overrulings of the Treasury Board. But, in conversation with him since he told me that he did not wish the item to be longer held.

Superannuation—extra allowance to Mr. Wallace, ex-postmaster at Victoria, B.C., $240.
Authorized by statute, probable amount required, $328,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the usual vote for superannuation. The only vote we are asked to make is $240, which is the old item for the ex-postmaster of Victoria. The remainder of the item is fixed by statute. As the House knows, it is a matter which we cannot control.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, the House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 23, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ORTHODOX RUSSO-GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta) moved :

That that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time to present petitions for private Bills, be suspended in reference to the Bill to incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church ; in accordance with the recommendation contained in the fourteenth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, and that leave be granted to introduce the said Bill.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Has the report of the committee been adopted yet ? Is not two days' notice required before the report of the committee can be adopted ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Under rule 31 when a report has been made by a committee, a Bill may be presented on that report without any motion for the adoption of the report itself. Consequently the motion is in order.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. But the rules of the House cannot be suspended except by unanimous consent. I do not wish to offer any opposition to this Bill now, but I would ask my hon. friend to postpone his motion for a day or so.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no objection to postpone the motion for a sitting or two. If the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) has the privilege of refusing to allow the introduction of this Bill now, and if he chooses to exercise that privilege, of course I cannot help it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It was understood that I should be invited to this meeting of the Standing Orders Committee, but I was not notified and I knew nothing whatever about it. If it was considered not worth while notifying me, I think it is only fair that I should exercise my prerogative now. I will not oppose the Bill going to the committee later on, but I hope the hon. gentleman will not press his motion to-day.

Mr. OLIVER. At what date may I have the privilege of making this motion ? I would like to have an understanding on that.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The day after to-morrow.

Motion (Mr. Oliver) withdrawn.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 128) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 109) to incorporate the Molsons Bank Pension Fund.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan, by Mr. Parmelee.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 132) to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 133) to amend the Rocky Mountains Park Act, 1887. He said : The Bill is for the purpose of enlarging the boundaries of the park. The present park is 260 square miles, or 166,400 acres. That is, as the House will see, considerably less than 20 miles square. The suggested park including the present one, will be 4,900 square miles, or 3,136,000 acres. But alongside of that on the British Columbia line we have by Order in Council set apart a portion of the railway belt of British Columbia, extending down to Field, under the name of the Yoho park, which is 832 square miles, or 532,480 acres. The suggested park and the Yoho park combined will amount to 3,668,480 acres. I may say that the number of visitors to the park is increasing very rapidly, and it is found that it is likely to become a place of very considerable resort, especially for American tourists. We have a thriving herd of buffalo there and a number of other animals, such as moose, elk, a couple of varieties of goats, and we are trying to get together a collection of animals that will be attractive. We find that these animals are exceedingly attractive to visitors. It is the opinion of everybody who has visited the park that it would be a great mistake to let it go any longer without increasing the boundaries to a sufficient extent to have room to carry out the original intention. I lay a map on the Table, so that members can look at it for themselves.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What will be the shape of the park when it is enlarged ? Will it be square ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will be almost a triangle. The longer side of the triangle will be the boundary between the North-west Territories and British Columbia, and there will be two straight lines culminating in a right angle out into the territories.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It was my good fortune to visit the park last summer, and I am very glad the Bill has been introduced.

Mr. MONK. Will this enlargement entail any expropriation ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, there is no expropriation provided for or contemplated. The only land which I believe is in any way alienated consists of some timber berths which will come back to the government in the course of a little time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 134) respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons. He said : The explanation of this Bill will not necessarily be long. It provides that the Yukon Territory shall be represented in the House of Commons by one member. The entire contents of the Bill are taken up in making detailed provision for the holding of the election. I observe, on making an examination of the Bill as it is drawn, that one clause has been left out by the law clerk, that is the clause declaring the time within which the election shall be held ; and I shall ask to have that put in in committee.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the qualifications of voters ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The same as in the territories. We have followed the terms of the North-west Territories Representation Act, so as to avoid differences on the question of qualification.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PETITION OF RIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 135) to amend the Petition of Right Act. He said : The object of this amendment is to give to the Governor General the right to require from the petitioner in certain cases security for costs. At the present time a fiat is granted on the recommendation of the Department of Justice, and we refuse to grant fiats in cases in which we think there is no merit. The petitioners may consider, notwithstanding the opinion of the department, that they are suffering a hardship by not being granted a fiat, and the intention is, in cases of that description, to require security for costs, so that the Crown may not be mulcted in costs when successful.

Mr. MONK. Is there any special amount fixed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the amount will be discretionary. The circumstances of each case will be carefully considered. I believe that in the province of Quebec, where there is a similar provision. the security is fixed at two hundred dollars. But it is optional with the court at any time to increase the amount of security if thought desirable.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you provide that the writ will issue as a matter of course ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Practically as a matter of course.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT PACKAGES.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 136) to amend the Fruit Marks Act of 1901. He said: The first amendment is with regard to section 4, and indicates clearly whose name should appear, as there has been some slight confusion in one or two instances owing to the fact that the name of the person on whose behalf the fruit was really packed was not put on the package.

With regard to the grading of fruit, certain grades are suggested and are required to be on, even though some other grading may be put on. The suggestion is that No. 1 or XXX be for first quality, No. 2 or XX for second quality, and No. 3 or X for third quality.

Where a package is falsely marked, the inspectors have no power to put on the package 'falsely marked.' We want that power given them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

FISHERY REGULATIONS.

Mr. FARQUHARSON asked:

Does the government intend to so modify the fishery regulation of the 28th December, 1893, which is in force in Quebec and the maritime provinces, which forbids the digging of mussel mud within two hundred yards from any live oyster bed, and then only at such place or places as may be prescribed in writing by a fishery officer, so as to enable the farmers to procure the mussel mud necessary for the cultivation of their farms?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). It is not the intention to amend the Order in Council, unless the encroachment is made on the live lobster beds, and instructions have been given to the inspector to use discretion in the enforcement of this regulation, and those digging mud will not be interfered with under the present regulations.

KING BROTHERS' CLAIM.

Mr. LAVERGNE asked:

1. Is the government aware that, in June last, an investigation was held in regard to a claim that Messrs. King Brothers have against the government, for damages caused to their property, in the Seigneurie of St. Jean Deschaillons, by the Intercolonial Railway?

2. Does the government purpose soon settling that claim?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. The government is aware that such an investigation was held.

2. The claims branch of the department at Moncton is of the opinion that the claim is not meritorious, and until the same is considered by the department here, no final decision can be reached. I cannot say, until I have an opportunity of looking into it, what action will be finally taken.

POSTMASTER OF CREDITON.

Mr. SHERRITT asked:

1. Has the Postmaster General been informed that the postmaster at Crediton, Ontario, is dead?

2. If so, when was the notice received; who has been in charge of the office since the death of the late postmaster; has any person been temporarily or permanently appointed?

3. If no appointment has been made, does the government intend making an appointment before the Ontario provincial elections take place?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). In the absence of the Postmaster General, I beg to reply that information was received on the 29th of October last, of the death of Mr. Jacob Eilber, postmaster of Crediton, Ontario. The office has since been in charge of Mr. W. W. Kerr, who was assistant postmaster under the late postmaster. No appointment, permanent or temporary, has yet been made to the office, and it has not been decided when the appointment in question will be made.

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow on the following resolution:

That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of an assistant commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police for the Yukon Territory, at $1,600 per annum.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES.

Mr. T. EARLE (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may look for a report of the commission appointed to look into the conditions of the fisheries in British Columbia?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I think that the short time the commission had to investigate into this matter does not put them in a position to report, and they have to ask for a further delay in order to

make investigations, especially with regard to traps, &c. I think the delay will have to be granted for futher investigation before they will be able to report.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 76) further to amend the Pilotage Act.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

YUKON POLICE MAGISTRATE.

House went into committee on the following resolution :

That it is expedient to amend chapter 41 of the statutes of 1901, and to provide that the salaries of the police magistrate at Dawson and the police magistrate at White Horse shall be $4,000 per annum.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Both these police magistrates receive $2,400 salary and $3,000 living allowance each. The intention is to raise their salary to $4,000 each, and their living allowance to $1,800 each.

Mr. SPROULE. Are those all the police magistrates in the district ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Resolutions reported.

SALARY AND RETIRING ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN JUDGES.

House went into committee on the following resolution

That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts and to provide as follows :—

1. That the salary of the third judge of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory shall be $5,000 per annum.

2. That a judge of a county court resigning at any time after becoming disabled by permanent infirmity or resigning after twenty-five years' service, may be granted a pension equal to two-thirds of his annual salary ; provided that if he has served less than five years, his pension shall not exceed one-third of his annual salary.

Mr. SPROULE. You will have three judges in the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This resolution provides for the appointment of an additional judge in the Yukon Territory. We have now two judges of the High Court residing there, and it is proposed that hereafter three shall be there, with salaries of $5,000 each. The expectation is that the three judges shall form a Territorial Court of Appeal, to which there will be appeals from the High Court sitting as a court of original jurisdiction, and also an appeal from the findings of the Gold Commisioner. At present the appeal from a single trial judge is to the court in British Columbia. It is extremely inconvenient to the people of the Yukon to be obliged to come down to British Columbia for the trial of their appeals. If this resolution is passed, a Bill will be introduced which will provide for three judges of the Territorial Court who will form a court of appeal, the appeal from them being to the Supreme Court of Canada. It is expected that this will not add very much to the expense of the administration of justice in that territory. It is true that there will be an additional judge, but we are amending the Act so that members of the High Court will be able to do some of the work that is now done by the police magistrates, and, in that way, we hope to dispense with the services of one police magistrate.

Mr. MONK. In this Court of Appeal, or Court of Review, will the judge who tried the case in the first instance sit as one of the judges ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. The present intention is to have it as our Court of Review in Quebec was originally formed, that is, the trial judge will be one of the three judges sitting in review. Personally, with the knowledge I have gained of our judges, I think it is not a bad principle, because the judge of the first court, it seems to me, would help to further enlighten the judges in appeal when he is a member of the court. I think that the departure from that principle in our province was not a step in the direction of progress. As to the second portion of the resolution, my hon. friends are aware that, under the existing law, a High Court judge becoming incapacitated at any time after he has entered upon his duties is entitled to receive his retiring allowance. He is also entitled to retire after fifteen years on the bench. But, in the case of county court judges in Ontario, we find that one of these judges cannot be given retiring allowance until after he has served ten years. A judge may become incapacitated through illness and be obliged to retire, yet not receive any allowance. It will be seen that that is a hardship. There are cases of special hardship which will be met by this amendment. One case, I think, is a case of extreme hardship. I think my hon. friend will admit that it is proper that if a judge becomes incapacitated, whether he be in the High Court or in the County Court, he should be entitled to a retiring alowance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This applies to judges in Ontario, not in the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In Ontario and all other places where there are county court judges.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any legislation proposed, looking to the compulsory retirement of judges after reaching an age limit ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. I may say that there never was any intention to introduce legislation of that kind with

respect to the judges of the Superior Court —there will be none this session.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister will excuse me, but there was a Bill introduced by himself for the retirement of county court judges who had reached the age of seventy years.

Mr. INGRAM. This feature is not included in this measure ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, there is no intention to do so.

Resolutions reported.

EXCHEQUER COURT—SALARY OF THE REGISTRAR.

House went into committee on the following resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the registrar of the Exchequer Court shall be $2,400 per annum.—(Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The salary of the registrar of the Exchequer Court is $2,000. But ever since his appointment he has been receiving annual increments of $25 and $50. The result is, hon. gentlemen will find in the estimates this year a vote which brings the salary up to $2,375. I thought it was better to fix the salary once and for all at what it is represented was intended to be the salary, rather than come back here every year or two for an increased vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is he a barrister ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who is he ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Audette. He came into the court when it was originally formed and has been there ever since. I think I can safely say that he has performed his duties with great satisfaction to the court.

Resolutions reported.

PENSIONS TO NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

House in committee on Bill (No. 40) respecting pensions to officers of the North-west Mounted Police—(Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

The PRIME MINISTER (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When this Bill was in committee before, sections 7 and 5 were reserved. Section 7 provides that if an officer is constrained to leave the service before a period at which a pension may be granted to him, by reason of severe bodily infirmity, through no fault of his own, and in the discharge of a public duty, the Governor in Council may allow him a pension not exceeding three months pay for every two years service. Section 8 provides that the Governor in Council may grant a pension to the widow and children of any officer who, having completed twenty years service, was at the time of his death in the receipt of a pension. It was suggested at the time that with regard to widows of officers who had been disabled before the period of twenty years, it should be made compulsory upon the government to allow a pension. This is practically what is done by the Bill. The wording of it is ' may ' instead of ' shall.' The reason why we have used the word ' may ' is that there may be reasons why a pension shall not be given. But in every case where no such reasons exist it is expected that the widow will be entitled to the pension. With regard to section 5, it provides :

If any officer is constrained, from any infirmity of body or mind, to quit the force before a period at which a pension might be granted to him, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding one month's pay for each year of his service ; and if any such officer is so constrained to quit the service before such period by reason of severe bodily injury, received without his own fault, in the discharge of his public duty, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding three months' pay for every two years' service.

The point was made, I think by the hon. member for Toronto, that there was here an invidious distinction The Bill provided that if a man had been twenty years in the service then he may retire with his pension. He may be in comparatively good health, but having served the country twenty years, he is entitled to his pension. It was suggested that if an officer, after twenty years of service, is in good health and is still entitled to his pension, why should we not do the same thing for an officer who has been disabled in the service of the country before he has been twenty years in the service. Well, this Bill provides for pensions to those who have served the country for long periods. The intention is that officers shall contribute to a fund, and it is expected that a fund will be created which will be self-supporting. But there may be cases where a man has not served twenty years, he may have served only nineteen years or ten years, and may be disabled in the performance of his duty, and then it may be said : Are you going to turn that man adrift and do nothing for him ? Why not provide for him ? The reason we do not provide for him in this way is because the Act is intended to give pensions for long service only. But I may say to the committee that those who have served the country and been disabled, are not turned adrift. Since 1885 we have always provided for cases of that kind. We have adopted in that respect the law which regulates the militia, a provision has been introduced in this Bill exactly like that which is found in the Militia Act. In 1885, an Order in Council was passed under the Militia Act to provide pensions for officers who have been disabled in the rebellion

of that year. In 1886, a similar Order in Council was passed adopting the same rule and the same rates of pension for officers of the mounted police who had been disabled during that rebellion. The Order in Council reads thus :

On the 19th of May, 1886, an Order in Council was passed providing that the members of the mounted police and Prince Albert volunteers who were wounded, and the families of those who were killed during the troubles in the North-west, be granted compensation in the same manner, and upon the same scale of gratuities and pensions as was provided for the active militia by the Order in Council of the 8th July, 1885.

Under this order is another order. We have every year in the estimates, including this year, taken an appropriation to cover all cases of disabilities occurring in the mounted police while in service. If members of the committee will look at the estimates of this year, page 37, item 108, they will find an appropriation of $2,510.03 to cover pensions payable in connection with the North-west rebellion of 1885. They will find also, in the same item, appropriations of $109.50 and $182.50 for widows and children of members of the mounted police killed in the performance of their duty. Again on page 70, item 242, there is an appropriation of $2,000 as compensation to members of the North-west Mounted Police for injuries received in the discharge of duty. At present, under these three heads, we have given pensions to members of the mounted police who have been killed and injured in the rebellion of 1885. We have sixteen pensions for which we ask appropriations this year as follows :

Major Moore, loss of leg, pension, $800 ; Private Newitt, shot in leg, $91.25 ; Mrs. A. Anderson, son killed, $91.25 ; R. Middleton, son killed, $91.25 ; Mrs. M. A. Smith, son killed, $91.25 ; Private Pembrun, loss of arm, $109.50 ; P. W. H. Smart, father killed, $109.50; Sergeant Ward, shot through lungs, $328.50 ; Sergeant Fury, shot in chest, $219 ; Sergeant McRae, shot in leg, $164.25 ; Constable Pocock, lost part of foot, $83.95 ; Constable Loasby, shot in body, $83.95 ; Special Constable Harpur, rheumatism, $219 ; Mrs. Burke, husband killed, $136.88.

Then we have in the estimates pensions to Mrs. Grundy and Mrs. Colebrooke, names which have not been forgotten, of men who lost their lives in the rebellion, and their widows receive pensions of $109 and $182. Then we have also a certain number of pensions to men who have not been killed or injured but who have been disabled. Under such circumstances I think we had better leave the law as it is, because no wrong has been done so far, and it is found that in every case parliament, at the suggestion of the government, has provided for relief in the manner contemplated in that section. This is a reproduction of the law respecting pensions for the militia.

Mr. MONK. In regard to sections 8 and 9 I would like to call the attention of the government to the fact that with these two sections, as they are to be read, even if the applicant does not fall under the exceptions provided in section 9, it still remains absolutely optional with the government to grant him any pension at all. After he has completed twenty years of service as provided in section 8, and if he is on a retiring allowance and dies, the widow has no right to any pension nor the children to any compassionate allowance if the government do not choose to give any. In reference to the exceptions provided in section 9 there is a great deal of certainty, and under section 8 the widow and children are still dependent on the good-will of the government.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend is in error as there is no intention to interpret the Act in such a harsh manner. This Bill is an exact reproduction of a similar Bill which was introduced last session and discussed at great length providing for pensions for the militia. We have taken it verbatim and it would not be advisable I think when these two Bills are intended to serve the same purpose that there should be a variation of the language even if the criticism of the hon. gentleman were well founded. My hon. friend knows that the word 'may' is very often construed by the courts to mean 'shall.' That is what is intended here. I do not say that if I had had the drafting of this Bill it might not have been well to have amended it in the light suggested by my hon. friend, but finding a Bill exactly similar, to apply to another branch of the service, the militia, we thought it advisable not to vary the language, but to take it as it is, it being well understood that the widow of an officer under section 8 is entitled to a pension provided she does not come within any of the exceptions mentioned in section 9.

Mr. MONK. The statute does not say so.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I think we had better leave it alone.

Mr. OSLER. Would a pension granted in the cases the right hon. gentleman has cited be about the same as a pension obtained in the usual manner under the Pension Act, or would it be larger or smaller ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The pension of the widow which would come out of this fund would be much larger than any pension that has been granted in the usual manner.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice in subsection (c) that if an officer marries after retirement he is not entitled to a pension, while subsection (e) reads :

In the case of an officer who is married after the first day of July, nineteen hundred and two,

if he was more than twenty-five years older than his wife.

That is a very odd provision.

Mr. BRODER. While we are on this question I wish to refer to a matter which is not covered by this Bill, but I think there should be some provision made for it. There are instances of South Africa volunteers who have been disabled in action. I have a case in my own county, that of the blind Trooper Mulloy. It seems to me that a case of that kind should be considered by the government and I understood, last year, in reply to a question I asked, that the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that the matter would be considered.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BRODER. I now mention it here because I think a case of that kind should not be overlooked.

The PRIME MINISTER. I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) that in the despatch of October 19, 1899, under which the contingents were authorized, the British government undertook to deal with pensions and I have no doubt as soon as the war is over, which I hope will be over in a very few days now, that matter will be attended to by the British government and then it will be opportune for the Dominion government to consider what action it should take. I am not prepared myself, to-day, to say, but, the matter will receive consideration.

Mr. BRODER. Trooper Mulloy is receiving a very moderate stipend now, I think 65 cents a day.

The PRIME MINISTER. Trooper Mulloy is geting a contribution from the patriotic fund.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would ask the committee to reconsider the 17th section of the Bill for the reason that I think there is some ambiguity in the language used and that it does not carry out the evident intention of the preceding sections. You will observe in reading subsection (b) that it is made to apply to :

To every officer now in the force who, within six months from the coming into force of this Act, elects to accept the provisions of this Act in lieu of those of the Civil Service Superannuntion Act or of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

There are officers in the force who are neither under the Civil Service Superannuation Act or the Civil Service Retirement Act. They, therefore, have nothing which they could give up for the purpose of coming under this Act. I think that section must be amended to make it clear that it is intended to cover these officers. I, therefore, beg to move :

Mr. SPROULE.

That the words 'instead of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, or the Civil Service Retirement Act,' in section 17, be struck out and that there shall be inserted as subsection (b) of section 17, the following :

(b) To every officer now on the force who is not subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act or the Civil Service Retirement Act.

And that the subsection now lettered (b) be lettered (c) and that there be inserted after the word 'who' in the first line of said subsection the following 'is within the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act or of the Civil Service Retirement Act and who.'

The effect, as you will see, is that it applies to every officer who is now on the force, or who hereafter may come into the force and likewise it is made to apply so that any officer who is now receiving a pension under the Civil Service Superannuation Act or the Civil Service Retirement Act must, within six months, elect whether he will continue under the provisions of either of these Acts or come under this Act. It must apply therefore to all of the officers and it is the obvious intention of the Act that such should be so. As it now stands it is doubtful and this removes any possible doubt about it on that score.

The PRIME MINISTER. The section would then read :

17. This Act shall apply,—

(a) To every officer hereafter appointed to the force.

(b) To every officer now in the force who is not subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act or the Civil Service Retirement Act.

(c) To every officer now on the force who is within the provisions of the Civil Service Superannuation Act or of the Civil Service Retirement Act, and who within six months from the coming into force of this Act, elects to accept the provisions of this Act in lieu of those of the Civil Service Superannuation Act, or of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported.

SUPPLY—SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TERMS OF PEACE.

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

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to bring to your notice certain matters connected with the motion of which I gave notice yesterday. I have thought proper to vary the language slightly, but the purport of the motion remains unchanged. Before proceeding to discuss this motion I had better perhaps read it, so that the House may be in possession of the features that it contains. It is as follows :

This House is of the opinion that British supremacy should be maintained and firmly established in South Africa, to which end Can-

ada has cheerfully contributed men and money. Having in view the effect of a policy of magnanimity and mercy at the cession of Canada, and at the close of the civil war in the United States, and for other reasons ; this House is also of the opinion that in the interest of peace and of future tranquillity, harmony and homogeniety in South Africa, the broadest policy of magnanimity and mercy may be extended to a brave foe now opposing British arms, upon condition of submission to British control. And upon this opinion, humbly presented with the prayerful hope that it may aid in securing a favourable and honourable settlement of South African difficulties ; this House invokes the considerate judgment of His Gracious Majesty the King.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is brought before the House in this manner and at this time, for the reason that another opportunity will not be afforded during the present session. It is not offered as a motion of want of confidence ; it is not offered in any sense as a motion having political significance or having anything to do with the policy of the party in power in this country, or with the policy of the opposition. The resolution, it will be noticed, provides expressly for submission and for the establishment and maintenance of British authority in South Africa. It is not a pro-Boer motion ; it is not a motion that in the remotest degree would counsel the establishing of Boer independence or the establishing of any condition of things in South Africa except British supremacy. At my request the motion will be seconded by a gentleman who, in my opinion, as fully as any other member of this House perhaps, represents French Canadian sentiment. I move the motion as an English representative ; the gentleman who will second the motion, I have asked to second it because he is a representative French Canadian. I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that that gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) is prepared to-day to endorse the assertion, that it is proper and desirable to maintain British supremacy in South Africa, and that the people in arms in that country against British authority should be called upon to submit to British control. This is all that can be required. This lays the foundation for the settlement of this question upon a basis which would be to the interest of all portions of this empire, and this motion deals simply with the character of the settlement that it is hoped may be obtained with the belligerents in South Africa, and obtained for the purpose of establishing in that country unquestioned and unimpaired British authority.

The motion, Sir, is an humble expression of opinion on the part of this House. It may be asserted that it will be considered an act of impertinence to offer such a motion here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Some hon. gentlemen say 'hear, hear.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. The motion says : It is humbly presented with the prayerful hope that it may be conducive to the securing of a settlement. Now, Sir, has this House of Commons of Canada no right to express an opinion upon a great imperial question—a question with reference to which we have been called upon to pour out millions of dollars ; and send thousands of our sons to maintain British supremacy. Have we no right, Sir, to express humbly an opinion as to the proper course to be pursued in securing the settlement of this war in South Africa——

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Suppose that my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House were to secure the adoption of their policy for imperial defence ; suppose Canada were called upon to pay annually into a common fund ten per cent of all its duties for imperial defence ; would it be said that Canada would not be allowed to have a voice as to the expendlture of that money ; that Canada would not be permitted even to express an humble opinion as to what course might be taken in regard to the expenditure of the money she had so contributed.

An hon. MEMBER. That is different.

Mr. CHARLTON. Sir, the condition of things to-day is exactly the same as it would be under such circumstances. While we have not a law which compels us to contribute a certain sum of money for imperial defence, yet we have done so voluntarily. Our soldiers have gone to South Africa ; our money has been expended ; we, as an integral portion of this great empire, have surely an interest in this question. I maintain that we in this parliament as the representatives of six millions of British subjects have a right to express humbly and respectfully an opinion, and that is all that the resolution asks shall be done.

Now, Sir, the motion may be useless, but the spirit manifested in offering it cannot be questioned and cannot be condemned. The motion may have no weight, but on the other hand it may perhaps be extremely useful. It may aid the imperial government in the settlement of this question by showing that in one of the great colonies of the empire the same spirit of bitterness does not exist that probably does exist in Cape Colony and Natal. This motion may have a counteracting influence possibly, to the pressure from the British colonists in these colonies asking for the exacting of vengeance upon the Cape rebels. If the motion does produce that effect, it will have a beneficient influence ; it may counteract that influence upon the British gov-

ernment which would be a most prejudicial and harmful one. In any event, while the motion is meant to do good ; while the motion is respectfully expressed ; while it is merely an expression of opinion ; in any event if it does do no good, in my opinion, it can do no harm. I shall no doubt be subjected to criticism for offering this motion, but that is a matter of utter indifference to me, provided I can feel that I have done right.

What troubles me is whether it is a judicious act, whether it is a proper act, whether it is something I ought to have done or ought not to have done. As to how it will be received by my fellow citizens is a matter of minor importance. It is my firm conviction that in the course I have taken I have been actuated by a sincere desire to benefit my country, to offer an influence that will aid in the settlement of a melancholy struggle. The motive, at all events, in offering this resolution is a good one. My own record with regard to this matter would render it absurd to say that I am actuated by pro-Boer sentiments. The House will remember the position I took on this question, the defence I made of the action of the authorities here and of the policy of the imperial government in this war. The House remembers that I would never for one moment have entertained the idea of parting with one foot of South African territory, or of lowering the British standard in the slightest degree. I have always maintained that British supremacy must be maintained in South Africa. I take that position to-day, and the question with me now is, what is the best course to pursue in seeking such a settlement as will place matters in South Africa on a just, humane and enduring basis.

Now, Sir, nobody would venture to make the assertion that Canada is not loyal to the empire. The expression of this humble opinion, if the House chooses to sanction that expression, will not be accepted in England as an evidence of disloyalty. It will, on the contrary, be accepted in England as an evidence of the sincere desire of Canada to aid, if it possibly may aid, in securing a settlement of a question which it is desirable to have settled. Canada is loyal to the empire, and its loyalty has been proved. Nobody in this country or in the world at large doubts that Canadian loyalty is something that will bear the strain, something that can be relied on, something that is thoroughly imbedded in the hearts of the people of this country.

Now, what were Canada's interests in this struggle ? Here we are on a continent, possessing more than two-fifths of it, with vast resources, with our own destiny to work out, with our own nationality to erect, with our interests requiring our utmost efforts for their advancement, with enough to command our utmost labours and resources. What had we to do as a matter of self-interest with the struggle in South Africa ?

With 3,000 miles between us and the motherland, with 7,000 miles of ocean between us and the scene of conflict, with our commerce with South Africa of the most insignificant character, if we had been governed by merely material or selfish considerations, we never would have put a dollar into that struggle or have sent one man to the scene of conflict. But we sent the men and voted the money because we wished to maintain and uphold the integrity of the British empire; because we wished to maintain the prestige of England; because we wished to have that country which afforded us a market, that country with which we were allied by the bonds of race affinity and by political institutions, furnished with aid, not from any selfish consideration, but purely as an offering to the welfare of the empire, given freely and fully by one of her great colonies without hope of securing reward for the sacrifices made. Canada stands in the position to-day where, having made these sacrifices, having put forth these efforts, having proved by its conduct that it is thoroughly loyal, it naturally desires to see an end put to this struggle that has been in progress for three years, and an honourable peace obtained; and Canada actuated by that desire may venture to express to the imperial authorities a humble and respectful opinion as to what course, in the estimation of the people of this country, might be pursued.

It is preposterous, Mr. Speaker, to assert that that expression of opinion can be or will be considered in England or anywhere else an impertinence. Of course, British authority must prevail; that is an absolute condition. No proposition of peace will admit of consideration involving Boer independence or anything but the absolute sovereignty of Great Britain over all South Africa—the Orange Free State, the Transvaal, Cape Colony, Natal, Rhodesia, and the whole of that magnificent country. British authority and sovereignty must prevail. This House perhaps has not been fully aware of the importance of that country, that great region of 1,500,000 square miles now in the possession of Great Britain, with vast possibilities for the increase of territory, with resources almost beyond the dream of the enthusiast, awaiting to be developed. A few days ago Cecil Rhodes was buried on the Matoppa Hills with imposing ceremonies, and his grave overlooks that vast region which his genius and his energy secured for his native land—a region which embraces the ancient Ophir, a region of untold possibilities, a region which England never could have afforded to have lost and must have put forth great efforts to retain. Happy perhaps it would have been if the genius and the experience of Cecil Rhodes had exercised more influence upon the counsels of British commanders and British authorities in South Africa. But this conflict has nearly run its course. It has been a great struggle, a greater struggle than was

anticipated at the outset, a struggle which will form one of the epochs of history, a struggle which has demonstrated the resources, the credit, the perseverance, the indomitable grit of the British citizens. We perhaps fail to understand the obstacles which they have overcome. With a single line of communication from Cape Colony penetrating into the far north, 1,500 miles in length, liable to be cut at almost any point; with the transport over that overloaded line of the supplies for a large army; with an aggressive and acute foe, familiar with the country; the subjection of the Boer has been a great achievement. It has been, I repeat, a great struggle; and Great Britain has learned in this war lessons with regard to the conditions of modern warfare that will be worth to her all the money she has expended.

And now we come to the point when this war is practically ended, when the opposition that remains is merely guerilla warfare. We come to the point of considering what were the causes of this war, and what distinction shall we draw between the belligerents in one section of South Africa and those in another? Shall we make a different rule of settlement for the Orange Free Stater, the Transvaal man and the Africander of Cape Colony? Is the one a rebel whom we shall put into chains and hang, and the other an honourable belligerent whom we shall treat with and pardon, and deal with on the terms of civilized warfare.

Sir, the deep-seated case of the hostilities in South Africa was the determination on the part of the Dutch element in that entire country from Cape Town to the Transvaal, to make South Africa a Dutch country. The Afrikander Bund, for years before the hostilities began, was laying its plans, accumulating its resources, buying arms and munitions of war, erecting fortifications and preparing for this struggle, which it entered upon deliberately. It had one clear purpose in view and that was to expel the British from South Africa, and when it found that Great Britain was transporting troops to that country, and threatening the success of that policy, it precipitated hostilities by invading British territory. I hold that every belligerent in South Africa should be dealt with on the same principle, that we should draw no distinction between the Dutchmen of Cape Colony and the Boers of the Transvaal or the Dutchmen of the Orange Free State. They all belong to the one nationality. They were all actuated by the one purpose and fought in the one common cause. We were contending, not with the Transvaal Dutch or the Free State Dutch alone, but with the Afrikander element in South Africa from Cape Town to the Zambesi.

Mr. BRODER. The Free Staters had no cause of complaint?

Mr. CHARLTON. No, but they joined in the general purpose of the Dutch in South Africa to erect a Dutch empire in that country. The Boer was a brave foe. He fought for his race, for his ideals. He staked his life upon the issue, and he has lost. It was known by close observers from the outset that there could be but one of two results. Either the Afrikander must prevail or the British; either South Africa would be Dutch or British. One thing or the other had to come to pass. And the thing that has come to pass is that the Afrikander has been driven to the wall, that the British forces are supreme and the contest practically ended. The question now confronts the imperial authorities: How shall this war, which has degenerated into murder, rapine and foray, how shall these useless hostilities be terminated? It is a question of delay in putting an end to useless suffering. It is a question of delay in the advent of prosperity and peace in South Africa. How is peace to be secured? How is this delay in securing peace to be obviated? How are these useless struggles in South Africa to be terminated? They can be terminated by protracting this struggle until the Boer cause is ground into fine dust. But it will take long to do it, many lives will be lost, and when that result is reached there will be left the seeds of bitterness and hatred in every Boer heart south of the Zambesi. It can be done in another way. It can be done by the exercise of mercy and magnanimity. The exercise of these two qualities will hasten peace, and not only hasten peace, but place that peace, when it comes, upon a sure and certain foundation, and leave these people satisfied that the struggle is indeed ended, and that it is useless to perpetuate it longer. On the other hand, severity will retard peace and leave endless hate to fester in the heart of every Boer in that country.

The imperial authorities are facing today the question of African reconstruction. The conditions of things that existed before cannot be continued. There can be no Transvaal with its dim shadow of suzerainty to the British Crown. There can be no independent Free Orange State. There can be no divided authority in South Africa. The whole country must be under one flag and one king. It must be a part of the one great empire. That is a foregone conclusion. How is this South African reconstruction to be accomplished? Not by the exercise of vengeance, not by the exacting of the pound of flesh, not by pursuing a fallen and noble foe to the utmost extremity of vengeance. But African reconstruction will be accomplished, if it is ever accomplished on an enduring basis, by Afrikander assimilation. Afrikander assimilation will be the hope of South Africa, and without it peace upon any enduring basis and success in the formation of a South African confederation cannot be secured. We have the exercise of a great principle now in operation which is peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon—the principle of federal

union, first adopted by the American states after the revolution, in 1787, next adopted by Canada in 1867, since then adopted by Australia, and waiting now to be adopted by South Africa. In that country there will be the colony of Natal, the colony of Cape Colony, the colony of the Orange Free State, the colony of the Transvaal, the colony of Rhodesia and other colonies to the north in that magnificent valley of the Zambesi, beyond which British possessions reach to the great inland sea of Tanganyika. This African reconstruction will be accomplished. It will build up in South Africa an empire under British influence and British laws. It will be another of the great commonwealths formed under British influence, and in accord with the genius of British laws and institutions. Does any man doubt that magnanimity will promote this result, that the exercise of mercy and generosity will have a favourable influence on the population of these colonies and tend to cement in ties of common interest their institutions and their laws? I think it cannot be doubted, and one reason why I introduce this resolution is the belief I entertain that the imperial government is probably embarrassed at this moment by the demands of the English colonists of Cape Colony and Natal, who refuse to consider the Dutch in arms against British authority in Cape Colony in any other light than rebels, and who demand the condign punishment of these men after the war is through. I do not believe that it would be good policy to adopt such a course. I do not believe that we should make any distinction between the Cape Town rebels and the Orange State belligerents and the Transvaal soldier. I believe, if any distinction is to be made, that it will simply retard the settlement and make it less satisfactory and less likely to be enduring after it is accomplished. This feeling, no doubt, impedes reconstruction. In my humble judgment, this feeling is an embarrassment to the imperial authorities, and for that reason I believe that the expression of a respectful and humble opinion on the part of the representatives of this great colony of the Dominion would have great weight with the British authorities and be most welcome. In this view I have ventured to offer this motion, and in so doing I believe that I am acting in the interest of my country and of humanity and on lines which would promote settlement in South Africa and hasten the realization of that condition of things for which we all hope. A great many thousand Boers are in captivity. Some are in Bermuda, some in St. Helena, some in Ceylon—thousands and thousands of these men who must be restored to their country some day—and it is a matter of the utmost consequence whether these men come back with sore hearts and cherishing vengeful feelings because of undue severity which they believe their conquerors have practiced, or whether they come back with gladness of heart, with thankfulness for mercies granted to them, for magnanimity, for generosity, for the restoration of privileges, for the expression of a desire that they should go back to their native land and become good citizens and obedient to the country that had treated them with magnanimity which I believe it would be wise to display.

The Boer, Mr. Speaker, will make a magnificent component ethnic quantity in South Africa. His is a noble race, the race that held at bay Alva in the Netherlands, the race that furnished to England the Prince of Orange, the race that has the lofty faith of the puritan and the endurance of the puritan—that is a constituent portion of the population of South Africa that it is worth the while of the British authorities to cultivate. It is worth their while to make this Boer element a loyal element, to make of this Boer element an element attached to the English institutions, an element that realizes that it has been treated with generosity, with magnanimity, and that it can put its faith in the power with which it is dealing. Now Britain wants in this matter, I apprehend, not revenge, that is not a British characteristic. Britain faces its foe, conquers its enemies and then deals with them generously. Britain wants no revenge; but she wants a united people in South Africa, the restoration of prosperity to that country and the creation of a commonwealth there that, in its history and progress will redound to the glory of English institutions and of English government. England wants no revenge, no devastated farms, no ravaged lands, reduced to the condition of a desert; no hords of beggars and fugitives harrying the country; she wants a prosperous land, a return to fixed conditions, and the gathering together of these people in their homes, and the use by them of their energies and industry to the advancement of the state. And, Sir, in gaining this aspiration, the three angels, mercy, amnesty and peace stand ready to give their services to securing the consummation of that which every true citizen of Canada must desire.

Now, it may be asked, Mr. Speaker, when the exercise of the qualities of mercy and magnanimity is urged, when the granting of amnesty is proposed, have we any parallel for this policy? I answer: Yes. And every parallel we have is a shining, a glorious example of the success of this line of policy. In 1759, Canada passed from one authority to another. Prior to that, the scapling knife, the tomahawk and the torch worked their savage will along the frontier from Penobscot to Fort Du Quesne. For generations the English colonists and the French colonists were engaged in bitter war, and the hatred of each side for the other was intense and consuming. We had the slaughter of Braddock's army at Monogahela; we had the battle of Ticonderoga and the British reverse there; we had the war-whoop and the Indian foray; we had bitter

and deadly hostilities along this whole border year after year. And when, at last, Wolfe took Quebec, and under the treaty of Paris, Canada was ceded to Great Britain, the policy that was pursued toward the French people of this country was to allow them to retain their laws, their religion, their language, their social and ecclesiastical institutions. And this broad, comprehensive, liberal policy adopted with these sixty thousand Canadians in British North America has had results for which we cannot feel too thankful.

Mr. SPROULE. Is not England's action in that case the best guarantee in the world that she will deal generously with a conquered foe, even without any resolution from any outside country ?

Mr. CHARLTON. Possibly that is so. But does it follow that it is wrong to counsel that policy which the hon. gentleman assumes that England will pursue ? Is it wrong to express the humble opinion here that the policy he says England is likely to follow will receive our approbation ? I think not. As I said at the outset, the expression of this wish can do no harm if it is unnecessary, and it may do good. This historical example to which I have referred resulted in firmly attaching all this race to British institutions. Thirteen years after the treaty of Paris the American revolution broke out, and an attempt was made by American agitators to carry the French colonists with them. But they failed. Those French colonists were faithful to British institutions then, they have been faithful to British institutions since, and they are faithful to British institutions now—and their history affords a shining and crowning example of the results following the policy of mercy and magnanimity in treating with a conquered foe. We had another case in the thirteen colonies. There was a Dutch colony there, which was called the New Netherlands. That colony was conquered and re-christened New York, and the Dutch colonists were incorporated with the Anglo-Saxon population. They were treated with generosity ; their rights and privileges were assured to them, including their language if they chose to use it. To-day it is one of the most loyal elements in the country. It has given one president to the union—Van Buren—it has its representative in the United States Senate—Depew—and it has given rise to a great family of railway kings, the Vanderbilts. Its history affords an illustration of the desirability and propriety of treating nations thus incorporated into another with generosity. And we have a still more striking example in the United States itself, in the great struggle of the civil war. That war was carried through with relentless and remorseless energy. It was a titanic struggle. The north and the south were arrayed against each other on a question of principle, and the hostilities between the sections was of the bitterest kind. The battles fought in that war were remarkable for their sanguinary character. In all the great battles of Europe, the number of men killed was smaller in proportion to the number engaged than in the great battles of this terrible war. There was Chancellorsville with its seventeen thousand dead ; there was Vicksburgh; there was Chicamauga ; there was Missionary Ridge. They fought the fierce seven-days' battle in the wilderness. Great struggles. Great loss of life. The south planted thick with graves. The soil soaked with blood. The war was fought out to the bitter end with relentless hate and animosity. And at last, at Appomatox, Lee surrendered to Grant. The southerners were exhausted. They were treated with the greatest generosity. A union soldier would deprive himself of his breakfast to give food to the starving confederate. And when the southern army was disbanded, Grant said : 'Take the horses, you will need them to put in your spring crops ; take anything that you can make use of—anything that will be of service to you as private property—I will take as public property only what you cannot use.' And these men disbanded with the kindest feelings toward their conquerors. And but for the unfortunate death of Lincoln, the reconstruction of the south would have been speedy and complete. There was a great cry for vengeance on the leader of the southerners, Jeff. Davis, but he was never punished except by temporary imprisonment. There was no confiscation of the property of a rebel, there was no disfranchisement of a rebel, there was no vengeance inflicted upon the heads of rebels; but there was magnanimity, there was generosity exercised by the conquerors to the conquered ; and the result has been a reconstructed nation, and those two belligerent sections fighting under the same flag in the wars that have since occurred where their country has been engaged. So, Sir, this struggle in the United States, which passed beyond the limits of a rebellion and became one of the great wars of history, is but a type of the struggle that has occurred in South Africa. In South Africa where the principle at issue has been whether one race or another should possess the country, where the prize has been the possession of South Africa either for Boer or for Briton, as in the case of the United States, so in the case of South Africa, let the same generosity and magnanimity be exercised towards the foe now as was exercised towards the foe then.

Heretofore, Sir, the Dutch in South Africa have fought against our progress. We have had no sympathy with the Burghers. If we can possibly attach to our interest that element of the African population ; if we can make them loyal to British institutions ; if we can make use of their energy, and their courage, and their powers of endurance to forward the British cause in South Africa, why, the whole southern half of the conti-

nent lies at our feet. It is a question of great importance what our possessions in South Africa shall be. We have in the north, from Alexandria and Khartoum to Uganda and Victoria Nyanza, possessions reaching across 36 degrees of latitude and to the very heart of the continent. We have in South Africa possessions reaching from Cape Town away north to the Zambesi, and beyond the valley of that great river and the great inland sea of Tanganyika ; and we can make great additions to that empire—it is not necessary to state in what direction. It is of enormous importance to British institutions and British interests that the Boer element, the Dutch element in South Africa, should be consolidated and made a loyal element of the population of that country. And, Sir, we can afford to dispense with all desire to gratify feelings of revenge, we can afford to be generous and magnanimous, we can afford to say to these men : Lay down your arms, resume your allegiance, and you shall have, as fast as you can be safely entrusted with it, the franchise and every right of a British subject, and representation in the colonial bodies that will be erected here ; and we will establish a confederation in South Africa with provincial autonomy and a great central government as in Canada, attached to the government of Great Britain.

Now, Sir, the measure of blood is full, the measure of misery is full ; and I imagine that no man in Canada wants any more. We are warranted in looking for a day when South Africa, like Canada will be a great commonwealth with two races moving together hand in hand, as is the case here, in promoting the interests and extending the boundaries and increasing the power of that South African commonwealth. Sir, mercy, and magnanimity, and amnesty are the powers that need to be exercised to secure this result. In moving this motion, Mr. Speaker, I have been governed by a sincere desire to place a statement before the House, to urge reasons to this House, that would warrant us, as I believe, in expressing an humble opinion as to the propriety of inaugurating that policy which I have set forth, which I believe to be the touchstone for the settlement of our difficulties in South Africa upon a permanent, a desirable and an enduring basis.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I desire to add a few words to what the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has said in support of this motion. I need not say that with all the views expressed by that hon. gentleman, as well as with some parts of the motion itself that he has placed in your hands, I do not fully agree. Professors of logic in this House will probably find a great deal of comfort and pleasure in such a declaration as this. But, Mr. Speaker, having no other aim in this matter but to fulfil what I believe to be my duty as a representative of the Canadian people, and my duty as a British citizen, whenever I find an opponent of mine coming towards my position I am willing to meet him half way. So far as British supremacy in South Africa is concerned, from the very beginning of this unfortunate war I stated clearly that I thought British supremacy was a necessity in South Africa. I admit that the warlike spirit which reigned in this House as well as in this country has perhaps made some hon. gentlemen forget the position I took at that time. But the position I took then, the position I have taken all along, and the position I take now, is that the only way by which British supremacy can be established in South Africa is by adhering to the best British traditions of respect for minorities and of generosity to foes in war.

As to the right of this parliament to offer its opinion to the British government, I think there can be no doubt. I was astonished to hear hon. gentlemen opposite interrupt, with what I might call sneers, the assertion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk, that we have a right to express our opinion on this matter. It is strange that, along with the development of what is called the new imperialism, and along with so much profession of fraternity on the part of the upholders of the new policy, they are always ready to take the subservient position that they are willing to be taxed, they are willing to give the blood and the money of this country, but they dare not express a single opinion on the issue of a war towards the prolongation of which they have contributed.

From the start of this question, I held, of course, that it was not our business to interfere at all in Africa. But from the moment we did interfere, either wilfully or not—from the moment this parliament called upon the Canadian people to vote a cent towards the carrying on of this war—we acquired the right of saying what should be its result. Now, if the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would come in with a motion interfering with the position taken by the British government—that, of course would not hurt my feelings very much—but it might lead a majority of the members of this House to say that it would be a mistake for this parliament, at this moment, to propose anything that might embarrass the British government. But, Sir, we should not be more loyalist than the King of England, we should not be more attached to British institutions than the parliament and government of Great Britain. It is now a well known fact to the entire world that the British government and the British people are endeavouring to secure peace in South Africa and are just as anxious for it as are their opponents. We have not yet the text of the speech that was delivered a week ago last Monday by the Chancellor of the Exchequer ; but what

do we see in the reports sent through by the associated press ?

Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is seldom dramatic; but when he referred to-day to the government's intention to restock the Boer as well as the colonial farms, his voice rose to an eloquent pitch. His gesture, as he spoke in praise of the valor of the Boers and expressed his hopes for subsequent friendship between Britons and Boer, took the House with him, and the cheers, especially from the opposition, prevented the speaker from continuing his speech for several moments.

When the hon. member for North Norfolk, a moment ago, gave expression to almost similar feelings, there were also some interruptions, but interruptions indicating that the broad feeling of generosity which is passing now through the British parliament, which is animating the mass of the British people, has not yet, unfortunately, penetrated this House. Whatever may be our differences upon this question, whatever may still be our private opinions as to the merits of this war, as to the causes which have led to this war and to the way in which this question should have been treated in years past, I think we can afford to bury these differences. We should be ready to help the British government and the British people in putting an end to this cruel and unfortunate war.

It has been stated in the press, and may be it will be stated in this House, that by adopting this motion we are embarrassing the British government and helping the enemies of Great Britain, and thereby preventing the war to be brought to a satisfactory conclusion. But, Sir, what did Sir Michael Hicks-Beach say in the British parliament, in the name of the British government ?

After the war was over there would be the great expenses of the relief and settlement of the two colonies and the re-stocking of the farms. He hoped that when durable peace was made, parliament would be generous and loan money for restocking the farms, not only of those who fought on the British side, but of those who had been honest enemies and whom they now hoped to make friends, and for railroad and other enterprises to serve to develop the two states.

So it is proper for the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Great Britain to say that the British people are ready to tax themselves and to borrow money in order to give the Boers back the farms, and restock them, after the British government had declared two months ago that they would seize these farms and sell them to pay for the support of the concentration camps. If the British government have come to the conclusion that they must change so radically their policy, is it not proper for the parliament of Canada to say simply and solely that a policy of mercy and generosity should be the basis upon which this war should be settled ? Not only are we not embarrassing the government of Great Britain, but by passing this resolution we are helping the British government.

The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) interrupted the hon. member for North Norfolk and asked : 'Is not the example given by Great Britain in 1763 a guarantee that the same policy of generosity will be adopted in this case ?' Circumstances alter cases. In 1763 there were two great powers fighting upon this continent. turies, and hon. gentlemen in this House They had been fighting in Europe for censeem sometimes to forget that if England had conquered on the soil of America she had been conquered on the soil of Europe during the Seven Years' War; that the treaty of 1763 was a treaty of give and take between England and France ; and that some advantages which France secured on the continent of Europe were compensated for to England by the cession of Canada, securities being given that the rights of the French settlers should be respected. The hon. gentleman seemed to assume a condition which does not exist in this case ; but I put that altogether aside. Contrasting the tone of the present English with the tone of the Canadian press, I am quite ready to say that, if I were a Boer myself, I would rather submit my whole case to British public men than to some colonial public men. But, Sir, this fight is not merely a fight between Great Britain and the Boers. This fight is a fight between the Boers, the Cape Colonists, or rather those who are called Cape Loyalists, and the paramount power of Great Britain. That the British government and the British parliament are disposed to show generosity in their treatment of a conquered foe, I have not the slightest doubt ; but, at the same time, that there are in Natal and Cape Colony a certain number of people who are ready to exact the pound of flesh, who are only looking to their own personal interests, and who would be ready to see the peace of the empire sacrificed if their personal interests were thereby secured and their personal feeling of revenge were assuaged, there is not the slightest doubt. You have only to read the statements which have been published in the British press to get evidence of this fact ; and the purpose of this resolution is neither to embarrass the British government nor to dictate terms to the British government, but it is to give strength to the British authorities in order that the very proposition that they are ready to uphold shall be upheld, and that they will be strengthened against the exactions of the very narrow loyalist element of Cape Colony. When I speak of the loyalist element of Cape Colony, I am not referring to the whole English speaking population of Cape Colony. There are, in South Africa, thousands of English-speaking people who have looked upon this war as a most unfortunate

period of British history, and of African history, and who would like to be helped so that this policy of generosity and mercy might be granted to the enemy.

It is true that the example of 1763 is to a certain extent a guarantee to us that the policy of generosity will be adopted. But there were other rebellions in other periods of the history of England which showed that some of the officials of Great Britain are not always animated by this sentiment of generosity. We have the history of the Jamaica rebellion where the British governor—after having notified the home authorities that the rebellion was over and that there was no more danger of uprising—caused hundreds of people to be hanged and flogged. I know that such is not the policy of the British government to-day; but we have unfortunate instances which show us that among the loyalist population of South Africa there is an element that would be glad to carry out, not the policy of the British government, not the policy of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, not the policy of Mr. John Morley, not the policy of the leading spirits of British opinion to-day; but the policy of Governor Eyre of Jamaica. I am sure that the British government will not give away to such pressure, but at the same time I believe that should their hands be fortified by expressions of opinion from the colonies generally, and especially from the Canadian parliament, it would be all the better to confirm them against temptation.

I agreed to second this motion in a spirit of conciliation. My opinions upon the merits of the war have not changed. My opinions as to the conduct of the British government previous to the war and during the war have not changed. These opinions were held by me sincerely and honestly, and I still hold them. But when I saw that a representative of the English-speaking majority in this House was ready to join hands with me in a motion like this, I was willing to put aside for the moment many of my opinions upon this question, and I did so in the hope that this House would receive the motion in the same spirit of conciliation, of peace, and of harmony.

One more word. I have my opinion and my strong opinion as to the policy of the British government upon this whole question—as to the policy especially of Mr. Chamberlain. But, I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite have a great deal of admiration and consideration for Mr. Chamberlain and his policy. For the past two years, previous to, during and after the last general election, what was the position taken by Mr. Chamberlain? It was: That the policy of the British government was framed not only in accordance with the wishes of the British people, but it was framed in accordance with the wishes of the people of the whole empire. His strongest argument against his Liberal opponents was: That the entire opinion of the colonies being in favour of his policy, he would not accept the views of a small handful of Englishmen and Scotchmen as against the views of the whole empire. That was repeated a hundred times by Mr. Chamberlain in parliament and out of parliament. We have therefore the very words of the Colonial Secretary, that he considers the opinion of the colonies as a great weight.

What is the opinion of the British government at the present time with reference to this matter? Up to within the past few weeks it was announced time and again by nearly every member of the government that unconditional surrender was the only basis upon which the war could be settled. But now we have the straight declaration of the government organs and supporters, and of members of the government themselves, that a policy of generosity and mercy is going to be the basis of the settlement. It may be said that when the Boers lay down their arms, then would be the time for this parliament to say that they should be treated leniently. But, if the British government, who know their position in Cape Colony—if the British authorities, both civil and military, who know exactly where they stand and where the enemy stands—if they should still persist in saying that unconditional surrender is the only basis upon which the war can be settled—I then would agree with the argument that this parliament should offer no suggestion until surrender is made by the enemy. But although hostilities are yet going on, we have the announcement that the British government will probably agree upon a policy of mercy and generosity; and that being the case, the passage of this resolution by the Canadian parliament would be a great help to the British government. It would not mean that we came between the British government and their enemy; it would not mean that we came between the British government and British public opinion; it would mean that having heard that the British government were ready to settle this question upon the basis of mercy and generosity, we, the representatives of a people who have given their money and their men to uphold British power, are now ready to help the British government in according mercy and generosity to the enemy. Let me say here—and I believe the Prime Minister will not contradict me upon this point—let me say that the French Canadians as a whole are opposed to this war. They detested, and they still do detest this war; but at the same time they are ready to join with their English-speaking countrymen in saying that the policy which has secured amity and friendship in Canada is the only policy that can secure amity and friendship and peace and harmony in South Africa.

I claim that the French Canadians have a special right to have their voice heard upon this question. We stand here as living testimony that this policy of conciliation is

the only one which can secure the acceptation of British institutions by a foreign element. Sir, that acceptation by us was not made in one year; it was not made in fifty years. We had to fight against British governments and against British governors, and against British civil and military authorities to get the rights that we now enjoy. It was not always peace in our history. Our freedom was not always a free and generous gift from the British authorities. It was very often a matter of fight, and had it not been for several outside circumstances, at times perhaps we would have lost what we had gained. But on the whole, why are we satisfied with the conditions under which we live? Why have we become year after year more loyal and devoted supporters of British institutions? It is because we have found that British rule, in its general and higher spirit and manifestation, is a good rule; British rule is a rule of peace; British rule is a rule of conciliation, of progress and of prosperity. I therefore say that this parliament, more than any other representative body in the British world, is specially entitled to express an opinion at this period of the war. I insist on the point that this will not be an interference with the policy of the British government, but that on the contrary it will strengthen their hands in showing mercy to their foe; it will strengthen them in carrying out that policy of generosity which all well-thinking British people wish them to carry out.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). For my part, I have no doubt whatever that both the mover and the seconder of this resolution are animated by the very best of motives. I have no doubt that both hon. gentlemen are thoroughly sincere in their hope that peace should be restored speedily in South Africa, upon the broadest possible basis of generosity to the Boers. On the whole, I do not regret this debate. At the same time, I must express the fervent wish that my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) will not press his motion further, and that the debate shall stop here and now. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), who seconded the motion, told us that he took some exception to the speech of the hon. member (Mr. Charlton) who proposed the motion. We who know the views long entertained by my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) are not at all surprised at that.

He has stated at the same time that he takes exception to the motion which he has seconded. For this, I may say, I was not so easily prepared. But I will not quarrel with my hon. friend on this score. My hon. friend has thought it advisable, and for this I do not blame him, to make a compromise with himself, to not carry out to the fullest extent the views he entertains on this matter. My hon. friend realizes that conciliation and compromise is an instrument of government, and that while it is quite proper and right for any one to hold his own convictions, it is also proper to remember that other people have convictions which they also hold dear. My hon. friend will realize that in a country like this, inhabited as it is by two different races, a policy of compromise and conciliation is indispensable if we want to make Canada a nation. This is the principle he wants to apply from Canada to South Africa, and in this I abundantly agree with him.

With the terms of the resolution, I may say without any hesitation whatever, I altogether agree. The resolution advises that the war in South Africa should be settled on two principles. The first is the principle of British supremacy. I am glad to hear from my hon. friend from Labelle that he also agrees that the interests of South Africa and the interests of civilization at large require that South Africa should be under British supremacy. There are two races in South Africa, the British race and the Dutch race, equally proud, in many respects equally strong, so intermixed that it is impossible for either to have an absolutely homogeneous government. The Dutch and the British are there together—in the Cape, in Natal, in the Orange Free State, in the Transvaal, in Rhodesia. They are neighbours who meet together every day in the ordinary avocations of life. It is impossible to separate them. They must be governed by the same authority—which shall it be, Dutch or British? This resolution affirms that this authority shall be British. With this we are all agreed. British civilization is the very civilization which will give what the Transvaal hitherto has not had—equality of rights for all, whether they be Dutch or British. That was the cause of the war—to secure this equality, which did not exist in the Transvaal. The Outlanders had long sought to obtain it, but failed to do so. The resolution affirms that the authority in South Africa shall be British; and we know from past experience of British civilization everywhere, that if British supremacy reigns over South Africa, there shall be freedom, not only for the British, but for the Dutch as well.

The second principle affirmed in the resolution is, that there should be most generous treatment accorded by the victors to the vanquished, by the British to the Dutch. Sir, for my part I do not think any resolution is necessary to obtain this generous treatment for the Boers in South Africa. A brave foe always commands the respect of a brave opponent, and that is enough to show that the Dutch shall receive generous treatment at the hands of the British. Why, it was only a few days ago that on the banks of the Hart's river a position had been entrusted to a few men, most of them I am proud to say, Canadians. They were assaulted for the best part of a day by an enemy at

least eight times their superior in numbers. Each assault was repulsed, but after each assault the thin band of defenders were reduced in numbers. So reduced were they at last that there was not one man in that small force who had not been either killed or wounded. At last, when the position was carried, there was still a man defiant and proud—Bruce Carruthers was his name, a Canadian officer, I am proud to say—a name that is honoured in the heart of every one of his countrymen. By all the rules of war he might have been killed ; but from the ranks of the enemy, in their sympathy, came the cry : 'Do not kill him ; he is too brave a man ; he must live.' This, Sir, is the lesson of the war, and I have no doubt the victorious British now in South Africa will display the same spirit. I have no doubt they will say : 'The Dutch must live ; they have earned it by their gallantry in the field.' Sir, this is the position left to the men who are now engaged in South Africa, not only with war, but also with the negotiations for peace.

As to the right of this parliament to interfere in this question, to affirm this resolution, I, for my part, unhesitatingly say there can be no discussion whatever. The parliament of Canada to-day is a sovereign parliament. It is a sovereign parliament within the British empire. Many years ago the parliament of Canada asserted this authority, and claimed not only the privilege but the right to interfere in any question which might affect any part of the British empire of which we form a portion. It is now almost twenty years since the parliament of Canada passed a resolution in favour of granting home rule to Ireland. We were not directly concerned with the question ; but why did parliament twice in succession affirm the position that home rule should be granted to Ireland ? Because we felt that it was in the interest of Canada as well as of the empire that the wrongs of Ireland should be righted. It was only two years ago that parliament passed a resolution in favour of praying the British parliament to amend the Coronation oath. Why did we do so ? Because we considered that it was a question which affected the rights and priviledges and consciences of a large section of His Majesty's subjects. It was only three years ago that this parliament passed a resolution expressing its sympathy with the Outlanders in the Transvaal. We then affirmed that we sympathized with the efforts of the British government to right the wrongs which the Outlanders were suffering. Surely to-day we have the right to pass such a resolution as the one presented by my hon. friend from Norfolk and seconded by my hon. friend from Labelle, to ask that the rights of the Dutch population be generously considered.

But while I do not hesitate to say that we have the inherent right to pass such a resolution and to present our views as to the conditions of peace, I ask myself, and I ask my hon. friend from Norfolk and my hon. friend from Labelle, is it opportune, is it judicious, is it advisable to present such a motion to-day ? That is the question and I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion at this moment such a motion is very injudicious. I will go further, and I will say to my hon. friend from Labelle that if I felt as he does, that the passing of this resolution to-day would strengthen the hands of the British government to be merciful and to grant an amnesty, I would not hesitate to agree to it. But the question to-day is not in this position. On the contrary, in my humble judgment—and I think I can make it clear to any man in this House—if we were to interfere at this moment, we might hinder that peace which we all desire to see established. Sir, my hon. friend from Norfolk knows, and my hon. friend from Labelle, who has been a close student of all these events, knows that at this very moment negotiations are going on for a settlement of the terms of peace. My hon. friends know that only a few days ago Lord Kitchener and Lord Milner met the heroes of the war on the Boer side—General De Wet, a brave soldier, General Delarey, another brave soldier, General Botha, another brave soldier. They have been in close conference, and we have every reason to believe, though we are not yet informed officially, that terms of peace have been agreed upon.

We know that the Boer delegates have gone back to the commandos in the field to submit to them the terms upon which peace may be secured. What these terms are we yet do not know, but is it advisable at this moment, when the conditions are submitted to the Boer commandos, that we should interfere and excite perhaps in them hopes which might clash with what has been done, and prevent the negotiations being brought to a peaceful and satisfactory conclusion ? My hon. friend from Norfolk may say perhaps that this is a remote contingency. My hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) may say that what we want is not to reach South Africa but England, but in these days of rapid communication, when news travels on wings, we were to pass such a resolution, its very terms would be wired at once to South Africa and possibly induce the Boers to break off the negotiations in order, if possible, to gain better terms. We are still in the dark as to the precise nature of the conclusions which have been reached but let me suppose a case, which is not a violent supposition. My hon. friend from Norfolk a moment ago referred to the civil war in the United States. Well, it is due to the American people to say that there never was more generous treatment accorded by a victorious foe to its enemy than was accorded by the men of the north to the vanquished south. There never was a page

more glorious in the history of any nation than that which was written. But my hon. friend knows as well as I, perhaps better—because he also has been a close student of those times and events—that after the war, the amnesty granted was not given to all those who participated in the strife. It is to the eternal pride of the American nation that not a drop of blood was shed on the scaffold, that not a man was punished for his participation in the war, that even Jefferson Davis, after a few years of seclusion, was set at liberty again. But my hon. friend knows well that immediately after Appomattox, which he described to us so eloquently, the amnesty granted to General Grant and later by Sherman did not cover all those who took part in the war, but only those who had laid down their arms after the surrender. A number of civilians were then debarred from the enjoyment of civil rights, but gradually, as the peace of the country increased and dangers were removed, all the shackles and disabilities were struck off, and at last a universal amnesty was proclaimed. Suppose at this moment terms were agreed on between Lord Kitchener on the one side and the Boer generals on the other, and suppose those terms did not include a general amnesty, but only an amnesty which covered the great mass of the belligerents, but excepted certain individuals. And suppose the resolution of my hon. friend were adopted and wired over to Africa, might not the Boers then say: 'Oh, we have the Canadian parliament standing behind us, and we must insist on better terms.' I do not know that my hon. friend would then find that by his resolution he was promoting the cause of peace. I think we had better at this moment leave this question in the hands of the brave soldiers who are dealing with it—Lord Kitchener on the one side, and Generals Delarey and De Wet on the other. I think we had better leave them to determine the settlement, and I firmly believe in my heart that the terms which will be granted and accepted by these brave soldiers will be such as can be accepted by every British subject all over the world. When the terms of settlement have been agreed upon, when the country enjoys again the blessings of peace, should it be found that the terms were not as generous as, in the judgment of my hon. friend from North Norfolk and my hon. friend from Labelle, or perhaps my own, they ought to be, we shall not abdicate the right of the Canadian parliament to affirm and send its views to the imperial authorities. It will not be too late then, because that will be the time when we can speak effectively. But at this moment, when negotiations are pending, it seems to me the argument is overwhelming that perhaps we would lose all in attempting to save all. These are the views I have to submit to the House and to my hon. friend from North Norfolk, and if I have any wish which I can express to him, speaking, I believe, the sense of both sides of the House, it would be that he ought not to press this motion, but agree to withdraw it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I regret extremely, Mr. Speaker, that the unavoidable absence of the leader on this side of the House imposes upon me the task of offering a few remarks in respect to this resolution, but I must confess that what has fallen from the lips of my right hon. friend the First Minister has rendered much easier the task imposed upon me. It struck me from the very first that this resolution was extremely untimely—I might almost say out of place, to use no harsher expression. The circumstances are these. After a protracted and very bitter struggle, the two great enemies have entered upon negotiations in order to arrive at some basis of arrangement. I believe also that they have agreed upon terms, but what these terms are it is impossible to say. In fact the home government itself is probably at present not informed as to the details. It seems to me, therefore, that, under these circumstances—and I believe that in this respect I am fortunate in representing the opinions of my friends who sit around me to-day—regrettable, whatever may be our prerogatives—and I would be the first to revindicate the rights and privileges of parliament—that we should take any action which might interfere with the negotiations. Such interference might defeat the very object of this resolution, to which in reality very few, I am sure in this House, have any objection. It might imperil not only the beneficent work upon which the home government is at present engaged, but also the advantages which the Boers are anxious to secure.

The hon. gentleman who moved this resolution took up considerable time in explaining its opportuneness and purport, in which he was perfectly right, but it seems to me that at this critical moment in this deplorable war, the voice of the politician—and in using that term, I am not implying anything which is not meritorious—should be silent, and we should leave the settlement completely in the hands of those armed foes who are now deliberating in order to secure if possible what we all desire—a satisfactory conclusion of this terrible conflict.

I believe that this parliament, with the sovereign rights which we undoubtedly have, can deliberate and express its opinion on every question. Yet I have been forced to the conclusion that, in a matter of this importance, in view of the constitutional principles which govern us, it would be better for our parliament, as it would be better for the British parliament, to observe the rule which I think they have steadily adhered to, and to which they have shown their adherence within the past few days—the rule that the conclusion of a treaty belongs to the executive authority. Parliament, of course, as my right hon.

friend (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) observed a moment ago, has reserved the right to criticise the conditions of the treaty when that treaty is concluded. And that is a rule which we should adhere to under the present circumstance, particularly in view of the fact that we have not the information necessary to enable us to form an opinion. In listening to my hon. friend from Norfolk, in listening to the remarks so vehemently urged by my hon. friend from Labelle, I was struck with the thought that, at this very hour, when great and courageous men are deliberating in the field in South Africa upon the conditions of the cessation of hostilities, how pitiful, if these hon. gentlemen will allow me the expression, how commonplace must appear the remarks which we make here, and how deficient in any truth and correct comprehension of the necessary important details which must attend any settlement. We can well take example form the attitude of the mother of our parliaments, that great assembly upon which this is modeled. It is a significant fact that, at this moment, the parliament of Great Britain has not taken up the study of this question, but has abstained, as it seems to me it should abstain, from deliberating on the question which, in its present critical stage can only be settled upon the field of battle itself. And I have remarked with no small degree of admiration that the great public men of England, the foremost men of that great country, where the almost constant necessity exists for public utterance on public questions, have refrained studiously from offering any deliberate opinion upon this serious question, as they are obliged to offer opinions every day upon other questions which present themselves for deliberation and decision in that free country. At a moment like this, and holding this view of the situation, I would not for an instant take up the task of pointing out certain serious discrepancies which have struck me not only in the speech of my hon. friend from North Norfolk, but also and more particularly in the remarks offered by my young friend the talented member for Labelle. I will not do that. God forbid that, holding the opinion that this discussion should, as soon as possible, drop, I should commit the indiscretion of entering upon the discussion of these discrepancies, which, under other circumstances, I should certainly deal with. I must say that, amongst many painful circumstances which attend public life, it is very satisfactory to see that upon a matter of this gravity, I believe I may say that there is a quasi unanimity in this House. I believe—and I may add this to the remarks made by the right hon. Prime Minister who preceded me—that not only could we do serious injury to the British cause, which has been so courageously upheld by our own fellow-countrymen in South Africa, not only could we do serious injury to the cause of the Boers themselves, a cause which must arouse our sympathy, if not to the extent indicated by my hon. friend from Labelle, certainly to that extent which is always won by courage and valour—but I do believe that, upon the occasion of the visit to England of the Prime Minister of this country to take part in the coronation, any resolution which we might adopt, any view which this parliament might authoritatively express would place serious obstacles in the way of the performance of the task, which is a noble one and in which we all take an interest, of representing this great Dominion at that imposing ceremony. I believe that any resolution that we might pass might embarass the right hon. gentleman himself. Whatever views we may hold upon the great public questions in our own country, I, for one, would be extremely sorry on a matter of this gravity to embarass the right hon. gentleman in a mission which I submit, in more than one sense, he performs on behalf of both sides of this House. Mr. Speaker, I do regret that my hon. friend from North Norfolk has seen fit to bring this motion to the notice of the House ; I do regret that my hon. friend from Labelle has taken part in supporting it. My young friend from Labelle, who has many qualities that I very much admire, has not the deep interest in this matter that some others have. Let me remind him of that day when the friends and adherents of Macduff brought to him the harrowing news of the death of his wife and children. His henchmen surrounded him, sought to inspire him with the legitimate desire of revenge for this awful outrage. When Malcolm urges revenge upon him, we all remember the answer of Macduff—'He has no children.' Sir, my thoughts and my feelings go out generously to those who have a greater interest, a nearer interest, perhaps, in this matter than I have myself. And I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that many a man far and near—aye, Sir, and many a woman, too—will silently experience a feeling of deep gratitude to those of us in this House who, remembering that others have so many dear relatives upon the field of battle in South Africa, adopt the suggestion which some of us have ventured to make, that at this moment the discussion of this subject should be dropped.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would not say anything on this subject——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Drop it, drop it.

Mr. SPROULE. I would not attempt to say anything on this subject but for the fact that I think we have been introducing a principle in this House of late years that is not conducive to the best results, and that is, upon every little occasion, of giving advice to the mother country. If I thought the mother country required advice, I would be one of the first to offer it. But it is because I do not share that opinion that I desire to protest against this principle and against this resolution. I

may say, in passing, that in my judgment the whole tenor of this resolution and of the speeches supporting it are an implied denial that the instincts of the British nation are humane and generous, and that they are disposed to do what is right. If we believe conscientiously and implicitly that the instincts of the British nation are to do what is right, what is generous and humane, where is there any necessity for such a resolution ? I oppose it also because I think it is ill-timed. It is ill-timed to start a discussion in this House at the very moment, as hon. gentlemen have admitted, when negotiations are going on, negotiations that we sincerely hope and believe will bring about a peace to the satisfaction of all. I believe the resolution is unnecessary because England has ever been generous, as all her history shows, to conquered foes. It is an instinct of the Anglo-Saxon race, and that instinct has been in evidence in all the history of the British power the world over. England has been most liberal, most humane, most generous, in her treatment of those who have been conquered by her. But we cannot but remember how necessary it is that peace should be established on a firm basis in South Africa; because thrice already England has had trouble with her South African colonies, and it is absolutely necessary that peace should be established upon a firm basis in order that the rights of every British subject may be secured beyond peradventure in that country. For this reason, if for no other, I say it is unnecessary that we should interfere by resolution at the present time. It is because I think this resolution is improper, uncalled for, and is an unwarranted interference with the prerogatives of the British government, that I oppose it. I do not think that we are warranted by our past services in passing a resolution in the Canadian parliament giving advice to the imperial government, notwithstanding our liberality and our endeavour to sustain British authority in that far distant country. It is also because I believe this resolution is in very bad taste that I offer objection to it. To justify it upon the ground of what we have done, I think is in bad taste. What we have done we have done believing it to be right, believing it to be our duty; therefore, I do not think we are justified in invoking our past services as a plea for passing this resolution. I think the resolution is indiscreet. Once before when we offered advice with regard to the internal affairs of the British empire, we are reminded that the Queen would have regard to the advice of her constitutional advisers, or in other words, that she did not think it proper that the Canadian parliament should offer advice to the mother country regarding affairs which concerned her and not ourselves. Now I am far from saying that we have no right to tender advice; I believe, with those who have already spoken, that we have such a right; but I do not regard it as the part of wisdom at this time that we should offer any advice. We are here to legislate for Canada and not for the purpose of settling South African affairs. Believing that we should attend to our own business, and believing as I do that we are drifting into an unsound custom of tendering advice to the imperial parliament on the most trivial occasions, I hold the views I have expressed, and I believe that this motion should be withdrawn.

Mr. CHARLTON. Of course, I do not need to recount any of the arguments I made in justification of my motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope the hon. member is not closing this debate, because I intend to speak on this motion.

Mr. CHARLTON. I may say that at the request of the premier, I was about to withdraw the motion. But I will take the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as I am upon my feet, of stating that my attitude on this occasion is not based upon any change of opinion as to the propriety of the motion. I do not by any means withdraw any of the opinions I have expressed; the country may judge of the correctness of those opinions by the facts and the arguments I have advanced. But I realize that the leader of this government has a right to demand of me in this case a certain line of conduct; he is responsible not only for his own opinions, but for the opinions of the government. While I do not concede that the position that I occupy is an improper one, and while I take due notice of the premier's own admission, that he was glad the discussion had taken place, and that he approved of the principle of the resolution, still as he asks that the motion be withdrawn upon the ground of its being inexpedient and inopportune, I think I am bound to be governed by the desire expressed by the Prime Minister; and with the consent of the seconder of this motion, and with the consent of the House, at the suggestion and request of the government, I beg to withdraw the motion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Mr. Charlton moves, seconded by Mr. Bourassa, for leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. MONET. Does that prevent me from speaking on the motion ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That does not prevent any one speaking.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE — THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—Mr. Harty.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia (Limited).—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

SUPPLY—SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—TERMS OF PEACE.

The House resumed debate on the motion of the Minister of Finance, that the House go again into Committee of Supply, and the motion of Mr. Charlton in amendment thereto.

Mr. D. MONET (Laprairie and Napierville). Mr. Speaker, I wish for a few moments to refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). That hon. gentleman admitted the unquestionable right of this parliament to express its opinion on every important issue with which the motion now before us deals, but he claimed that the resolution was untimely. And in that contention he followed the right hon. the leader of the House, and his own lieutenant-leader, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). This contention being the very contention of the hon. leader of this House and his own lieutenant-leader, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), I hope the hon. member for East Grey will not charge me with any lack of courtesy if, instead of replying to every item of his speech, I merely refer him to the criticism which I intend to make on the speech of the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier opened his remarks by saying that he regretted very much the absence of his leader from the House to-day, because owing to that absence it became his duty to voice the feeling of the opposition on the subject that was being discussed in this House. I believe the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was right when he regretted the absence of his leader. I believe it would have been far better for the hon. member for Jacques Cartier if his leader had been here, and had himself taken the responsibility of the attitude that has been taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. What is the conclusion to be drawn from the speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier ? It is this : that the lieutenant leader of the Conservative party, the leader of the Conservative party of the province of Quebec, refuses to send to the British parliament a humble prayer in favour of the poor victims of this imprudent war in South Africa, asking for mercy in their favour, when this very prayer was called for by an English-speaking member, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I do not believe that this attitude of the lieutenant-leader of the Conservative party will ever be highly appreciated by the Conservative party in that province.

Then the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, while not explicitly finding fault with the hon. member for Labelle for joining hands with the hon. member for North Norfolk, referred to the fact with a certain ironical smile covering his lips ; and it was very easy to see that he was amused at such a spectacle being given in this House. But if the hon. member for North Norfolk has been converted to the ideas that have been expressed by the hon. member for Labelle on the question of the South African war, he is not the only member of this House who has been.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier himself, in his capacity of lieutenant-leader of the Conservative party, is a convert to the views of the hon. member for Labelle. In the by-election that took place since the last session of this parliament in the county of Laval—and I see the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) sitting close to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and I challenge him to deny the assertion I am going to make—is it not a fact that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in his capacity of leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec, said that he blamed this government for allowing England to recruit soldiers in this country to go to the front in South Africa ? This is the very attitude that was taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in the by-election in Laval, and I ask him and I ask the hon. member for Laval to tell me if the hon. member for Labelle has ever gone further in that direction ? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier took the very same attitude in the by-election that took place in St. James Division, Montreal, where Mr. Bergeron, an ex-leader of the Conservative party, was candidate. He said there that he would have supported the motion brought before this House by the hon. member for Labelle if that motion had not been an academic motion, because, so far as the ideas were concerned, he sympathized entirely with the views expressed by the hon. member for Labelle. So, if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier saw fit to sneer a little about the hon. member for Labelle joining hands with the hon. member for North Norfolk, I think every member of this House can accord the same sneering to himself, because he has done the same thing as the hon. member for North Norfolk ; and why did he do so ? I am very far from blaming the hon. mem-

ber for Jacques Cartier for having done what he has done. I believe he has done so knowing that he voiced the feeling of the province of Quebec when he turned in the opposite direction from that which he had always followed on the South African question since he first occupied a seat in this House. Now, it is true that the hon. member for North Norfolk has changed a little his opinions about the South African war, or rather about the quality of the Boers peopling the Transvaal and the Orange Republic. I remember very well, when this question of the South African war was first brought up before the House, the hon. member for North Norfolk gave us one of the best reasons that could be adduced in favour of England waging that war, that England had the undoubted right to force British institutions on these very same ignorant and half-barbarian people of the Transvaal. To-day I am glad to see that the hon. member for North Norfolk—and I congratulate him on the fact—considers that this brave race of the Transvaal deserves better treatment than he himself formerly thought should be accorded to them.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, in discussing the resolution which we are now debating, admitted that this parliament had the right to express its opinion on the question at issue ; but he said that the resolution was extremely untimely. Mr. Speaker, did the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, or did even the hon. leader of the government, give a single reason why this resolution is untimely ? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is very timely. In what circumstances is it brought before this House ? We know perfectly well that just now the question in England is, what treatment are we going to give to the Boers ? We know perfectly well that the decision is not arrived at yet. We do not know very well on what basis the peace will be made. Then, I say, if this parliament has a right ever to give its opinion on the terms of the peace which is going to be made, now is the time for giving that opinion. Those who claim that this resolution is untimely would do well to state when it will be timely for us to offer it. When will it be timely for us to ask the British parliament to give such treatment to the Boers of the Transvaal and the Republic of Orange ?

An hon. MEMBER. Never.

Mr. MONET. An hon. member says, never. Then he does not share the opinion of his leader, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who said very plainly that he agreed with the very terms of the resolution. When will it be timely for us to express our opinion in the matter ? Will it be after the peace is concluded ? I say it will then be untimely for us to say anything about it, because the decision then will have been arrived at and there will be no use in our saying anything about it. The attitude of the right hon. leader of the government and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Monk) reminds me of that taken by a lawyer who, though he appeared to plead a case before the judge, would not speak. And when the judge said to him : Well, give me your opinion before I decide the case, the lawyer would reply : No, it is not time now for me to plead the case, but when the judgment is rendered I will give my opinion. It seems to me that if we accept the view of those who claim that this is not the proper time for us to express our opinion, that time will never come. If we are to express an opinion at all, there can be no doubt that to-day is the proper time to do so. No valid reasons have been given why this resolution should be declared untimely, but on the contrary very good reasons can be given why it is now very opportune indeed.

Let us look back to what took place before the war broke out. A few months before war was declared, at a time when there were only rumours of war, the right hon. the leader of the government rose in his place in this House on the 31st July, and taking advantage of the silent consent of the whole House, proposed a resolution without having previously given notice. The first part of his resolution read as follows :

> Resolved, that this House has viewed with regret the complications which have arisen in the Transvaal Republic, of which Her Majesty is suzerain, from the refusal to accord to Her Majesty's subjects now settled in that region any adequate participation in its government.

Then the resolution concluded :

> That this House, representing a people which has largely succeeded——

Mind you, Sir, the very circumstance mentioned in support of the resolution I am quoting presents itself again to our consideration.

> —which has largely succeeded, by the adoption of the principle of conceding equal political rights to every portion of the population, in harmonizing estrangements and in producing general content with the existing system of government, desires to express its sympathy with the efforts of Her Majesty's Imperial authority to obtain for the subjects of Her Majesty who have taken up their abode in the Transvaal such measures of justice and political recognition as may be found necessary to secure them in the full possession of equal rights and liberties.

On the 31st July, 1899, we considered it advisable for this House to pass a resolution assuring the British parliament that we sympathized with them in their efforts to secure to the Uitlanders of the Transvaal, who were still termed British subjects——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONET—the rights to which they were entitled. My hon. friend behind me says 'hear, hear,' and no doubt we may be told that in this resolution we were simply

expressing our sympathy with the British parliament in their endeavour to give equal rights to British subjects, whereas to-day we are asking that same parliament to grant a certain measure of magnanimity to the Boers. But I would remind hon. gentlemen that since the proclamation of Lord Roberts, the Boers have become British subjects at an English point of view, and when we are asking the British parliament to give the Boers the best terms possible, we only asking in their favour the equal rights which in our former resolution we asked for the Uitlanders. If, therefore, a few months before war was declared, it was right to take the step we did, why have we not the right to-day, before peace is concluded, to say on what basis we would like to see peace effected between England and the Transvaal ?

I do not suppose that much more can be said on this question. It seems to me that it has always been recognized in this House that the Canadian parliament has the right to make any representations to the British parliament concerning any matter in which we are but indirectly interested. We have done this several times in favour of home rule, and to those who object to this resolution because it is untimely and because we may rely on the magnanimity of the English people, I would say : Could not the same objection have been urged against those who asked this House to pass resolutions in favour of home rule ? Could we not then have been told that we might rely on the magnanimity of the British people and the British parliament in their dealings with the Irish people ?

The right we have to express our opinion is one that no hon. member in this House can dispute, especially in such a case as this, owing to the contribution which Canada has been called on to make in favour of England—a contribution which has been pretty heavy for Canada. That certainly gives us an undoubted right, apart from every other consideration, to send across to the home government the prayer embodied in the resolution before the House. Of course, owing to the fact that the mover of the resolution has withdrawn it, no practical result can ensue from this debate, but I believe it my duty to record my opinions on the matter, and if the hon. gentleman would press his resolution to a division, I would vote in its favour.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (North Victoria). It has been my misfortune, Mr. Speaker, not to have been present to hear the excellent addresses made by the mover of the motion (Mr. Charlton) and by my good friend the right hon. leader of the government as well as the other speeches made on this occasion. However, the motion is here and it speaks for itself. The introductory paragraph speaks of ' maintaining and firmly establishing '—I should imagine that our worthy friend (Mr. Charlton) would have transposed these terms and have first spoken of establishing and then of maintaining British supremacy in South Africa. The resolution reads :

> This House is of opinion that British supremacy should be maintained and firmly established in South Africa.

At present British supremacy is not firmly established there, and it has to be firmly established first, and then maintained irrespective of what the consequences may be.

The second part of the resolution I entirely dissent from :

> And that in the interest of peace and of future tranquillity, harmony and homogeneity, it is expedient to offer universal amnesty as a condition of peace and submission to British control, to all persons in arms against British authority in Cape Colony, Natal, the Orange River Colony, the Transvaal, and all other portions of the British dominions in South Africa.

From that view I entirely dissent. There is a statement—I have forgotten exactly where it is to be found—to the effect that the road to the nether regions is paved with good intentions. I am not impugning the motives of my good friend, the mover of this resolution, the hon. member for Norfolk, but there can be no doubt that it has been maudlin sentiment such as this that has prevented this war being closed long before now. We have had the pro-Boer in Britain sympathizing with the Boers. On any and every occasion, when disaster befell the British arms, no word of sympathy was heard from these gentlemen. But let the slightest victory be obtained by the Boers and they were jubilant ; let any treatment be meted out to these people in the way of forcing them to move from their farms and go into concentration camps and this maudlin sentiment—I use the word advisedly—has been shown by the pro-Boers, and not only the pro-Boers but by a large class of sentimental people. This it is that has given encouragement to the Boers that some European complication might arise, that some nation might intervene before the close of the war to engage Britain's attention elsewhere, and then they would be guaranteed their independence. To my mind there has been but one course open to Great Britain from the outset. As was said by the right hon. leader of the House, in language that, I believe, no tongue in this Dominion could match for beauty, the Boers themselves chose the arbitrament of war and they must be content to abide the consequences. There can be no conclusion to this war except that Britain shall force it to a finish, and that would mean the entire subjugation of that people. When they are subjugated, that is the time to extend the right hand of fellowship, that is the time for Great Britain to treat them as she has done the people in all her other colonies and give them

every opportunity to become true British citizens. Our good friend the member for North Norfolk must have had some object in bringing forward this motion. I cannot say what it has been however. If his object was to bring about peace, I can assure him that if his tone could have been heard in the Boer camps it would have given those people great encouragement and would have tended to the prolongation of the war. His object certainly could not have been to promote the well-being of the Boers, because that would imply that Great Britain in the past has not accorded good treatment to the people she has conquered. But I think the pages of history will be searched in vain for evidence in support of any such contention. Britain has never treated any people whom she has conquered otherwise than in the most merciful and magnanimous spirit. But there is danger in being magnanimous and great with a people you have not conquered. Even after you have conquered them there is danger of their misunderstanding your magnanimity and greatness and mistaking it for weakness. Again and again have the kindness and generosity of heart of Lord Roberts and other British commanders in the field been laughed at by the Boers, their magnanimity sneered at as weakness and they themselves held in scorn. There is only one way to manage a man if he is your opponent—conquer him and then treat him kindly. So, with the Boers, there is only one way—conquer them first, and then let magnanimity and greatness and mercy follow. Some are inclined to say that there is a desire on the part of our good friend to advertise himself. I would not endorse that for an instant, because our good friend has been well known in the history of this House and the country as undertaking to lead in all this class of sentimental subjects, which really amount to nothing so far as benefiting the people is concerned. And the trouble is, when it is all over, from his own professions we are never really sure where to find him. There are people who are unkind enough to say that this is a put up job between the hon. member for North Norfolk and the right hon. leader of the government. I do not believe that for an instant. I am satisfied that that is not so. It may have been that the right hon. leader of the government may have been consulted before this motion was brought to the attention of the House. He should have been consulted. But, if he gave our worthy friend the answer then that he gave him to-day, that he could not endorse his motion, that it was inopportune, or had told him that he wished him to withdraw it, would not a loyal follower, such as the member for North Norfolk has been of the leaders of his party through all their devious turnings and twistings for twenty years or so—would not he have been only too willing to withdraw it instead of taking up the time of the House and placing it before the country? I am satisfied he would. I do not object to the motion because it is ill-timed or inopportune, or anything of that kind. I oppose it on principle and I will give my reason.

I deal first with the Free Staters, and Transvaalers. I do not find that the hon. gentleman mentions these but speaks of 'persons in arms.' But, so far as concerned those who were Free Staters and Transvaalers before the war, I will join hands with him. More than that, I stand here to say that if these people had been properly used they would have laid down their arms nearly two years ago. It is a well known fact that General DeWet offered to lay down his arms and those of 18,000 followers. When the Free State was annexed by that beautifully-worded proclamation, got out by some of these artistic young ink-slingers—I was not in the party, I want the House to understand—annexing the Free State the condition was promulgated that those who would lay down their arms would be allowed to return to their farms and enjoy their civil rights. That was all right, but it was in another, a negative clause that the difficulty lay—that those who did not lay down their arms would be treated, when captured, not as prisoners of war, but as rebels. That clause could not have reached half the Free Staters in the field, but I maintain that every self-respecting Britisher must have found it objectionable. DeWet withdrew his army to the mountains away on the eastern side of the Free State and gave General Roberts an almost uninterrupted march to Pretoria. It is well known that a bitter feeling existed between the Free Staters and the Transvaalers. The Transvaalers deserted their capital, refusing to defend it. As soon as that news reached DeWet, he sent word to the British General—General Rundle, I think it was—that he was ready to lay down his arms, and gave as his reason that, inasmuch as the Transvaalers had failed to defend their capital he felt, as a Free Stater, that, in the interest of the two races and in the interests of the great future of South Africa the war should come to a close. He asked as a condition, a condition which I believe they will grant to-day, a condition which should have been granted then by any magnanimous general, that in place of being treated as a rebel, he and his kin of Free State birth and nationality should be treated as prisoners of war. It was denied him by the highest military authorities, I believe, in South Africa; and as if to drive him to surrender, his property was destroyed and his vineyards and his home were wasted. General DeWet is reported to have registered an oath that he would make the British pay in blood and treasure for that piece of work, and I kind of reckon he has carried out his threat. To-day I believe the same terms that General DeWet demanded then are being accorded to these

men, the Free Staters and Transvaalers, and I say, rightly so, for they are Free Staters and Transvaalers. I never questioned their right to fight against us and bowl us over on any and every occasion, but I questioned their right to deprive us of the rights of British subjects in their republics.

But there is another question that my hon. friend from North Norfolk laid stress upon, that is the colonial rebels. Now, my worthy friend has read history, as every intelligent member of this House has. Many revolutions have been justifiable. No man to-day, and no man at that time, ever questioned the right to rebel of Hampden and Cromwell. No lover of responsible government has ever questioned the righteousness of the rebellion of 1688; no man I ever met in modern times questions the righteousness of the American war of independence from the colonial view point. It has established throughout the world the principle that taxation carries with it the right of representation. When tyrants and oligarchs undertake to govern and tax people without giving them the right of representation, then they expose themselves to rebellion. In the American civil war the people of the south had, as they thought, a justification for rebellion in the defence of their old established principle of slavery. But it was a principle not consonant with the great principles of British and American liberty, and therefore it was deemed in the eyes of the world as an unrighteous cause, though others undoubtedly deemed it a righteous one. But I ask the hon. member for North Simcoe can he——

An hon. MEMBER. North Norfolk.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The two hon. members, Mr. Speaker, for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) and North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) are so intimately associated with each other in little affairs in this House, that I find myself referring to the member for North Simcoe instead of to the member for North Norfolk—I ask the member for North Norfolk to lay his finger upon one solitary cause for rebellion that any Boer in the British colonies of South Africa ever had. He has not done it, and the man does not stand in this House who can do it. Who can give any more reason why any Boer in South Africa, any British Boer in South Africa, should rebel than why any man in the city of Ottawa should step out and rob a bank or murder his neighbour? He can't do it. The mere fact that they are of the same race and lineage is no reason. Thousands of loyal Boers have fought for Britain against their own kinsfolk. The records of history show that great movements have never necessarily brought men of the same race together. Let us go back to the days when the ancestors of these men were fighting for the liberties of Europe, when the old Batavians, or as we know them in later times, the Dutchmen of Europe, who were fighting for liberty against the tyranny of Spain and Austria. Were they fighting as men of one race? Not at all. It was people of one race fighting against the tyrants of the same race, only they were allied with the free men of all nationalities. In France, the country of those gallant fellows, the Huguenots, whose descendants we find distinguishing themselves in South Africa to-day, when these men were struggling for liberty in the days of Coligny and Colbert, and that grand hero whose statue stands prominently in the old citadel at Quebec, Samuel De Champlain—when those men were struggling for liberty in Europe, who was it that fought side by side with them? Why, Sir, the free men of Britain, and in every struggle that Huguenots and Dutchmen engaged in all through history they have fought shoulder to shoulder with the free men of Britain. And, Sir, had they been fighting in a just cause in Africa to-day, mark my words, they would have had the free men of Britain standing shoulder to shoulder with them again. There were also in that cause thousands of loyal Boers fighting for Britain.

Now what are the conditions? The Boer people had been repeatedly saved by Britain from the attacks of the natives, they had been placed on their farms by Britain, they had been given their liberty by Britain, they had been protected. There was not a solitary farm that was not regularly visited by the Cape mounted policemen, and law and order were everywhere dominant. They were free from taxation, they were free from excise duties in South Africa. Neither directly nor indirectly have I ever heard any man pretend to say that the British Boers in South Africa had any cause of complaint, and I never met one of them that pretended to have any. Their only excuse was the race cry. Now, Sir, there has been a little too much of this race cry, not only in South Africa, but in Canada. We don't want these appeals to race and religion in this country. We want men to stand out in South Africa, and in Canada, on the basis of principle, and to leave race and religious cries out of the question entirely. Their only excuse in South Africa was the race cry. When you come to analyse their plea, they say they were promised by the Kruger and Steyn oligarchy exemption from debt, they were promised the farms of the British loyalists, and the Boer loyalists too; they were promised shares in the Rand and in the other great mining corporations in South Africa. These were the excuses they offered, and the excuses that are offered to-day by the Boer rebels, by the British colonials who rebelled in South Africa. These are the only excuses they make; and yet my hon. friend from North Simcoe—North Norfolk—coolly stands up in the House and asks for an amnesty for this type of men. Now, I want to point out to him that these Boer rebels

in South Africa have lost little or nothing. I could name scores of them who took the poor whites, labouring men and their families on their large estates, and forced them to go on much against their will and fight against Britain. But whenever things got dangerous they—the leaders—withdrew to their own farms, and as soon as the British came along they would then hob-nob with the British and become advisers, or interpreters, or counsellors, in order to escape the penalty due them for their disloyalty. I will give you one instance, a very wealthy man named Duplessis, who comes from the bank of the Vaal river, at Middle Drift, near Kimberley. He brought a number of those poor Boers to work for him on a Saturday, and his excuse was that he wanted them to build kraals for the cattle and sheep and goats. These poor whites came over with their utensils and implements in order to build these kraals. On Monday morning Duplessis, who was a field cornet of the Boers, commandeered every man of them and made them go to the front to fight. A number of these fellows were killed, and others were taken prisoners. There was one of them, whose name was Van Vuren, and the incident in connection with whom I know very well. He was taken prisoner, tried for being a rebel and sentenced to two years' imprisonment in South Africa for the offence of taking up arms against the British government, while the man who brought him over under false pretenses, commandeered him and compelled him to fight, because he is rich and stands in with the British officers, was let off with five year's disfranchisement. The prime mover of the whole district is disfranchised for five years, while the poor beggars who were commandeered are either buried under the sod, or breaking stones for a period of years in South Africa. This is one of the gentlemen that our hon. friend wishes to let off. The leading rebels have lost nothing. Their stock was unmolested by the Boer forces. It was always the loyalists' stock that was raided, and I say it would have paid the British loyalist in South Africa hands down ten times over, from a dollars and cents point of view, to have joined the Boer forces in South Africa at the beginning of this war. The Boer rebels in South Africa are treated better than the colonial loyalists in South Africa. The loyalists—both British and Boer—were driven from their homes. They had to escape as best they could, they had to leave their property at the mercy of these people, their women and children were left on the farms at the mercy of these Boers. I am very glad to say that in the great majority of cases the treatment accorded them was fair, but it was imprisonment all the same. They dared not communicate with their friends, they dared not touch one of their own animals, and they were practically prisoners on their farms. Their property was taken, yet the claims of the loyalists have been actually denied while their Boer neighbours who were disloyal have been paid pound for pound for all that was taken from them by the Boers in the course of the war. There is one case which I think is the most scandalous on record. Before one of these compensation courts a gentleman and his wife were proving their claim, but the British officer refused to allow their claim on the ground that the wife should have stayed on the farm—the wife, a young English lady, about 23 or 24 years of age, with an infant baby—and should have protected the farm against the Boers, and cared for the animals upon it. She inquired where was the strong right arm of Britain upon which British rights had depended. She depended upon the British soldier to protect her, and when he failed her, she was expected to have guarded the stock against the Boers. Her husband and all her relatives were fighting for Britain, and she was forced to leave the farm as a refugee. That is the treatment which was accorded British loyalists in South Africa. When I speak of British loyalists, I mean loyalists of British stock as well as of Boer stock, because I am proud to say that there are tens of thousands of Boers out there who from the start to the finish have been thoroughly loyal to Britain in this affair.

There is another class besides the colonial rebel, that, I maintain, should be excluded from any such resolution as this, and it is the hired mercenary, the soldier of fortune, the adventurer who joined the Boer ranks to fight against Britain. He certainly should be excluded from any such resolution as the one proposed by the hon. member for North Norfolk. If this resolution were to carry, or if this principle were to be adopted, it would put a premium on revolution, and that sort of thing will not do. If men have a just cause for rebelling, why, then, by all means, let us be civil to them when the war is over, but until the hon. gentleman can point out one solitary case of complaint on the part of the colonial rebel against the British government, then, I maintain, he has no excuse whatever for bringing any such resolution before the House. It must be made a risky job for these gentlemen to turn out and murder a neighbour, destroy his property and rob him of his stock. The hon. gentleman who has preceded me spoke of the settlement when this war is over. There can only be one settlement for the British government, and I trust it will be a settlement along British lines. We will give them the rights and liberties of Britain, the rights and liberties that have made Britain great, we will give them her language, her literature and her history. If those institutions which have made Britain great, which have made her the envy of the nations, are not sufficient for the people of South Africa, then let the war continue to a finish, or until we bring these people to their senses. I would treat them fairly. The Free Staters and Transvaalers who lay down their arms should be

treated in a fair spirit, and I never would ask them to surrender as rebels, but with the colonial rebels I have no sympathy whatever, nor has any man who is at all cognizant of the facts of the case. I maintain that this is a mere piece of maudlin sentiment, and at all times in the world's history it has done more harm than good to bring any such opinions as these before any country on an occasion of this kind. It is time enough to be magnanimous and great when the people you are dealing with prove themselves magnanimous and great, prove that they regret the course they have pursued, and that they are ready to give an absolute guarantee that on the first occasion which presents itself in the near future they will not rise and seek to destroy that flag that I saw floating from the top of this tower to-day. As I came in on the train to-day I saw that grand old flag torn almost to tatters, and I wondered what was going on in the House. When I reached here and found that the hon. member for North Norfolk had been holding forth upon the notion of granting amnesty to the rebels of South Africa, who had arisen and murdered their neighbours, destroyed their property and robbed them of their goods, and who had turned the women and children into camps up and down the country—not the concentration camps that hon. gentlemen talk so much about—I could not but feel that the breeze blowing at the top of the tower had found possibly a fitting semblance in the wind that was blowing in the House of Commons.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciate the magnitude of the task of dealing with an imperial question in this Canadian parliament, but I do not object to the motion moved by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on that account. If plain every day Canadians are good enough to give their lives to the empire, I suppose plain every day members of parliament are good enough to give their views in support of the prestige of the empire, or to pull down that prestige if it so pleases them. I consider it is perfectly legitimate for this parliament to discuss the question of the war in South Africa, but not altogether because of Canada's contribution in men and money. Canada has reason to be proud of her contributions in men, but I am not so sure about her reason to be proud of her contribution in money.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Neither am I sure that Canada, so far as this war has yet gone, has reason to be proud of the way in which she has treated her soldiers who have suffered disability, or the relatives of those who have suffered loss of life in that war. Let that be as it may, I would not feel that I was doing my duty if I allowed a motion against whch I feel so strongly to be lad before this House, and to let it go by giving only a silent vote against it. I look upon the prestige of the British empire as a question of the most intimate local character, concerning every dependency and every citizen in every dependency throughout the empire. The maintenance of the prestige of Great Britain is just as necessary to the peace and welfare of Canada as it is to the peace and welfare to the county of York in England. So long as Canada is a part of the empire, the safety of Canada depends upon the strength of the empire. Anything that weakens the empire weakens Canada, endangers Canada, and hurts every citizen of Canada. Just as this is the sentiment which prompted our young men to volunteer in thousands to risk their lives on the battlefields of Africa, so it should be the sentiment with which this parliament should approach this question. I am not above giving advice nor am I afraid to give advice to the government of Britain upon occasion, but I object to the character of the advice on this occasion. I object to the advice, I object still more strongly to what appears to be the motive behind that advice. The motion, as I understand it, is a motion demanding—I say demanding—in the name of the men we have sent and the money we have spent; demanding amnesty for the rebels of Cape Colony; for the men who have added treachery to treason; the men who have added murder and pillage to treachery; the men who are outside the law of civilization in any civilized country in the world ; the men whose lives, liberties or civil right are forfeit under the law of every civilized country.

Mr. BOURASSA. Was that because they released Methuen ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand that the Cape rebels released Methuen. I do not understand that General Delarey was a Cape rebel. I understand that certain Cape rebels who were captured were hanged according to the law of nations, and I say that others deserve to be hanged. I say that when this parliament of Canada or the members of this parliament of Canada ask the government of Great Britain to violate the law of nations, they weaken the prestige of the empire to that extent, and they violate the sense of right of this Dominion of Canada, and of loyalty throughout this empire. They throw disrespect on the empire in the minds of every civilized nation and every honourable man in every civilized nation in the world. I say that such advice is beneath contempt. I say it is of itself and in its nature treasonable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. It is of itself and in its nature treasonable, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. It is absolutely unworthy of any loyal citizen, to say nothing of any loyal representative in a loyal colony of the empire. Let there be no mistake on this question. We cannot be both for and against the empire. If we are not for the empire then we are against it, and if we are not for carrying out the laws of civilized nations in the protection of the prestige and the dignity of the empire, and the safety and welfare of its loyal subjects, then we are against the empire, and neither more nor less. I say, Sir, that this motion comes with ill grace. A motion asking for leniency, for clemency for rebels—or for belligerents if you like—addressed to a nation whose whole course of clemency during the war towards her enemies has made her the laughing stock of these enemies and of the friends of these enemies in every country in the world.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, Britain has been made a laughing stock because she was as lenient as she has been; because she has taken the sworn word of men who do not honour their oath; men who have given up their arms, have been sent through the British lines as free and peaceful citizens, and then returned that clemency by shooting British soldiers in the back. I say, Sir, that it is ill-judged to address requests for clemency to a nation which has gone beyond the limits of reason in extending clemency to their enemies in this war. I have no hesitation in saying on my responsibility—which is equal to that of other hon. members—I say on my responsibility as a member of this House, that what is needed in the present case is not more but less clemency, so that it shall be understood by the world that it does not pay to be treasonable and disloyal; that it does not pay to burn and destroy the property of the loyal subjects of this empire. I am glad to know that merciful feelings prevail in the minds of so many hon. members. So am I merciful, but my merciful feelings are towards those who are loyal to the empire, and not to the disloyal enemies of our empire. Let me ask: Who has suffered more in this war—the British or the Boers? It may not be to our credit; unfortunately it is not to our credit; but it is a fact that the British people have suffered more in blood and money than have the Boers up to this time, and I say, Sir, that in mercy to ourselves we demand that such means be taken as shall bring this war to an end. But it will never be brought to an end so long as our opponents—believing them to be sensible and self-respecting men—are allowed to remain under the impression that they can stay in the field and carry a gun with impunity. If the Boers are what they are; then there is only one way to secure peace and that is by fighting this war to a finish. There is only one way to secure safety to the British empire in South Africa; there is only one way to secure safety for the loyal people of South Africa, be they Britain, or Boer, or black, and that is by fighting this war to a finish and letting it be known from sea to sea in South Africa, that it does not pay to be treasonable and disloyal; that it does not pay to organize treason and sedition year after year; that it does not pay to pillage your loyal neighbours and then give up your gun and go home pretending to be a peaceable citizen. Let it be understood that that game is not a good one; let it be understood that it does not pay to do that kind of business, and when that is understood, then a long step will be taken towards peace in South Africa.

From the beginning of this war to the end, whenever Britain showed the slightest inclination to slacken the iron hand, what was the result? Was it praise for the clemency of Britain? Was not the declaration heralded from every capital in Europe, and from city to city in the United States—I do not know but what it was whispered from house to house in some localities even in Canada—that Britain was getting weak; that it was fear or inability to cope with the conditions that led to that clemency? In every case Britain's clemency was a mistake. It encouraged the continuance of the war; and within the past week or two, because the Cape rebel Kritzinger was not put to the death penalty, as he richly deserved to be, it was heralded throughout the world that Britain was afraid to execute the death penalty upon him. Under these circumstances, I say that if these hon. members who moved and seconded this resolution are loyal to the empire—if they are——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has no right to impute any motive.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not impute. I asked the question.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has not even the right to doubt the loyalty of any member of this House.

Mr. OLIVER. If I am out of order, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw whatever part of my remarks you rule to be out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I say it is forbidden by the rules of this House to impute motives to any hon. member, and it is out of order to declare that any members of this House are disloyal, or even to express a doubt of their loyalty.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, if I am not allowed to express a doubt as to the loyalty of these hon. members, the only thing I can do is to leave it to the members of the House to draw their own conclusions. I will merely say, Mr. Speaker, that the facts have shown that wherever and whenever undue clemency was exercised by the British towards their enemies in South Africa, that occasion was used as an argument to prove, not that Britain was using clemency, but that Britain was cowardly and weak. That

was the argument that was used by those who were the enemies of Britain and of Canada, who were the enemies of civilization and liberty, of which throughout this world the prestige of the British empire is the greatest, if I should not go so far as to say the only safeguard. We are interested in maintaining that prestige, man by man, in this country. Our citizens have done their share, some part of their share, at any rate, towards sustaining that prestige ; and I can only again express regret that it should have been the part of any members of this House, at a time when there was danger of Britain erring, as she has erred before in her negotiations with her enemies and ours—at a time when Canada is sending two thousand more of her sons to fight the battles of the empire in South Africa—at a time when our men are dying day by day in South Africa for the glory and prestige of the empire and for the honour of Canada and the honour of every one of us in Canada—that this time and occasion should have been used by members of this House to move a resolution throwing discredit on the motives of Great Britain, and strengthening the enemies of Britain and Canada and of civilization and liberty and enlightenment throughout the world.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I wish to add, in the fewest possible words, my protest against the resolution which has been introduced into this House to-day by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). I never can find language to express myself to this House to my entire satisfaction ; but never have I been so much at a loss, as I am on this occasion, to find language to adequately express my feelings, I may say my indignation, at the terms of this resolution. I can only say that I consider that, not only is the present time inopportune for introducing such a resolution into this House, but if it were carried as the sense of this House, it would no doubt embarrass the British government in their present negotiations to bring about a peaceful settlement of the war that has been going on in South Africa. It would also, it seems to me, embarrass the Prime Minister in his negotiations with British statesmen when he goes to London in the coming June. But, Sir, the resolution is also inopportune because it offends the British people. It offends Englishmen all over the world. It is inopportune because it is introduced on this day, which all Englishmen honour as the day of their patron saint, St. George. I also protest against introducing such questions into this House as wasting the time of the House. As soon as two or three members had expressed themselves on the resolution, the hon. member for North Norfolk was going around and trying to withdraw it. It was too serious and far-reaching a matter to be introduced with any such intention. I felt, when the hon. member for North Norfolk was talking, that it was a great pity that he had not offered his services to Great Britain, and that the British government had not employed him to go to South Africa to supercede such eminent statesmen as Lord Milner and Lord Kitchener in disposing of this whole question. I have watched with interest the political wanderings of my hon. friend from North Norfolk. We saw him pass from a protectionist to a free trader, and from a free trader back to a protectionist, and from advocating a policy which would result in the annexation of this country to the United States to advocating that a regiment of British soldiers be stationed at the city of Quebec, though there was no more necessity for stationing a regiment of soldiers at the city of Quebec than there was at the city of Toronto. I have watched the hon. gentleman's inconsistencies in all these courses, and we see his inconsistency to-day in introducing this resolution.

He must have made his peace with the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), otherwise surely that hon. gentleman could not possibly give his support to one who made the ridiculous suggestions, on the eve of the last general elections, that we should station soldiers at Quebec. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) must have recanted that sentiment before he could have got the hon. member for Labelle to second this resolution. The hon. gentleman referred to the millions of dollars that we have spent in sending men to South Africa, our noble sons whom we despatched over there to risk their lives in this campaign. Well, we have spent but little over the $2,000,000, and certainly very little considering the great advantages we have always enjoyed under the protection of the British flag. What credit or honour is due to this government for the bravery of these men to whom the right hon. the Prime Minister referred ? What credit can this government take to itself for the conduct of that noble son of Canada, Lieut. Carruthers, and that other hero, Private Evans, who died so nobly on the veldt, and who, when he found his life blood ebbing fast away and his strength nearly gone, broke his rifle rather than allow it to fall into the hands of the enemy, and Private Milligan, who left his wife and family in this country, where he was surrounded by all the luxuries of peace, and volunteered to go to South Africa and fight for the British flag ? Those men were not sent by this government at the expense of the tax payers of Canada, and this government is entitled to no credit for their sacrifices other than that which falls to them as citizens of the country which has produced such men. The hon. member (Mr. Charlton) referred to the fact that the object of the Boers was to drive Great Britain out of South Africa and make it a Boer republic, and yet he brings up this resolution. Can one understand his proposing such a resolution, admitting, as he

does, that the Boers were on the offensive from the start? Who doubts Great Britain's generosity? Nearly every hon. member who has spoken has referred to the generosity with which Great Britain has dealt with her defeated foes in the past. Who then doubts her generosity to deal with the Boers at the present? Is Great Britain to-day less civilized than she was in years gone by? Is she retrograding towards barbarism now? I cannot, for my part, see what ground there is in the slightest degree for suspecting that Great Britain will not treat the Boers with the greatest possible consideration. Do we want another settlement such as we had at Majuba Hill or when the British troops were withdrawn from Khartoum? We had subsequently to go over the whole ground again and spend millions upon millions, and the loss of so much human life to reconquer in both cases, and we do not want any such weak-kneed administration or policy in Great Britain to-day as when Mr. Gladstone administered the affairs of the empire. I think that a greal deal of unnecessary sympathy in this discussion has been given the Boers. We have not heard very much said by those hon. members who have supported the resolution about the relatives of the 25,000 odd who have died on the veldt of South Africa, either from wounds or diseases, or about the billion of dollars which Great Britain is spending in defending her South African possessions. I think, with the hon. gentleman who has preceded me, that we ought to hear a little more in regard to this feature of the question. It ill becomes us, who are enjoying all the blessings of peace to interfere. Surely we can leave this difficulty to be settled by the statesmen and soldiers of Great Britain, who represent those who have borne the greater part of the brunt of the war. It is not only the lowly sons of Great Britain who have risked their lives in this war but the scions of her nobility as well. From every class, her children have gone and offered up their lives for the country, and it is the representatives of these on whom we can rely to deal out every justice to the enemy. I think that this motion is a very ill advised one. I look upon it as embodying a mischievous policy, and regret very much that the question should have been introduced into this House at all. But I would suggest a resolution which, I think, would meet with almost the unanimous consent of the House, and which I drafted in the few moments at my leisure during recess. It is as follows:

That this parliament regrets that Mr. Kruger, the acting presidents and the generals of the Orange River and Transvaal Colonies who are still leading a small but brave remnant of the Boers, have not seen fit to cease the hostilities in which they took the initiative against the British empire, by invading and annexing British territory. That we point them with pride to the great liberty and many privileges enjoyed by the people of this country, as well as the other parts of the empire, under British institutions by all races, creeds and nationalities, and realizing the magnanimity shown in the past to a defeated foe we have the utmost confidence that the most generous terms of peace will be extended to the Boers by the statesmen and soldiers of Greaat Britain.

That is a resolution which nearly every member of this House I venture to think would support.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). I understood that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had consented to withdraw his motion before recess, but I also, like the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp), have drafted an amendment to the resolution. The amendment I would suggest is as follows:

In the opinion of this House, it is not advisable to offer any advice or give any instructions to the British people relating to their duties regarding the Boers in South Africa, believing that the well known magnanimity and generosity always practised on all occasions by the British government will be exercised on the present occasion.

I think that that will fill the Bill. From what I have learned to-day, I am sure that it is not the desire of any hon. member of this House to say a word that would interfere with the making of peace between Britain and the Boers, and I think that the resolution introduced by the hon. member for North Norfolk will have that tendency. If carried in this House it would lead the Boers to believe that a large number of the people of Canada were in sympathy with them. I am satisfied that there are few people in sympathy with the Boers, except to the extent that the underdog is sympathized with. Britain has always shown magnanimity to her foes, and where is there any nation in the world which has shown it in the way she has done to her foes in South Africa? Is she not educating the children of her foes? Is she not supporting the lone and fatherless on the veldt? Is she not doing everything she possibly can to conciliate these people? I contend that she is and doing it very graciously, and if we were to show sympathy to the Boers now, we would be not only encouraging them, but giving comfort to many nations of Europe, which are only too pleased to see the British in difficulties.

They have shown their sympathy with the Boers throughout the whole of this war, and would have been only too glad, had they thought they could have done it, to assist the Boers. There is no doubt about that. But they know that Britons are united, that the old lion's teeth have not dropped out, that her whelps are around her and assisting her, that Canada has given her aid, and so have Australia, New Zealand and all other

parts of the empire, and that they stand ready to back up Great Britain for the reason that they know she is right in this cause and for the reason that they are determined that the British empire shall not be dismembered by a few Boers or a few disaffected men in our own country. I make no insinuations against anybody. I do not think the brainy men of Great Britain will be coerced or cajoled or influenced by anything that members of this House say, and, therefore, I think it is time that we should refrain from discussing this matter any further. Mr. Speaker, I hope that if you put my amendment, it will carry.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must tell the hon. member (Mr. Robinson, Elgin) that it is not permitted by the rules of the House to move an amendment to the amendment to motion for Committee of Supply.

Mr. ROBINSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, it is simply because you did not notice me first, for I was on the floor.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, after what has fallen from the lips of the right hon. the leader of this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), the lieutenant of the leader of the opposition, who have, in such eloquent language, spoken the sense of this House in favour of the peace negotiations being brought to a satisfactory conclusion, I should certainly have refrained from participating in this debate. But as the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) have deemed it fit to give a new trend to the debate, and as they have insinuated that some hon. gentlemen were not in favour of peace and harmony being restored in South Africa, and were not anxious to see an end put to this struggle that has been in progress for three years, I think it opportune, under such circumstances, to protest against such statements.

The hon. member for Victoria, in his speech, referred to rebels, and stated that many revolutions have been justifiable. But, Sir, do you know under which circumstances nowadays rebellion is not justifiable, and when the right to rebel of a people can be questioned ? It is when the rebels are vanquished. But when they triumph, and when victory perches on their banners, oh, then it is quite another question, and we find it recorded in history that they had a right to rebel, and that the righteousness of their cause cannot be questioned. In 1837, we had a rebellion in Canada. In Upper Canada and in Lower Canada the patriots rebelled, not against Great Britain, but against a bad and tyrannical government. But is it not agreed on all hands to-day that those patriots had a right to rebel against that oligarchy, and that they had serious grievances ? From the events that transpired in this country, in the province of Quebec, we ought to learn a lesson, and it is that it is always bad policy for a victorious foe to wreak resentment upon a vanquished people, and that sooner or later, when the recoil ensues, the vanquished foe will resent that treatment. The memory of those heroes DeLorimier and his unfortunate companions is still living in the hearts of their fellow-countrymen. Had Colborne shown magnanimity, and extended to the foes the right hand of fellowship, would he not have better secured peace and harmony between the two races in our country ? Nobody, I think, will question that it would have been good policy to have pursued such a course. I agree that the social fabric must be upheld and order secured in the community, but the victors can always afford to accord a generous treatment to the vanquished, without any danger or peril.

By the resolution which is now before the House, we tell the imperial parliament—provided this resolution should ever reach parliament—that, in our opinon, the Boer cause is lost, that British supremacy should be maintained in South Africa, but we further affirm that the broadest policy of magnanimity and mercy should be extended to a brave foe now opposing British arms. We further tell the vanquished that they may look forward with confidence to the future, and that, when they have laid down their arms, they shall have the franchise and every right of the British subject, and enjoy the boon of a wise and just administration.

When the American colonies which now form the United States of America rebelled against Great Britain, eloquent voices were heard in the British parliament in favour of a policy of magnanimity, but, unfortunately, those voices appealed in vain to the sense of justice of parliament, and what was the result, Sir ? The result was that the finest British colonies were lost to the mother country.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, if all the hon. gentlemen who have participated in this debate had taken their cue from the right hon. the leader of this House, who has displayed, throughout the whole of his speech, a judicial spirit and a serenity which are the true characteristics of statesmanship, I would have refrained from interfering in the debate ; but I thought it my duty, the more so as I pride myself on my descent from one of those rebels who, in the course of this century, fought for securing freedom to their fellow-countrymen—to protest against the intemperate language used this evening by some hon. gentlemen in this House. And if there is some ill-feeling against England still rankling in the hearts of my fellow-countrymen, the reason is to be found in the fate of those unfortunate fellow-countrymen of ours who died on the scaffold. That is our main grievance against England. And when I heard, this evening, a Christian gentleman appeal to us in the name of civilization, and tell us that it is

the duty of a nation to take revenge of her fallen foe, I could not help regretting that principles so utterly at variance with the tenets of our modern civilization should still be taught and upheld in this country of ours. These are growing times, Sir, and in this twentieth century we ought to keep abreast of the spirit of the times. In former times there was no mercy, no magnanimity exercised by the conquerors to the conquered; and a fallen foe was reduced to slavery. But, nowadays, the very moment a man lays down his arms, his life is held sacred. Nowadays when a vanquished foe lays down his arms, not only is his life spared, but he is also entitled to whatever makes for the happiness of life; the enjoyment of freedom and of his property.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) have leave to withdraw his motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I object, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment (Mr. Charlton) negatived.

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

Arts, agriculture and statistics — census, $120,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) explain why he requires so large an amount for taking the census as compared with ten years ago? The census of 1891 was taken for about $500,000. The hon. gentleman has already announced that he has spent on the present census over $980,000, and estimates that it will cost $172,000 to complete it. Why is so large an expenditure required?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In explanation of that, I need not go into any long details, I may say, in the first place, in general terms, that the cost of everything has materially increased as compared with 1891. It does not matter what one undertakes to-day, the cost is materially increased. This is due, no doubt, to an increase in the cost of living, and an advance in the scale of living. The result is that one cannot get people to do work for what one could get the same class of people to do work for ten years ago.

In 1891 there was a general lack of employment throughout the country, whereas in 1901 the contrary was the case, and employment was seeking the people rather than the people seeking employment. For that reason it was necessary to establish a higher scale of pay than the scale of 1891. The pay in 1891 was sufficient to attract a large number of people to census employment, but in 1901, on the contrary, it was found rather difficult to get people to do this work, even with the higher scale of pay. Another reason for the increased cost, was that in the census of 1901 a great many more questions were asked by the enumerators, and the filling up of the schedules required more time and labour. For this reason a good deal more labour was thrown upon the commissioners. Then there was the additional fact that in 1901 there were several territories and outlying districts which had to be covered by enumerators, and which had not to be covered, or not to the same extent, in 1891. This involved a considerable additional expense, and an expense greater in proportion than the additional number of people to be taken in the same section of country. In those outlying sections population is sparse, and the difficulties of the enumerators were greater. Even in those territories and sparsely settled parts of Canada where the enumeration was taken in 1891, there was a larger number of people to be enumerated in 1901, because the population had increased during the decade. There was also the fact that we undertook to take the census of 1901 in a shorter time, to do it more rapidly, so as to get the returns sooner before the people. For this purpose we employed a larger number of enumerators, and although the actual population to be taken by them was not so very much larger, the increased number of enumerators did cost a larger amount than a smaller number would have cost to do the same work, the object being to take the census more rapidly and to get the results quicker. These different reasons, shortly stated will, I think, account for the increased expense which the hon. gentleman has alluded to. No doubt hon. gentlemen will ask questions with regard to this matter, and I shall be happy to answer them to the best of my ability.

Mr. TAYLOR. The first argument the minister advanced, that wages were higher in 1901 than in 1891, I think the general public will not agree with, I do not think there is a manufacturer in this country who will say that he is paying more to his hands now than in 1891. It will be admitted by every manufacturer in this country that wages have not increased materially during the last ten years. I know it is not so in our town, and I think our town will compare favourably with any other town in the country. Then he says that the territories are now better filled up than in 1891. Well, if the population in the territories was sparse it would cost more to take the enumeration. I think the argument he advanced in reference to the territories is an argument against himself. I find that under the late government the census was taken three times. In 1871 it cost $511,000; in 1881 it cost $552,000; in 1891 it cost $549,000. Now the Minister of Agriculture, in reply to a question on the 3rd of March, stated that he had already expended $948,000. I asked the question the other day how much was expended up to the 3rd of April, and he made the same reply, $948,000. Now will the hon. gentleman tell us what the expenditure has been up to date on the census?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got the figures of the expenditure made since the date on which I gave the answer, a week or two ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. On the 3rd of April he said the expenditure had reached $948,000, and he estimated it would take $170,000 to complete, making $1,118,000 altogether.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With the sum I am asking for the ensuing year, the expenditure altogether will be $1,050,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the hon. gentleman is not asking for enough, according to his own estimate on the 3rd of April, he is $68,000 short, and will have to bring down another sum in the supplementaries. I estimate that it will cost a quarter of a million dollars yet to complete the census, judging from the staff the hon. gentleman has got in this building, for which he is paying $6,000 a year rental.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman state when he expects to have the census completed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I hope to get the great bulk of it completed in the ensuing fiscal year for which this vote is being asked. I cannot say positively that all the tabulations will be done within that time.

Mr. FOWLER. I understood the minister to say that there was great difficulty in getting people to do this census work. I would like to ask him if he advertised for clerks or enumerators, and if so, in what papers and at what cost to the country ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, I did not advertise.

Mr. FOWLER. In what way did the hon. minister find difficulty in getting clerks to do the work ? I think the difficulty would be that there would be too many applications.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A number who were asked to do the work declined it at the rates we proposed to pay.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose it would be impossible for the hon. minister to give the names of these parties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, they could not be Liberals, because it has never been known that Liberals have declined an office of emolument.

Mr. GANONG. I would like to ask the hon. minister if it is not a fact that 90 per cent of those who were recommended were recommended by his Liberal friends to these positions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Could you not make it the whole hundred ?

Mr. OSLER. This is a most extraordinary instance of government extravagance, when the cost of taking this census is compared with the expenditures upon previous ones. The cost of taking the census in 1891 was a little under 11 cents per head of the population. This was under a Conservative regime that hon. gentlemen opposite condemned as being extravagant and corrupt. The cost of taking the first census under Liberal rule is a little over 20 cents per head of population, or nearly twice the cost of taking the census in 1891. This either indicates gross and absolute incompetence, or something worse, because there is no increase in the salaries paid. There is nothing but the grossest extravagance that could possibly have taken place to account for doubling the cost of the census from 11 cents per head of the population to 20 cents per head. This is a condition of affairs that is not to be excused by any such explanation as that given by the hon. minister.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. minister if he has settled with the census enumerators yet ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. With very nearly all of them.

Mr. SPROULE. How did the hon. minister settle up the dispute between the enumerators and himself regarding the schedule by which they were to be paid ? Did the hon. minister pay $3 a day or were they paid by the name ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were paid by a schedule of rates which was published.

Mr. SPROULE. By the name or by the day ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. By the name and on other items. There was a schedule of rates published by which they were to be paid 5 cents per name, 5 cents for every death, 25 cents for every farm and 30 cents for every manufacturing establishment recorded. That was the same principle on which the other census was taken.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here a copy of a paper which seems to leave another impression on my mind :

There is considerable discussion going on as to the usefulness of the Labour Bureau. It is claimed for it that it has already done good work in effecting settlements between employers and their men, and it is said that it is well worth its cost. I do not desire to dispute this claim. I merely want to call the attention of the Labour Bureau to the trouble which has arisen between the Department of Census and its employees, and ask if it is not a proper subject to be dealt with by the Labour Bureau ? I understand that the Census Department set some 8,000 men to work throughout Canada on

the understanding that they were to get $3 per day of eight hours, and after the men had been at work several weeks the employers repudiated the $3 a day arrangement and fixed a kind of a piece work rate, which means a reduction, in wages of about one-half. The men, I understand, have refused to accept the reduction, and are to all intents and purposes on strike. Lawyers have been employed and the matter is to be taken into the courts at great cost to the men who, in the meantime, are left unpaid. Now, if I understand the object of the Labour Bureau, it is to settle such disputes as this, and see that the workingman gets fair treatment. Without passing any judgment on the dispute one way or another, it is reasonable to assume that there is good ground for the stand the men have taken, or their lawyers would not have advised them to take it into the courts. It would be a great triumph for the Bureau of Labour if it stepped in now and effected a settlement of the whole trouble.

The hon. minister says that it was by piecework they were to be paid, but I would draw his attention to the fact that the instructions given to the census enumerators in regard to their employment were something like the following :

> The day's work of census officers, commissioners, enumerators and other employees for the taking of census will consist of eight hours of proved effective service, and all overtime will be allowed as part of a day at the same rate of enumeration as is provided for a day's work. Ten hours of proved effective service will count as one day and one-quarter and twelve hours as one day and one-half.

If the payment was to be by the name, what was the necessity for stating what would constitute a day's work. It goes on to say :

> Section 24 of the Act reads as follows :
> The Minister of Agriculture shall cause to be prepared one or more tables setting forth the rates, allowances, or remuneration of the several census commissioners and enumerators, which rates shall not exceed in the aggregate a total amount of $3 for each day of good effective service for any enumerator; or $4 for each day of like service for any census commissioner.

That seems to indicate plainly that they were hired by the day. Referring to this matter, 'Events' says :

> Hon. Mr. Scott, who is acting Minister of Agriculture, and therefore, for the time being, head of the Census Department, has given an interview to the press in which he declares that the enumerators have only themselves to blame for falling into the error that they were to get $3 a day for eight hours work. He says the basis of payment was plainly stated to them at the start.

Well, they have not themselves to blame at all. The instructions issued by the government clearly led the enumerators to that conclusion. As 'Events' says, if the Bureau of Labour was of any value whatever, the Deputy Minister of Labour should have been called in to settle the dispute between the employer and the employee. The men being helpless had no recourse against the government, and they feel to-day that they have been deliberately cheated out of what they regard as their honest wages. They cannot sue the government, of course, unless the government allows them, and so they have to grin and bear it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has quoted a newspaper.

Mr. SPROULE. I cited the regulations given in your own instructions, not a newspaper report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The instructions given by the minister were under the wording of the Act itself, which says : That the enumerators shall be paid by a schedule of rates to be fixed by the minister and published—

> Which rate shall not exceed in the aggregate the total amount of $3 per day for each day of proper effective service for any enumerator, or $4 for each day of like service for any commissioner.

They were not to be paid a fixed sum per day, but they were to be paid by a schedule of rates, which schedule should in no case allow an enumerator to earn more than $3 per day, or a commissioner more than $4. They were to be allowed $3 for eight hours work if they had done enough work by the schedule of rates to justify their earning $3 per day. The House can understand that if they were simply paid at a fixed rate per day, there would be no inducement to do an effective day's work, but if they were paid by the schedule of rates under which they had to do a certain amount of work to earn $3 a day, that was a stimulus to them to do that amount of work. As a matter of fact, a considerable number of enumerators would have earned by the schedule more than $3 a day, but they were only paid that amount because the Act does not allow us to pay any more. There were other enumerators who by the schedule of rates did not earn as much as $3 per day, and it would not be fair, as between man and man, to pay those who did comparatively little as much as those who did a great deal more work.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the duty of a commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The duty of a commissioner in each electoral district is to supervise the enumerators, give them their instructions, see that their work is properly done, and send in their report.

Mr. SPROULE. How are they paid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were paid one cent a name for all the names taken in the county, and they were made an allowance for general expenses besides, which was published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. INGRAM. When the commissioners in some districts handed in their reports, were they instructed to do some other work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know of a case in which the commissioner was asked to do work which was not proper work for him to do.

Mr. INGRAM. That is not an answer. Were any commissioners asked to do any other work after they handed in their reports ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think some of the returns were found not to be correct and they were sent back to the commissioner to be corrected.

Mr. INGRAM. That is not the information I want. I can tell the minister that the commissioner for East Elgin, after handing in his report, was instructed to do a considerable lot of work afterwards.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of that.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman bring down the information as to what that additional work was ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will be glad to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister point to the regulation under which they were paid by the 'name' ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The original instructions quoted the Act and said they were to be paid by a schedule of rates which was afterwards fixed by Order in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. There is not the slightest doubt in the world but that owing to the instructions sent out, the enumerators were left under the impression that they were to receive $3 per day. That was the natural conclusion to draw from the wording of the instruction. It was long after, that the schedule was fixed, and so the enumerators were deceived.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The instructions told them very distinctly and clearly that they were to be paid at schedule rates, and not $3 a day. That was published for the knowledge of anybody who undertook to do the work.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to call the attention of the minister to a fact that came under my own observation. In Commissioner Tweedie's district, in the province of Prince Edward Island, the man who was appointed as enumerator was found to be incompetent to do the work.

Mr. BENNETT. They did not dispense with him for that reason ?

Mr. HACKETT. No, he was not dispensed with, but he entered into a bargain with another man to do the work for $20. He farmed out the taking of the census in that division. The name of the man who was appointed is Martin P. Doyle, and he farmed out the work to a man named Broderick, and between the two they took the census.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Which county was that in ?

Mr. HACKETT. Prince county, in Commissioner Tweedie's district, in township No. 1. This man Doyle was actually appointed and sworn in to do the work. I would like to ask the minister if that matter has been brought to his notice, because I state here on my reputation as a member of this House of Commons that it is correct.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I never heard of the case before. No such thing has been brought to my attention, and I do not think it has been brought to the attention of my officers, or I would have heard of it. If it was done, it was done distinctly contrary to the instructions and in violation of the officer's oath of office. I will certainly inquire into the matter.

Mr. HACKETT. There is no opportunity of the enumerator being changed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If an enumerator resigned, we would have to appoint another man to take his place ; but the enumerator had no right whatever to pass his work on to another man without our authority or without our appointing the other man and obtaining from him the oath of office. It would not be at all proper, or allowed for a moment, for an enumerator to pass on his work to another man without the full authority of the department.

Mr. OSLER. The minister did not give any explanation at all in answer to the question I asked as to how the census of last year came to cost twice as much as the census of ten years before. Apparently the little incident which we have just heard may account for it. If throughout the country government heelers, as I believe they are called, had these appointments and farmed out their jobs, that would quite account for a very large amount of the extra $500,000. If that is not the reason for the increase, I think the minister ought to give us some general explanation of why the last census cost over 20 cents a head, whereas the census of 1891 cost about 11 cents.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the hon. member was not in the House when the vote was first called, when I did give a general explanation. I do not know that he would wish me to go over that again ; but if there are any details that he would like to have explained, I shall be only too glad to give them. I may say in a general way that the reasons are these : In the first place, the cost of employment in

1901 was very much greater throughout the country than in 1891, and consequently we had to adopt a higher schedule of rates, which probably involved two-thirds of the increased cost. Next, we had to take the census of the Yukon, Athabasca and Keewatin territories, which were not included in the census of 1891. Thirdly, in the territories which were included in the census of 1891 there were large areas in which there was no population at all, no enumerators appointed, and no expenditure ; but in the census of 1901 every nook and corner of the territories was more or less occupied and enumerators were appointed, and very heavy expenditure was incurred because of the scattered nature of the population. Fourthly, our census enumerators in 1901 had very much more extensive schedules and had to ask a great many more questions, which took a longer time and required them to do fewer households in a day than was the case in 1891. In the census of 1891 the schedules contained 216 questions, while in the schedules of 1901 there were 623 questions, or 407 more, or practically three times as many.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister how much per name was paid in 1891, and how much per name in 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 3 cents per head, and in the last census 5 cents ; in 1891, 3 cents per death, and last year 5 cents ; in 1891, 15 cents for each farm, and in 1901, 25 cents ; in 1891, 20 cents for each manufacturing establishment, and in 1901 30 cents.

Mr. CLARE. When the hon. minister says that it was almost impossible to get enumerators in 1901, let me tell him that he required 37 enumerators to take the census of the south riding of Waterloo in that year, when 15 did the same work in 1891. The cost of taking the census in 1901, was $2,821.44 and in 1891, when there were 14 enumerators and one commissioner, the cost was $1,491.36 or nearly 100 per cent less, and the population, which in 1901 was 25,480, was 25,139 in 1891. Therefore, it took this economical government $1,400 more to take the census of South Waterloo, which has only increased 341 since the previous census.

Mr. GANONG. The youth, innocence, and inexperience of the minister never was better illustrated than it has been to-night. But youth, innocence and inexperience are not the most desirable things in a minister of a business government. He says that the cost of wages had increased and he has got down so low in parish politics that he has to resort to a miserable plea of this kind to account for his extravagance. But if he had come to the county of Charlotte and had given me the opportunity, I would have found him more Grits there than were necessary to take all the census in New Brunswick, and at the same rates as were charged ten years ago, and they would have been better men than those he appointed. And I have no doubt that the same thing can be said about the other counties in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister kindly inform us the rates he is paying now per day to the enumerators or the staff of tabulators here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We pay different rates according to the work. The ordinary rate is $1.50 per day, with an increase when the work is more important, or where a man has charge of a staff under him.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was paid in 1891 for the staff here ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The same rates.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was paid the commissioners in 1891 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The same rates. The commissioners were paid $4 per family in 1901, and this year they are paid 1 cent per individual or name taken.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the chief commissioner in each riding paid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were paid on the schedule rates, equal to $4 per day for so many days accrued service. In 1891 they were paid $4 per family, and expenses. This year they were paid a cent per name and an allowance for expenses. In some counties they were paid $100, and in some few places more than that.

Mr. BENNETT. What was paid in East Simcoe in 1891 and 1901 to the commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In East Simcoe the total cost in 1891 was $2,304.48, and this year $4,465.79.

Mr. BENNETT. East Simcoe offers a fair example of the extravagance of this government in the taking of the census. The cost in 1901 was only $2,304 and in 1901 it had swelled to $4,465, and there was but a small increase in the population, and that principally in one or two towns. The reason why the expenses were swelled was because of the political leverage which had to be exercised in that riding. In 1891 there was only one commissioner, but political exigencies compelled the minister to appoint two in 1901, which swelled the expenses very considerably. In the town of Midland in 1891, one man enumerated the whole town, but in 1901, owing to public exigencies, the work was distributed among three, and these three, who were business men, took odd hours of the day to do the work. All over the riding the same sort of thing was done.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I took the plan of appointing an enumerator for each polling subdivision, and roughly speaking there were about twice as many in 1891 as in 1901. The object was to have the census taken more quickly and much more information was required. There were 65 enumerators in East Simcoe last year.

Mr. BENNETT. And in 1891, how many?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Twenty-seven.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a case in point. The population was practically the same and the territory exactly the same. Yet we have 27 enumerators in 1891, and 65 in 1901. I do not know what time the enumerators took up, because they claimed very little of my attention. But, speaking of my own town of Midland, who were these enumerators? One was the express agent, who, when he had nothing to do, went about the census enumeration. And there was a clerk in a grocery store who occupied himself in odd moments in the same way——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What were the names?

Mr. BENNETT. White, Moore and Grice. But the names are immaterial. I am pretty confident that in 1891 one man did the work, and I will be bound to say that he was much better fitted to do it than all these three put together. Yet, for this census three had to be appointed. The hon. minister has given some sort of a solution—that he had an enumerator appointed for each polling subdivision. As a matter of fact, there are the three polling subdivisions, so that worked out fairly.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many polling subdivisions are there in the riding?

Mr. BENNETT. Sixty-five, I should judge. But, first as to the commissioners, the minister must have had representations that party exigencies required the appointment of two. Two were appointed. One was the magistrate, a lawyer by profession, and the other was the township clerk. These gentlemen must have been running into each others territory all the time. In how many other ridings of the province were there two commissioners?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were two chief commissioners in a number of ridings. I would have to go through the list to learn how many there were in Ontario. But where the circumstances were peculiar it was sometimes deemed advisable to appoint two commissioners, especially was that the case where there was a considerable proportion of people representing the two different languages that are current in this country. If there was a large area, that was another reason. Speaking from memory, I think that in the hon. gentleman's constituency the appointment of two was due to the fact that there is a considerable French population in that riding.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, as to one of these reasons, neither of the commissioners appointed in East Simcoe could speak a word of French. And as to the plea of extended area, I may tell the minister that one of the commissioners unfortunately is a very bad cripple, a man who cannot walk about, but has to be lifted. One can readily understand how he could get over a large area of country. I may explain the circumstances to the minister to refresh his memory. One of these appointees was recommended by the Liberal candidate for the local legislature, and the other by the defeated candidate for the Commons. Both had to be appointed, and the country has to pay for them. If that is a fair sample of the way the census was conducted all over the country, it is clear that the great expense has been due to the fact that so much has had to be done out of consideration for political exigencies.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I have given the facts concerning the two chief commissioners, and they are quite in accordance with what I have said.

Mr. McGOWAN. Will the hon. minister please say how many commissioners there were for Central Wellington?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One.

Mr. McGOWAN. What was his name?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Thomas Harcourt.

Mr. LENNOX. What was the expense of taking the census in South Simcoe in 1891 and 1901?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 the cost was $1,341.41, and in 1901 it was $2,794.56.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the hon. minister give the reason for that increase? Is it due to increase in the population or to any special circumstance?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not give reasons beyond the general reasons I have given. I have not the details for this particular county.

Mr. LENNOX. If the hon. minister will look up the census of 1891 and compare it with that of 1901, he will find that there has been rather a decrease of population if anything. There is no change of circumstances that would account for this greater expense. While I am speaking, I would like to ask the figures for North Simcoe, as the hon. member for that riding is not here.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The figures for North Simcoe are: 1891, $1,728.62, and 1901, $2,890.05.

Mr. BENNETT. What were the respective figures for West Bruce ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891, $1,359.46, and in 1901, $2,135.36.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any particular reason for that ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have no details to show the particular reason in this county.

Mr. BENNETT. I can, perhaps, give the minister an explanation with regard to that riding. No doubt, the enumerators had the figures of the preceding census, and when they went around the riding they found that the population had dropped from 22,377 to 17,925, a decrease in that riding in the province of Ontario, where there is so much so-called prosperity, of 4,452. I suppose the enumerators became very zealous and worked over time, probably with the expectation that they would be paid by the day, to find where these 4,452 people had gone.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman will see the fallacy of that when he recollects that the enumerators were paid by the names they got, and if they did not get the names they did not get the money.

Mr. COCHRANE. How then did they get more money than in the previous census?

Mr. SPROULE. Were there two commissioners or one in North Simcoe and East Grey ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In East Grey there was one commissioner.

Mr. LENNOX. How many in North Simcoe ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. One.

Mr. LENNOX. What was his name ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Archibald Currie. In East Grey it was R. D. Carruthers.

Mr. BENNETT. In East Simcoe what were the amounts paid to the commissioners, Storey and Tudhope ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. Tudhope was paid $264.09, and Mr. Storey $301.80.

Mr. BENNETT. What amounts were allowed them for livery hire, if any ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing was given to the commissioners for horse hire.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the population of East Simcoe ?

Mr. BENNETT. 39,257.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister say what was the respective cost of taking the census in East Grey in 1891 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 it cost $1,834.77 ; in 1901, $3,593.47.

Mr. McGOWAN. Would the minister kindly tell me the cost in Centre Wellington in the two years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 the cost was $1,591.99 ; in 1901 it was $2,681.79.

Mr. COCHRANE. What was the cost in East Northumberland ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891, $1,626.76 ; in 1901, $3,323.30.

Mr. VROOMAN. What was the cost in South Victoria ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891, $1,253.38 ; in 1901, $2,663.10.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman kindly tell us what the population of the whole province of Ontario was in 1891 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The total in 1891 was 2,114,321 ; the total in 1901 was 2,182,942.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, will the hon. gentleman give us the cost for 1891 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The total cost in 1891 was $147,142.29 ; in 1901 it was $281,401.18.

Mr. LENNOX. Was there any riding in the Dominion in which it cost less in 1901 than in the previous census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think there is a riding in which it cost less. The schedule of rates which was paid and the work which was done in every case, I think, were more.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister explain what it was that induced him to change the schedule of rates ? Was it a matter of intuition on the part of the minister, or was it after making inquiry, and after having endeavoured to get the work done at the old rates ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We knew that we were asking the enumerators to do a good deal more work ; and we knew also from inquiries that we could not find men to do the work as easily as they were apparently found in 1891. We consequently fixed the rates at what we thought was a fair salary to enable the enumerators to earn $3 a day if they did a fair days' work.

Mr. LENNOX. Would you reckon their labour as skilled or unskilled ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should call it skilled labour.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister understand that skilled labour was paid at a higher rate in 1901 than in 1891, as a rule ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think such labour as this, clerical labour, was paid higher in 1901 than in 1891.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where did the minister find any difficulty in getting men to do the work ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not tell the hon. gentleman off hand where a man refused, but there were a good many instances of that kind, and many representations made of the difficulty of finding men to do the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. I know a gentleman in my riding who came down here for two years waiting for a job. He was perfectly competent and tried to get work on the hon. gentleman's staff and could'nt get it. I cannot see for my part why taking the census in East Northumberland cost in 1901 more than double what it did in 1891. The same class of men was employed, only they were Liberals, and of course their services were skilled. Perhaps some of the Grit heelers that were along with the machine the hon. gentleman wanted to pay as he is now paying Mr. Preston for hugging the machine.

Mr. BOYD. When were the enumerators paid for the county of Lisgar ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The accounts were paid as they came in. I could not give the hon. gentleman the exact time, or even about the time. They were not all paid at once. The accounts of each enumerator come in and are checked over here, and as they are checked, and accepted, and passed by the auditor, they are paid.

Mr. BOYD. Have any been paid during the last month or six weeks ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not remember whether there were any paid in the last month or not. The accounts were in dispute in many counties but I could not say whether there are any in Lisgar. I will look up the facts in the department.

Mr. BOYD. The information I have is that in a number of cases, in fact in all of the cases of disputed accounts in the county of Lisgar, an amicable settlement was made about the time of the late election. I hope the hon. minister will give the information before the item passes, together with the names of the enumerators there whose accounts were paid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can give the hon. gentleman the names of the enumerators at once, as I have the information under my hand. The dates of their payment I will have to get in the department, and I will be glad to do it if the hon. gentleman wishes it. I may say that the report which he has heard as to there being an amicable settlement in regard to these accounts in Lisgar, and that the enumerators were all paid, is entirely unfounded, and, I think, if the hon. gentleman discusses the question with some of these enumerators, he will find that their accounts were not paid to their satisfaction. I regret to say that there are a great many of these cases all over the country, and I regret to say also that in a few instances we have not yet made a settlement of the accounts.

Mr. BOYD. The hon. minister does not know whether they have been settled in Lisgar to the satisfaction of the enumerators ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can get the dates if the hon. gentleman wants them.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to have them.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to call the hon. minister's attention to the fact that we have not received that definite information that we are entitled to in regard to the question of increased remuneration for labour. I do not think the hon. minister has given us any basis upon which to judge whether a fair increase in the remuneration of these officers was made or not. If the hon. minister will say that he found that the percentage of wages for skilled or clerical labour had, in his estimation, and according to his investigation, increased 5, 10 or 15 per cent, or whatever percentage the hon. minister found that the remuneration had increased, we will have some reasonable means of ascertaining whether a fair arrangement was made or not. I understand that in the years that are past hon. gentlemen opposite maintained that the great object for a legislator to aim at was to make Canada a cheap country to live in, and that cheap food and cheaply paid labour were the great objects of legislation and of government. According to what we find to-night from the hon. Minister of Agriculture, this has been made a very very dear country to live in. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he found, before he made this regulation, that labour was worth from 10 to 15 per cent, or some definite percentage, more in 1901 than in 1891, so that we can ascertain whether, in the first place, the conclusion he arrived at was correct in regard to what we know to be current in the country, and in the second place, whether the increase which he made was in accordance with that test.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the hon. minister who the enumerators were in the towns of Orillia, Gravenhurst and Penetanguishene ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have the list of enumerators, but I have not attached to it the places in which they made their enumerations.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will allow me to see the list perhaps I can select them.

Mr. LENNOX. In the meantime, will the hon. minister answer, as far as possible, the question I submitted to him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) asks whether there was a definite ascertainment of particular facts in regard to the increase in the general wages of the country. I may say to the hon. gentleman at once, no. That is a very difficult thing to find out, as a matter of fact. I have examined all the statistical records I can find in the country. I find that until the Labour Bureau was established here there was nothing in Canada from which one could make a definite statement as to the price of labour, but now that the Labour Bureau has been established that will be remedied, and in future the cost of labour will be on record so as to be available for statistical purposes. In the past no such record has been available. However, I formed my judgment on what I believed to be the general consensus of opinion and of knowledge in the country that the remuneration of all classes of skilled and clerical labour was higher than it had been, and also upon the fact that while in 1891 there were a large number of temporarily unemployed and idle people, in 1901 there were comparatively few people who were not busily engaged in one kind of work or another who were not prepared to leave their work for temporary employment, and who could not leave their employment with advantage unless they got a fair remuneration. A number of instances are on record where men who were offered these positions refused to accept them, because they could not take them at the pay which was offered.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that the hon. gentleman had thousands of applications more than he had positions for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is not a fact.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman say that there have not been more applications than there were positions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think the hon. gentleman would be correct in saying that there were any more applications than there were positions.

Mr. INGRAM. In 1891 we had, in St. Thomas, four enumerators, and in 1901, we had fourteen, and there were forty ready to take the positions if they could get them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We did not have fifty applications from all parts of the country for positions as enumerators. Recommendations were made to us and the people who made the recommendations, in many instances, had to search out men to do the work.

Mr. LENNOX. As I understand the hon. minister, he says that there are no means of ascertaining whether the increase in the rate of pay was fair or justified, that he was anxious to ascertain it but that he could not do so. Then, I understand that there was no reason for increasing the rate, there being no means of definitely ascertaining that there should be an increase in the rate. Am I right in assuming then that the main reason for increasing the remuneration was by reason of the increased number of questions asked and answered ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That was one of the chief reasons.

Mr. LENNOX. Was that the chief reason ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I may say it was the chief reason.

Mr. PUTTEE. May I ask the hon. minister if any steps were taken to get information as to what wages are being paid now ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the ordinary schedules there are questions which indicate the pay that the people who are remunerated are receiving. Part of the questions which are asked are in that direction, and these results will be tabulated.

Mr. PUTTEE. Was there any like schedule in 1891, so that you can make a comparison ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister say that the government first fixed the rates to be paid to the enumerators, and then increased them afterwards ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BLAIN. On what authority does the minister state that some who were offered the positions refused them on account of the lowness of the rate of pay.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Other people took the positions afterwards.

Mr. VROOMAN. The figures given me by the minister with regard to South Victoria have whetted my appetite for further information. In 1891 the cost of taking the census for South Victoria was $1,253, and in 1901 it was $2,663, more than double. That county has a less population now than it had in 1891. I wish to know who was the chief census commissioner there, what was he paid, what is the population now as compared with 1891, and how many enumerators were employed in both periods ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In South Victoria the commissioner was F. C. Taylor. He was paid $299.55 all told. The population in 1891 was 20,455 and in 1901 it was 19,953. There were 17 enumerators in 1891 and 39 enumerators in 1901.

Mr. VROOMAN. Was there anything paid the enumerators for horse hire.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1901 they were allowed $1.50 per ordinary day, and in 1891 they were allowed nothing for horse hire.

Mr. INGRAM. I asked the minister if it was not a fact that hundreds of applications were made for the position of enumerators as well as commissioners, more than there were vacancies to fill.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The applications were not made to Ottawa. They were made to the representatives of the Liberal party in the county and not to me.

Mr. INGRAM. Therefore the minister could not answer the question ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Then why did he give an answer that was misleading to the House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I had reports sent to me.

Mr. INGRAM. Can you say now, that there were not more than fifty commissioners in all Canada who applied for positions that had been filled ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were not fifty applications for enumerators who came to me. I understood there were no doubt a large number of applications in the different counties, and it was reported to me that it was difficult to find men to do the work at the rate of pay.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister stated that one of the chief reasons why they increased the pay of the enumerators and commissioners was on account of the scarcity of men to fill the position. I can tell him that in East Elgin he had more applications for positions than there were vacancies. That was the same, I venture to say, in every constituency in Canada except in perhaps a few sparsely settled districts and probably not in them. There was no reason to increase the pay on that account.

Mr. RICHARDSON. One of the main reasons given by the minister for the enormous cost of the last census was the difficulty of obtaining competent men to act as enumerators. Will the minister tell us what means were taken to obtain applications from capable men to fill these positions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Our friends in the different counties were asked to make recommendations and those whom they recommended were asked to forward specimens of their handwriting, and so on, in the form of a letter to the department so as to indicate whether the persons recommended were properly qualified by their education to do that work.

Mr. BENNETT. I have had the advantage of seeing the list of enumerators in East Simcoe. I shudder to think what must be the lists sent in by some of them in the line of orthography. I notice the name of one gentleman who, under the wonderful power conferred on the Ontario government of appointing every one who may be useful from a party view to be a justice of the peace, has been appointed to that office. He was one of the enumerators selected by the Minister of Agriculture. He is a gentleman who believes in signing his name to all papers as a justice of the peace and he always spells it 'Justis of Pace.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister had many more enumerators like that he did not put them through a very rigid educational examination. On looking over this list of enumerators for East Simcoe, I see in it the same old gang of political heelers of the Liberal party. It would not be a question of fitness, for that certainly was not the question in the selection of enumerators there, because we find that they were the old time division court clerks, license inspectors, bailiffs, and men of that ilk. These were the enumerators for the riding of East Simcoe. As to their fitness by reason of education, I can only tell the minister that if the men got correct returns in East Simcoe, then I am very much mistaken. What are the facts of this census ? Let us take the province of Ontario. We find that there has been an increase in the province of 53,657. In the cities of Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton, London and Brantford there has been an increase of 55,900 odd, so that in the bulk of the province of Ontario the population, instead of increasing, has gone backwards. Can any one believe that in ridings where the population was tumbling from 22,000 to 17,900—and this has gone on throughout the province generally, though I am glad to say not in all the ridings—there would be such a scarcity of men to do the work that the minister had to increase the pay ? As I have pointed out, party exigencies drove him to appoint two commissioners in the riding of East Simcoe, which of course increased the cost accordingly. Then he had to increase the number of enumerators from 27 in 1891 to 65 in 1901. I will refresh the minister's memory as to one of the requirements that were to be exacted from these enumerators. I suppose the minister has not forgotten the famous circular : first, on your oath, do not give anything away ; and next, send to the county secretary the names of all the lads in your division who are approaching 21. I think that is the reason why a good many of these men in East Simcoe were chosen—that they would have an utter disregard of their oath of office, and would do what I know they were doing—going about the riding getting all this information preparatory to the revision of the voters' lists last fall. I can only speak of that one riding, but I have no doubt that if the hon.

gentlemen study the lists in their own ridings, they will find the same thing there—that these men were selected as enumerators because they would be useful from a party point of view, and that is the reason they were not going to do the work at the rate that had been in force in 1891, but demanded a higher rate. That is the reason the minister was moved—and I suspect that the greatest pull came from the province of Ontario—to increase the rate from 3 cents per head to 5 cents. The minister cannot make any reasonable man believe that in those parts of the province of Ontario from which people were fleeing as if from a pestilence, it was difficult to obtain men to do the work. In East Simcoe these little doles which were given out to those men were perfect Godsends to them. A number of them were men who were pursuing their ordinary avocations, and this was money simply thrown to them on the side. It will not do for the minister to try to convince the country that these men were paid these excessive rates to take the census, because there was no complaint that the enumerators were under paid in 1891. It was simply and solely because they were so hungry that they had to be paid an excessive amount, and it was thrown to them as a sop and nothing else. The statement that the cost of labour had increased so much in the province of Ontario will not apply in East Simcoe, because most of these enumerators have no ordinary avocation save being hangers-on to a political party ; and I am bound to say that if other members go through the lists of their own ridings, they will have the same experience there as I have had in East Simcoe. It was the hungry cry of the party followers, driven on by the members behind him, which drove the minister to increase the rates in 1901 over what was paid in 1891.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). I am sorry to think that there are so many hungry people in Ontario. We have no such class of people in Nova Scotia, and particularly in the island of Cape Breton, where the value of labour has increased 25 to 40 per cent, and in some instances 50 per cent.

Mr. BENNETT. On account of the iron bounties.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). The best class of people have moved to the Sydneys. Speaking for my own county, I can say that the men who were appointed enumerators there were perfectly qualified in every respect, and their returns, if examined, will show that they were not appointed because they were hungry, but because they were qualified to do the work that was entrusted to them. I think that will be found to be the general experience in the whole island of Cape Breton. We have no hungry people, I am happy to say, in the island of Cape Breton at the present time, but the people are prosperous, and are getting from 25 to 50 per cent better wages than they did in 1891.

Mr. BENNETT. I can only say, in answer to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that if times are so good in the riding of Victoria, which he represents, it is a wonder that some 1,500 people less are there now than there were 10 years ago.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). They have moved to the county of Cape Breton.

Mr. BENNETT. To get the benefit of the bounties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) must remember that there are iron bounties paid in Ontario, and in the town of Midland ; and if these accrue to the benefit of workingmen in the province of Nova Scotia in increased wages, and do not in the province of Ontario, we ought to know the reason why.

Mr. BENNETT. I grant the Finance Minister that they do accrue to the benefit of the country ; but there is this marked distinction between hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and hon. gentlemen on that side, that we on this side, not only when in power, but also when in opposition, have been favourable to iron bounties, while the hon. Minister of Finance and his friends placed themselves on record by a resolution when in opposition that iron bounties were a bane to the country, and voted against the giving of them, but they were very different when they came into power.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Well, as Mr. Rudyard Kipling says, that is another story. We do not happen to be discussing just now whether iron bounties are wise or unwise. There is the fact, that iron bounties are paid in both Cape Breton and Ontario, and the idea that they are peculiar to Cape Breton is a mistake, that is all.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that iron bounties exactly account for the increased cost, nor does the reason given by the Minister of Agriculture. His principal reason is that wages have increased between 1891 and 1901. We have some means of making a comparison. I have before me the report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for the two periods, and I find that the wages of farm labourers in 1891 were $25.81 a month, and in 1901, $26.14, or a difference of 33 cents a month. Surely that cannot account for it. I think the minister will be obliged to look around and find some other reason. He will certainly not find people in Ontario, who have been in the habit of employing men, agree with him that the difference in wages can account for the increase. Take the riding of East Grey. I find that in 1891 it cost $1,324 to take the census, whereas in 1901 it cost $3,500, or more than twice as much, notwitstanding the fact—and I speak from experience because I have been hiring men all along—that the wages paid in 1891 were about the same as were paid in 1901. When

these gentlemen were appealing to the people, they said that if they got into office they would make the country a cheap one to live in, but according to the minister it is dearer, because he says that on account of the increased cost of living we have to pay more wages. They also said they were going to exercise stringent economy, and yet they paid double in 1901 for the same work that was done in 1891.

Mr. FRASER. So far as my county is concerned, there has been an increase in that county of over 1,200 during the last ten years. The hon. member who has just spoken must remember that the question of the cost of living is one that must always be considered in connection with the wages paid. Suppose a man gets $2 per day this year where he got $1 per day ten years ago, will it be fair to say that because his living cost him 50 cents per day when he only got a dollar, and $1 per day when he gets $2, that the cost of living has increased ? In the one case he is 50 cents a day better off than the other. Speaking for my own county, except in two districts, I had not an application to appoint a man to take the census. I had to enumerate good men myself and ask them to do the work, except in two districts. My county is divided into two municipalities. In the one, in order that the work might be well done, I asked the warden of one of the districts if he would not be the commissioner for that particular district and he consented, in the other I appointed one of the best men I could find, who never applied at all. It may be different elsewhere, but I do not believe there is a man who took the census in Nova Scotia—I know there was none in the county of Guysborough—who could not make more money at something else during the time he took to do that work. The remuneration after all was not so very great, and I did not think that even in Ontario taking the census would be found such a very lucrative job. It certainly was not considered so in the province of Nova Scotia, and nobody was scrambling for the positions. We had to look for the men to take them. The two commissioners appointed in my county could have made twice as much money at other work during the time they gave to the census.

Mr. MATHESON. In my county I was asked to recommend enumerators and several refused to accept. I had only very few applications. I have in my mind one from a certain gentleman who had taken the census twice before, and who claimed he was about the only man competent to do it. But when I found that he began to spell census with an 's,' I began to doubt his qualifications. It was true that we did not take farm hands in our county to do the work, but men who were skilled in that particular line, and in several cases the men I asked to do it would not accept at all. I had very few apppli-

cations for the job, and when I called on some men to perform the work, they said they could earn more money at something else. It was no wind-fall to our people to get such a job, and I am sorry to hear it was such a Godsend to the people in Ontario. In my simplicity, I had the idea that Ontario was rather ahead of us in that respect, and that the people there were not so badly off that they looked upon a week or ten days' work on the census as such a Godsend to them.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman must remember that they had an eighteen-years' hunger on. I would ask why it was deemed necessary in the county of Guysborough, which has only a population of 18,000, to appoint two or three commissioners ?

Mr. FRASER. The county has two distinct municipalities, and there is a shore front of over 200 miles, and it was a saving to the department to have a commissioner in each municipality.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the minister's version ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. friend from Guysborough recommended the men and I took his recommendation.

Mr. BENNETT. While accepting the statement of the hon. member for Guysborough, it seems rather strange that, if there were no men looking for the position, two gentlemen should have been appointed as chief commissioners for the small number of 18,000 people. There must have been some anxiety for the best positions when two were appointed where one had previously done the work.

Mr. FRASER. There was no such thing. Neither of the men made any application. Had only one commissioner been appointed, he would have had to travel around a shore frontage of some 200 miles, and in appointing two men, travelling expenses were saved, and the government effected an economy of $200.

Mr. INGRAM. How many commissioners were appointed for West Elgin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There were two in West Elgin.

Mr. INGRAM. So in West Elgin, 25 miles long, the same rule does not apply as in Guysborough. Will the minister tell us if the same explanation would apply to West Elgin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the first place West Elgin, I believe, is about 40 miles long, and in the second place, it is composed of parts of two municipal counties. The riding is not all in one municipal county, and it was thought better to have one man attend to the part in one county, and another man attend to the other part.

Mr. INGRAM. What does the hon. gentleman mean by a municipal county ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In Ontario there are certain counties for municipal purposes. By the Gerrymander Act the ridings are not always bounded by the same boundaries as the municipalities. The county of Elgin comprises portions of two different county municipalities.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). What was the cost of taking the census in West Elgin in 1891 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 it was $1,644.72 ; in 1901, $3,581.80.

Mr. INGRAM. Please give the figures for East Elgin ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891, $1,715.58 ; in 1901, $3,221.57.

Mr. TAYLOR. Kindly give us the figures for Guysborough.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891, $1,239.77 ; in 1901, $2,391.

Mr. TAYLOR. The county was of the same size, I presume, under the corrupt Conservative government that did the work, and did it just as well, for $1,231, as it has been done last year for $3,301. My hon. friend from Simcoe informed the minister a few moments ago that the population of Ontario during the ten years had increased by 53,000 souls, while the population of four cities that he named had made up that total increase. Now where has the increase taken place ? In all the smaller towns, villages and rural municipalities there is not a man in Ontario to-day who is satisfied with the census. I have before me the census in our town, and I find that in 1891 it was 3,669, and by this census it is 3,526. Here is a certificate from the county clerk taken from the assessment roll that simply gives the heads of families and their children. It takes the same count that the enumerators are supposed to take, and the assessor was doing the work at the same time that the enumerators were. The town clerk says :

Gananoque, October 17, 1901.

The assessment roll for the town of Gananoque for the present year, 1901, shows the population to be 3,718.

(Sgd.) SAMUEL McCALLUM,
Town Clerk.

The enumerators of the hon. gentleman give the population as 3,526, or 192 less than the population in our town taken in the same month by the town authorities. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman will account for the great discrepancy there. Besides the four cities the member for Simcoe named show an increased population more than the total increase for Ontario that the hon. gentleman shows by his census. He must know, as everybody in Ontario knows, that the census for Ontario is not correct, because the Ontario Bureau of Statistics show a much larger increase, and my hon. friend here proved by the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, made up by the same gentleman who has been at the head of this census staff, that the wages paid in 1891 were within 23 cents a month as high as those paid in 1901. The minister himself says that the men doing this kind of work must understand clerical work, and he is paying to-day just the same prices that were paid for doing the same clerical work as was done in 1891, $1.50 and $2 a day—that is what they were paid in 1891. Where is the increase ? In the city of Ottawa, where living ought to be dearer, if in any place, he is giving his staff the same pay as was given in 1891, namely, $1.50 and $2 a day. The hon. gentleman has at the head of his staff the same gentleman who took the census during the two last decades, he had the same machinery, but he had to find jobs for his friends. What are the facts to-day? The present census will cost, by the time it is completed, more than double what the last census did, to say nothing about that $6,000 a year rent he is paying for a building that will not hold the staff doing the work. Let anybody go down to that building and say if $6,000 a year rent is not an outrageous price to pay for it, besides spending $10,000 or $12,000 for fitting it up. That is how this economical government are running the affairs of the country, and it is so in every department. This is a plain kind of work that any man ought to be able to do, at least for the same amount of money that it cost ten years ago. The fact is that labour has not increased, as proved by statistics here, and by gentlemen who are employing men. I have some 60 men employed in my factory at Gananoque, doing the same kind of work that they did ten years ago, and they are drawing the same pay now that they did then, and it is the same in every other factory.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Have you not a larger number now ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I have no more, we have just about the same number that we had ten years ago, but we have another factory. The pay is the same. Every employer of labour knows that there is no such increase in wages. The hon. gentleman admits that he is paying his staff in the city of Ottawa just what the late government paid ten years ago, namely, $1.50 and $2 a day. But how did he obtain his staff ? I am informed that each supporter behind him and each defeated candidate have a right to name one clerk to come down here on the census staff—213 clerks sent down from 213 constituencies in the Dominion of Canada, to fill this building renting at $6,000 a year, and they are crammed in there, tumbling over one another. But there had to be one taken on from each constituency, and I presume that if each supporter and each defeated candidate had the privilege of naming five clerks there would have been five from each constituency taken on, because I understood that more came than the

hon. gentleman could find room for. The minister will find that the estimate he made the other day that it would cost $170,000 more to complete the census, will be exceeded, and that it will take a quarter of a million dollars more to complete a work that was done in 1891 for $549,000. The city of Kingston had a census taken, and they claim a large shrinkage. Owen Sound, Toronto, and almost every other place has had a similar experience. In many cases they were so disappointed that they had the census taken over again, and the Minister of Agriculture has heard from them. Ontario does not show anything like the population which is given by the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. OLIVER. The case I have to lay before the minister is the direct opposite of that of these hon. gentlemen. They complain of the minister having spent too much money, but my complaint is that he has been too careful in his expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what we expect of hon. gentlemen on that side.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad I do not disappoint the hon. gentleman. There is in my constituency, and, I think, in adjoining constituencies, very considerable complaint because of failure on the part of the census department to pay accounts for money earned last spring—that is to pay them in full.

Mr. BRODER. And are they not paid yet ?

Mr. OLIVER. They have been partially paid, but the complaint is that the minister has been over particular in checking the accounts and refusing payment, I suppose in order to keep within the mark in expenditure. For the purpose of my present argument, I am not concerned whether the expenditure on this census is greater than on the one preceding it or whether the expense is large or small. I am concerned with getting the people paid who did the work. I would ask the minister what are the prospects of these census accounts in the North-west being paid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are dealing with the accounts as rapidly as we get the proper vouchers from the individuals who claim the money. We have had a good deal of difficulty in getting vouchers which were acceptable to the accountant and which could pass according to the rules of the department. I think I may say, in a general way, that that is the reason of many of the delays in regard to accounts from the North-west Territories. I may say also that in the North-west, where distances are great and there is often difficulty in transportation, we have found it hard to get details of the accounts. I think that most of the accounts in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Oliver's) riding are paid, but that there are still some in other places in dispute between the officials and the department. I can assure the hon. gentleman that we are dealing with these as rapidly as the staff at my disposal will allow. If the enumerators had been able to file the necessary vouchers for expenses, I have no doubt they would have been paid long ago.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee in discussing the matter at length, but I would like to bring to the minister's attention the fact that the order requiring vouchers was not issued until after a great part of the work had been done and it had become impossible to get vouchers, and that now the demand for vouchers makes it impossible for the parties to collect their accounts. There should be some other way of arriving at a conclusion than by this demand for vouchers, which it is impossible, at this stage of the game, to obtain.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error in saying that instructions as to vouchers were not issued until the work was commenced. This was distinctly made known to the chief commissioner for that district, and if he did not give it to the enumerators, that is not the fault of the department. Mr. Deftal, who is the commissioner for the territories, says he gave it to the commissioner for every riding.

Mr. OLIVER. At what time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the 17th March, two weeks before the enumeration took place.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister, of course, will not expect this item to go through to-night. I think that before it goes through he should bring the list showing the number of commissioners and enumerators. There is also the question of payments in the constituency of Lisgar. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) says that a large number of cheques for census work went out into that constituency at the time of the election. We would like to know to whom they went. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) might bring down his cheque book with stubs showing the payments made in February.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should be glad to give the hon. member the information. While I do not expect this item to pass this evening, it is still early, and we can go on threshing it out, and perhaps some other points may arise on which information will be required that I will have to procure and bring down at a subsequent sitting. I would like hon. gentlemen to ask now for what information they want.

Mr. MONK. I have not been able to be present during the whole discussion. Has the hon. gentleman here a complete list of

the employees in Ottawa in the work of the census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I have here the paylist. It does not include the name of Mr. Blue, the chief commissioner, or Mr. St. Denis or Mr. Coté, of the Census Department, but it gives the names and salaries of the others connected with the work. I will send the list over to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONK. I shall be glad to see that list. I would also ask the minister out of what fund the investigation which was made in the province of Quebec, and of which we have heard a great deal, was paid for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Out of the census vote.

Mr. MONK. In what way was it charged—as an investigation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, as part of the work connected with the census.

Mr. MONK. I was speaking of the investigation which was made in regard to the census of 1891. What was the total amount?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think I could tell the hon. gentleman off hand what the amount is.

Mr. MONK. We would like to have the amount, and the way it is charged in the account.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will get it for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MONK. While I am on my feet I would like to know the cost of the census taken in 1891 in the county of Jacques Cartier and the cost of the last census.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give the hon. gentleman that.

Mr. MONK. And who were the commissioners ? Was there only one commissioner, and if so, who was he ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The census of 1891 in Jacques Cartier cost $842.08 and the census of 1901 cost $2,770.58.

Mr. MONK. And the name of the commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The commissioners were U. H. Dandurand, who received $206.67, and Caron Vallée, who received $201.06.

Mr. MONK. At whose suggestion were they named ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say off hand, but I will look it up. I think it was at the suggestion of Mr. Decarie.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman what authority he had to charge to the cost of the census of 1901 this investigation made as to the census of 1891. I think this is a very important question which I will refer to again when I get the amount. It has always been my impression that the way in which we vote money is extremely vague, and I maintain that a study of the estimates and the voting of the estimates would be much shorter and much less of verbal explanation would be called for, if every item gave distinctly the purpose for which the money was asked. Anybody who takes the trouble to go over the estimates, will, I am sure, come to the conclusion that a great many questions which are asked on this side of the House would not be asked if the object for which the money is to be voted were clearly designated. But, outside of the general consideration, it seems to me a most preposterous act on the part of the government to take this specific vote given by this House, under the supreme authority which we possess, for the census of one decade, to take a sum which must have been very considerable out of that vote, to make an investigation as to the census of the decade previous. I believe there was no authority whatever, and when there has been such a flagrant violation of fact that what has happened in this case has sound principle, I am perfectly convinced that a careful examination of the ends to which the money is put, and under the loose system in which we vote it, will reveal the fact that what has happened in this case has happened in a variety of other cases. I will confine my attention to this particular case, and I say it is an absolute violation of the rules and principles which should govern us and which ought to be taken notice of by every fair and impartial member of this House, because we may be on the other side of the House to-morrow. It is gross violation of principle that a sum voted for such a specific object as this should be devoted to defraying the expenses of the investigation which was made into the census of 1891. I would ask the hon. minister to explain upon what authority he has violated one of the fundamental rules which should govern us in our financial conduct in this House ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is quite a fair question to raise. I felt that the investigation into the accuracy of the census of 1891 was called for, because of the results of the census of 1901 which showed very extraordinary decreases of population in a great many places where the people of the locality were quite satisfied that such decreases could not have occurred. In other cases where the increases were very small indeed the question arose as to how this could be accounted for. It was a question concerning the census of 1901 and when the suggestion was made, and which came naturally to the minds of many people, that the census of 1891 was unduly swelled and that the apparent anomalies

which existed between the results of the census of 1891 and the results of the census of 1901 were perfectly explainable if we could show that the census of 1891 was unduly swelled, which I think we could show, and which I think we did show, especialy in the province of Quebec, it would be a sufficient explanation of these apparent anomalies and would be a confirmation of the results of the census of 1901. I therefore considered that the results of the census of 1891 were bound up with the question in such a way that the expenditure for this purpose seemed to be perfectly legitimate out of this vote for taking the census of 1901.

Mr. MONK. I will not deny that the explanation given by the hon. gentleman is a plausible one, but still I maintain that there was no authority given by us to use that money for such a purpose. We will refer to this further when we get the amounts. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he took upon himself, upon his own authority, to make that expenditure and to thus divert money from the use for which it was originally intended. Did he do that of his own volition, or was it done by Order in Council, or how was it done? How were the accounts passed by the Auditor General? Having before him the vote which we had given, how could he possibly pass this amount which was intended for taking the census of 1901, and which was not intended to defray the cost of holding an investigation so as to criticise the census taken ten years before?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There certainly was no Order in Council authorizing it to be done. The decision was arrived at after consultation with my colleagues. I did not assume the responsibility entirely on my own shoulders, although I carried out the intention and desire of my colleagues after consultation with them.

Mr. BRODER. Will the hon. gentleman give the cost of taking the census in the three Bruces in 1891 and 1901?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give the cost in 1891 first and then the cost in 1901: East Bruce, $1,330.61; North Bruce, $1,594.51; West Bruce, $1,359.46. In 1901 the cost was as follows: East Bruce, $2,667.04; North Bruce, $2,911.34; West Bruce, $2,135.36. The population was as follows: In 1891, East Bruce, 21,355; North Bruce, 20,871; West Bruce, 23,377. In 1901 the population was as follows: East Bruce, 19,313; North Bruce, 21,297; West Bruce, 18,410.

Mr. BRODER. It costs many thousands of dollars more in 1901 with a population 6,000 less.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The information obtained at the last census was three times as much as in the census of 1891.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the cost of the census for King's, N.B., in 1891 and in 1901?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 it was $1,615.92, and in 1901 it was $2,396.93.

Mr. FOWLER. What was the amount paid to the commissioner in each year?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891 the commissioner received $280.20, and in 1901 the commissioner received $316.63.

Mr. FOWLER. Have you got the list of the enumerators there?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I will hand you the list for the whole province.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I may state that in my county it did seem difficult for the government to get a commissioner. The first man to whom they offered the job said the government owed him more, and he wanted more. He would not take the job, but he recommended another who did take it.

Mr. BENNETT. What did they owe him more for?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). I really cannot tell that. I wish the minister to tell me what was the cost of taking the census in 1891 and in 1901 in the county of Cardwell.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman confirms my statement that this man would not take the position because he was not paid enough.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). No; it was because he said the government owed him more.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know what the government owed him.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Have you found out since?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. The census taken in Cardwell in 1891 cost $1,102.94, and in 1901 it cost $1,965.93.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would ask the minister the same question with regard to South Grey.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cost in South Grey in 1891 was $1,647.85, and in 1901 the cost was $2,597.36.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Did the gentleman who refused the commissionership in Cardwell get a better job since?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know who he was or anything else about him.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Well, it was Mr. Stubbs.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh, yes, Mr. Stubbs has a position in my department, but I do not know if it is better or not.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cardwell). Well, if he did not refuse it, it must be better.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is in a position which is more continuous and possibly is better.

Mr. SPROULE. I have now a copy of the circular sent to the enumerators. I notice that while first instructions contained the bald statement that the day shall consist of eight hours, and that they shall not be paid higher than $3 a day. It appears that on the 30th of April an Order in Council was passed forming the schedule upon which they should be paid, but that was long after they were appointed and after the census was taken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It says they shall be paid at schedule rates.

Mr. SPROULE. It says that the day shall be of eight hours of proved effective service, and that the minister shall set forth a table of remuneration which shall not exceed in the aggregate a total of $3 per day for each day of proved effective service for an enumerator; or $4 for a commissioner. That circular was sent out to the census employees. They were furnished with no other schedule, and I claim that they had a right to assume that that was the only binding contract between them and the government, and that they were employed at $3 a day; but after a month, after the work was done, then comes out the other schedule stating that they were only to be paid 5 cents a name. It does seem to me that the government have broken faith with their employees, and have done a great injustice to them; and up to the present several of their enumerators have not been paid, and have refused to take what is offered to them, and I think very properly so.

Mr. BENNETT. When the minister the other day was going into the figures of the census of 1891, I think he referred to the towns of Goderich and Clinton, in one of which it was alleged there were on the list the names of some 37 persons who were not really there in 1891. May I ask the minister what means were adopted for making this comparison ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A gentleman who was thoroughly acquainted with the places, who had lived there for many years before 1891, was employed to ascertain, of his own personal knowledge and from such information as he could get from the old inhabitants of the place, those who were present in 1891, and he was given a list of the names taken in those municipalities in the census of 1891.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the same gentleman act in both towns ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, Mr. D. F. Macpherson made the investigation in both places.

Mr. BENNETT. My recollection is that these two places were the only ones cited by the minister. Can he explain how it was that it was only in the riding of West Huron that he seized on any towns for the purpose of comparison ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was not only there. We also made inquiry in East Hastings, North Middlesex, Cornwall and South Norfolk. There were five places in Ontario in which investigations were carried on.

Mr. BENNETT. I am speaking from memory, but I think 'Hansard' will bear me out, that only in those two towns of Goderich and Clinton actual names were picked out. Percentages were given for the other places.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot remember in what places names were picked out.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the medium that started the inquiry in these particular ridings ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were chosen simply at random. We wanted to get places scattered over the province, and we employed gentlemen who from their residence in the places and their knowledge of the localities were competent to do the work.

Mr. BENNETT This gentleman, Mr. Macpherson, did not explicitly say that the people were not there in that year. It may have been that they were there part of the year. I think the census of 1891 was taken late in the fall.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it was taken in April.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, it may have been that the people returned there in the fall. Does Mr. Macpherson allege that they were not there in any part of the year at all ? If he has made any statement in writing, will the minister produce that at the next meeting of the committee ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statement was that they were not there on the date the census was taken, that is, on the 6th of April, and had not been there for years before.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister a written report of Mr. Macpherson ? If so, will it be laid on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have a full copy of the report here, and I will show it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER. I was not able to conclude the remarks I wished to make to the minister. What I wished to say was that even if the Chief Commissioner did issue the instructions, I am satisfied that these instructions did not in all cases reach the enumerators in time, and for that reason and others of a local character, it was not possible for the enumerators in all cases to follow the instructions as to securing vouchers, and I would urge upon the minister the necessity of relaxing in some degree the requirements in order to clear up the accounts. There will have to be some relaxation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would say to the hon. gentleman that in view of just such cases as he mentions, I have given instructions to this effect, that if the enumerators who did not get vouchers would make an affidavit to that effect and supply the details of what they knew they had expended, we would take that and make the payment. But we require something to show us that they were real expenses incurred, and we cannot take a general statement of figures.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister state in two words what was the nature of the investigation which was made in reference to the census of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The investigation in the province of Quebec was carried on largely in this way. It is a well known fact that every year a parochial census is taken by the Catholic clergy of the province. The figures of that census were taken and compared with the figures of the Dominion census of the same year. The same thing was done for 1891 and 1901, and we found this extraordinary fact, that in 22 counties there was a difference of 44,000 between the parochial census of 1891 and the Dominion census of 1891 an average difference of 2,000 per county in which the parochial census was less than the Dominion census. In these same 22 counties there was a difference in 1901 of only 8,000, or a difference of about 400 per county. We went further than that, and appealed to the registers of the parishes in which the names were entered. We compared these with the schedules in those counties and the lists of the names which were taken in the Dominion census, and we found name after name in the Dominion census which did not appear in the parochial registers. I made personal inquiries from priests, notaries, and old residents in those particular localities, and I got name after name and names of whole families which the people in those localities declared positively were not there in 1891, and had not been there for five or ten years, and in some cases twenty years, and in many cases had never been there at all.

Mr. MONK. Of all this there is an ample report in writing, no doubt ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, the reports were laid on the Table some time ago.

Mr. MONK. Knowing how our clergy take their census, and how their system is necessarily different from that pursued by us, and knowing how their census is limited to those of their own communion, it would not surprise me at all if the results which they arrive at should be different from those we obtain.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those were taken in purely Catholic counties.

Mr. MONK. If any argument has been drawn from that, which I believe has been, I should say that the findings of our clergy have been put to very base and irregular uses. I would not at all question the findings of my own clergy, but it would not surprise me that they should be widely different from those of our enumerators, who proceed under a totally different set of rules. There is no ground possible for comparison, but I do not want to speak without examining the record. Would my hon. friend bring to our next meeting, not only the vouchers connected with that investigation, but the books in which the entries were made ? That would greatly shorten the work of my hon. friend and mine. Is this list, which my hon. friend has handed me, really a list of the permanent staff of the census employed at Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a list of the people now engaged in the census work here at Ottawa, with the exception perhaps of one or two employees, permanent in the departments, but who are also engaged in this census work. It is a list of the nominees appointed to do the work of tabulation at Ottawa in connection with the census.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend bring down a complete list of those specially employed at Ottawa on the census of 1901, giving their names and salaries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will provide a supplementary list, if there are any names not on.

Mr. MONK. Are these officers paid by the day, week or month ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think that everybody on the list is paid by the day. They are paid every day right along, including Sunday.

Mr. MONK. Do they work on Sundays ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. INGRAM. When we had a discussion on the census some time ago, the hon. gentleman argued that the Conservative party in 1891 had stuffed the lists in the province of Quebec, and he gave a number of constituencies, in which a large number of families were enumerated in 1891, who were not there at the time. How can he reconcile that with the statement made frequently throughout the country that the French population of the province of Quebec had been under-enumerated in the census of 1891 by the Conservatives, and that Mr. Cote's circular was sent out for the special purpose of guarding against a similar occurrence ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware that the charge has ever been made that people were left out in the province of Quebec from the census taken in 1891.

Mr. INGRAM. Then why was the Cote circular sent out ? The reason given was that the French families in the province of Quebec had not been properly enumerated in 1891. Yet, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, instead of people being left out of the census then, the census lists in the province of Quebec were stuffed in 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason why the Cote circular, as the hon. gentleman describes it, was sent out, was to obtain a correct census in 1901, without any reference whatever to the census of 1891.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman must have heard his colleague's statement that was circulated in the press.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not responsible for his statement.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of Public Works was charged with circulating a statement that the French families of the province of Quebec had not been properly enumerated in 1891, that the Conservative party had not done justice to that population, and that was the reason why this circular was issued.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I sent out that circular for the purpose of getting a correct census in 1901. I never understood that there was any accusation that the French Canadians in the province of Quebec had not then been fully enumerated, but what I did understand—and I think that certain words in the first volume of the census of 1891 will bear me out—was that there were French speaking people all over the Dominion who had not been enumerated as such. There were Acadians in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and French Canadian people in Ontario and Manitoba. But there was only one description of them, that of French Canadians. A great many of these people, especially the Acadians, did not return themselves as French Canadians, thinking that 'French Canadian' was a term applied only to the French Canadian habitant of the province of Quebec. There were a large number of people of French origin, and of the Catholic religion, and who are really French nationality, but who were not returned as French Canadians. I think that was the complaint made by certain French Canadian members on the floor of this House after the census of 1891. I was not in the House at the time when the debates took place, but my recollection is that this is what has been explained to me as having occurred.

Mr. INGRAM. Then the Conservative party are not open to the charge of having given credit to Quebec for too large a population in 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not accusing them of that.

Mr. INGRAM. But, on the other hand, the accusation is that they did stuff the lists in the province of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, investigation shows it.

Mr. MONK. I see the point made by my hon. friend. But, the matter will be thoroughly sifted before this matter is passed. We will know if the statement of the Minister of Agriculture is true and if the charge, the violent charge, made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is well founded—that there are a very large number of perjurers among the French population of Quebec. That charge so repeatedly made will have to be sifted to the bottom. I can tell hon. members that the people of the province of Quebec, part of whom I represent here, have keenly felt that charge. We are Conservatives and Liberals in the province of Quebec and we have our political difficulties as other people have. But I should be very sorry to rise in this House and charge that the Liberal enumerators of 1901 were perjurers. And what is still stranger than the fact of such a charge being made concerning the enumerators of 1891 is the fact that it is proven out of the mouth of our Roman Catholic clergy. We will see the bottom of that before this item passes. For my part, I am prepared to suspend judgment until we have before us all the documents we have a right to see. In the meantime, I will examine the documents so far presented.

Mr. BENNETT. Coming to the alleged charges of falsification of the census in Ontario, I am informed that the inquiries were not made at random but specifically in every riding, and that the only county in which the investigator dared to put down anything definite was the county of Huron. In this case, the statement is made by a Mr. Macpherson. This gentleman does not live in Goderich, but, apparently in Clinton,

as he writes from Clinton. Who is he, and what is his occupation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that Mr. Macpherson is a member of the firm of Macpherson, Glasgow & Co., makers of agricultural implements, and lives in the town of Clinton.

Mr. BENNETT. This investigator or inquisitor lives in the village of Clinton, which, I think, is about ten or fifteen miles from Goderich. In 1891 Goderich was returned as having a population of about 4,000. After a lapse of ten years this gentleman goes up there. He does not make a single statement on his own authority, but what he says is 'after making careful inquiries of different old residents.' I suppose he took old people because their memory might be at fault and they might be easily persuaded to agree to what he said. This statement the Minister of Agriculture read out to show that the list for Goderich had been stuffed. The census was taken early in the year 1891. Now, take the first name mentioned as having been improperly included in the census list. This is Elizabeth Tebutt, who was enumerated twice, once in Goderich township and once in Clinton. I know nothing of the case, but I presume this woman was a domestic. She may have been at her home in Goderich township when the enumerator went around, and was probably included in the census again by the enumerator for Clinton where she was working. Now, the town of Goderich is a lake port of importance and a number of vesels run in and out of there. I find the name Worthington given here with the remarks that this party was in Chicago in 1891, and another party was in Buffalo, and so on. These men were probably vessel men, and were properly taken by the enumerator at Goderich. Everybody knows that a man connected with a vessel leaves home in the spring for the fitting-out work that is done on the boat. If the bulk of these cases were inquired into, I have no doubt it would be found that these men lived in Goderich and their occupation was such as to take them away during a part of the year. One is represented here as having been in Winnipeg, one in St. Paul, one in Vancouver, and others in other places. What does that indicate ? It indicates that this very inquisitive gentleman—who, I have no doubt we shall find out later on was well paid for his inquisitiveness—learned the names of people who, at some time of the year were away. He does not say that they were away the whole year. They may have been there in 1891 when the census was taken and been away in the fall. On this list are the names of the enumerators whose work is here impugned. Have they been asked for an explanation ?

Mr. BENNETT.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think so.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. minister think it is British fair-play to lay on the Table a statement opposite which is a name of, no doubt, a respectable man of the county of Huron or the town of Goderich, which statement practically brands that man as a perjurer ? I think my former statement is true, that these inquiries were made all over the province from the members representing the ridings, and that the member of that particular riding seemed to be very busy about this town of Goderich and the town of Clinton where he lives. Go all through the list and you find the same thing. Here are two men who were said to have been employed elsewhere in 1891, and the statement does not say they were not there in the spring of the year when the enumeration was taken.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The statements all have reference to the 6th of April.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister says that, but Mr. Macpherson does not say it. On the face of it, Mr. Macpherson knew nothing about it. He lives ten miles away from this town. Is the minister going to ask the people of this country to be asses enough to believe that a man who lives twelve miles away from a town can go back ten years afterwards and pledge his word that on this particular date, the 6th of April, every one of these men were not in that town I live in a town of 3,000 population, and I would hesitate to allege that on the 1st of April of a particular year men were not in that town who perhaps were there. Here is another statement. There is a Mr. Cook, a Mr. Corbett, a Mr. Woodcock, a Mr. Reid and a Mr. Stiver. I do not know any one of those men. Perhaps you do, Mr. Chairman, as you come from Huron ; and would you be prepared to say that these men were perjurers ? Now this man Macpherson would not venture to say this is true under the solemnity of an oath, and he would not hold himself responsible that there is one statement true on his own knowledge ; he says that the statements are made to him. I think it is preposterous that the minister should place such a document before the House and make wholesale charges based upon it. I am glad to know that having scoured Ontario from one end to the other in a vain attack on the census returns of 1891, he was only able to find in this town of Goderich the particular instances of wrongdoing that he mentions, and which, on their very face, will not carry to any fair minded man an idea that there was anything wrong on the part of these enumerators. Now, here is a test for the minister. He has the criminal law of the province of Ontario behind him, and he has been afraid to prosecute one of these men

for perjury. I ask the minister if he has prosecuted one of those men for making false returns ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Does he propose to prosecute any of those men for fraud ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not proposed to do so.

Mr. BENNETT. I admire the hon. gentleman's discretion. Here on the 17th of February this statement is sent in by Mr. Macpherson, and the minister thinks that between man and man it is fair and honest to these gentlemen to make this slander on them without asking them for an explanation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I want to correct the hon. gentleman in saying that the province of Ontario was carefully scoured to find out those frauds. There was no attempt of the kind in any shape or form.

Mr. INGRAM. In no case ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In no case. There was no inquiry made, and in this very place where an investigation was made there was no preliminary inquiry of any kind. Before the work was commenced we had no idea what the result was going to be. As a matter of fact, there were five places in which this work was conducted, and in two of those places, two townships in one riding, there was evidence that the census was taken correctly in 1891, and in the others there was evidence that it was not.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman give those statements ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave them in full to the House not long ago. The places in which the investigation was made were in Huron west, in Goderich and Clinton, in the town of Simcoe, and the village of Port Dover, in the south riding of Norfolk, where also many errors were found. In Cornwall also irregularities were found.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman leave these reports on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will be glad to do so. I may say that the best evidence that there was no preparation for this investigation is the fact that in one place, at all events, no irregularities were found. If our object had been to discover irregularities before we made our investigation, we would not have chosen that plan, but we would have chosen places where we had found irregularities. We just took the places at random, and made the investigation with the results that have been detailed. I have here four of these, and one where there was nothing wrong found. I will bring the reports down before the next meeting of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume these commissioners were paid out of this appropriation the same as in Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I stated a few minutes ago that the hon. gentleman had a staff composed of one clerk from each constituency in the Dominion, and the hon. gentleman stated a few moments ago that there was a supplementary list to be added. I have added up the numbers, and I find there are 205 names on this pay-list. I find also that he has able bodied men and women working at $1.25 per day, judging from this pay-list. I want the hon. gentleman to tell me how much it cost in 1891 and in 1901 to take the census in the city of Ottawa, where you have to pay for clerical work $1.25 a day ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say that as far as the $1.25 a day is concerned, there are a few clerks who are being paid $1.25 a day. This is because there were a few clerks who were not doing their duty properly and they were cut down from $1.50 to $1.25 a day as a warning and told if they did not do better they would be dismissed altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is quite a number of them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman how many there are. The expense in the city of Ottawa in 1891 was $1,564.37, and in 1901, $4,573.96.

Mr. TAYLOR. Three times the amount that it cost in 1891. I have just run up this monthly pay-list, and to the end of March, I find that it takes $10,500 to pay the persons whose names appear here. Then, there is a supplementary list, and there is the commissioner and a large number of the members of the staff who are not on this pay-list at all. There is Mr. Blue, the commissioner, whose name does not appear and that will increase the amount very materially. It is costing $10,500 a month, and from the best information we have it will take two years to complete the work of tabulating the statistics from the 1st of March. To pay this staff it will cost $250,000, to say nothing of the commissioner and the other members of the staff. My hon. friend does not expect to get through in less than two years from March last. The expenditure up to that time is $948,000 to say nothing of the commissioner, or rent, or the other members of the staff. This is the ordinary list of pay clerks who are receiving $1.25, $1.60, $1.75, and up to $2 a day. There is one man drawing $100 a month on the list, and he is the only one that I have noticed receiving that amount. I am prepared to say that before the work is

completed $1,250,000 will be nearer the amount expended than the sum stated by the minister.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the latest bulletin that has been issued ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Bulletin No. 7, giving the population by origins and nationalities.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has not been very extravagant in furnishing us with copies of the bulletins. I would like to know why the distribution office of the House is not supplied with a reasonable number so that copies can be obtained by members.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will be glad to send some copies to members of the House.

Mr. MONK. I think we have advanced a little and that we might now adjourn.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think we have advanced the business very much, but this happens to be as convenient a time as any other to adjourn.

Mr. CLARE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether he would object to bringing down a detailed statement of a few of the enumerators' accounts ? I would like the hon. gentleman to bring down a statement showing the amounts paid to the enumerators in South Waterloo particularly.

Some resolutions reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 126) to incorporate the Bishop of Moosonee.—Mr. Taylor.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 1.10 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 24, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

BOER IMMIGRATION.

Mr. WILSON asked :

Is the following statement correct which appeared in the 'Mail and Empire' of Saturday, April 19th, 1902 :

Canada wants the Boers.

London, April 18.—The question of what to do with many of the Boer prisoners has been a matter of the most earnest consideration on the part of the government. A good deal of correspondence has taken place on this subject between the Colonial Office and the Canadian government.

Canada wants men, plenty of men ; in the North-west Territories and towards British Columbia there are thousands of square miles that are lying waiting for settlers. The Boers are the sort of settlers that the Canadian government is looking for. The Dominion government proposes to give a full homestead, consisting of 160 acres of land, to each head of a family that will settle down, as well as to each male over twenty-one, to assist them with money—as settlers are at present assisted—and to admit them to the same terms of civil liberty as any settler.

If so, will the government lay the correspondence on the Table of the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no such correspondence.

PURCHASE AND SALE OF CHICKENS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Was the sum of $373.86, as shown in the Auditor General's report for the year ending June 30th, 1901, page D—59, paid to Geo. E. Baxter, Andover, N.B., for the following articles and services, viz. :—

Services collecting chickens, &c., 16 days at $2 ; 392 pounds chickens, $110.31 ; feeding chickens, October 13 to November 19, and December 12, 1900 to January 13, 1901, 67 days at $1.50 ; killing and packing, $9 ; labour, $1.50 ; paid to pickers, 24 days at $1, 12 days at 75 cents ; board, $12.20 ; ground feed, 3,232 pounds at $1.80 per cwt.; milk, 2,152 pounds at 30 cents per cwt.; collecting milk, $5 ; tallow, 25 pounds at 5 cents; sulphur, 8 pounds at 10 cents ; grit, $1 ; 100 bricks, $1.25 ; freight charges, $1.40,—$373.86.

2. Is the amount shown on page D—68, of the said Auditor General's report, viz., Andover, $225.66, all that was received for the sale of said chickens ?

3. If not, where is the balance shown as having been received, in said Auditor General's report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Was the sum of $115.50, as shown in the Auditor General's report for the year ending June 30th, 1901, page D—60, paid to George C. Douglas, Mount Stewart, P.E.I., for the articles and services, viz.:—

October and November, 1900, services, $42.50; 120 chickens, $31.27 ; oats, $56, ⅜ bushel at 32 cents ; grinding, $3.20 ; milk, 1,350 pounds, at 50 cents per cwt.; tallow, 14 pounds, at 6 cents; sulphur, 8 cents; horse hire, $1; freight charges, $1.38 ; cartage, 50 cents; rent of scales, 50 cents; labour, 80 cents ; dressing chickens, $1.50 ; paid to pickers, $7,—$115.50.

2. Is the amount shown on page D—68, of the said Auditor General's report, viz., Mr. Stewart,

$9.90, all that was received for the sale of said chickens ?

3. If not, where is the balance shown as having been received, in said Auditor General's report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) :

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Was the sum of $451.23, as shown in the Auditor General's report for the year ending June 30th, 1901, page D—60, paid to A. P. Hillhouse, Bondville, P.Q., for the following articles and services, viz. :—

Chickens, 240 at 27 cents, 200 at 26 cents ; grain, 5,196 pounds at $1.22 per cwt.; sundry feed, $6.94 ; milk, 2,845 pounds at 15 cents per cwt.; eggs, $35.98 ; tallow, 65 pounds at 5 cents; oil, $10.16; 3 cans, 85 cents, 4 pails, $1.20; nails, $1.50 ; lumber, 78 cents ; 6 feeding troughs, $4 ; 3 egg cases, 90 cents ; paint, $4.87 ; wire, $1.25 ; sundries, $6.19 ; freight charges, $19.50 ; cartage, $1.50 ; telegrams, 75 cents ; telephones, $1.55 ; paid to pluckers, $29.25 ; labourers, $68 ; for care of chickens, $54.75 ; buyer of chickens, $14.

2. Is the amount on page D—68, of the said Auditor General's report, viz., Bondville, $212.21, all that was received for the sale of said eggs and chickens ?

3. If not, where is the balance shown as having been received, in said Auditor General's report ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Again I answer twice, yes.

THE PLAINS OF ABRAHAM.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. When the Plains of Abraham were handed over to the city of Quebec, was the right reserved to the militia and military authorities to use the plains for drill, review or inspection purposes ?

2. Is the government aware that the municipal authorities have refused the local militia regiments the use of the plains for drill or inspection purposes ? If so, is it the intention of the government to take any action in the premises ; and if so, what action ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Yes.

2. The government has no such information, nor does the government believe that the statement is correct.

WHARF AT L'ILE-AUX-COUDRES.

Mr. ANGERS asked : (Translation.)

1. How many tenders have been received for the intended extension to the wharf at l'Ile-aux-Coudres ?

2. What are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?

3. To whom was the contract granted, and for what reasons ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) :

1. Two.

2. Magloire Francœur, $6,967.10 ; Harvey Perron and Dufour, $8,875.

3. To the lowest tenderer, Magloire Francoeur.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 40) respecting Pensions to Officers of the North-west Mounted Police.—The Prime Minister.

SUPPLY.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the House again go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend permit me to say that I am aware of the matter he intends to bring up, and to ask him if it will suit him as well to bring it up to-morrow, as the Minister of Railways wants to make an address which will occupy some time. If the hon. gentleman wishes to proceed, I will not object ; but it would be a matter of convenience if he would let the matter stand until to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a pity you left the Chair before we had time to come to an understanding.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I supposed that the hon. member manifested his assent. I had no desire to take any advantage.

Mr. MONK. The situation is this. We were not prepared to go on with the railway estimates immediately, because we thought the motion of my hon. friend from Macdonald was going to be put before the Speaker left the Chair, and consequently two or three of our friends who desire to be here when the railway estimates are proceeded with are not in the Chamber at this moment.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say to my hon. friend that the members will not be called on to vote on the estimates for some considerable time, as the Minister of Railways desires to make a somewhat lengthy address, and before we reach a vote, the hon. member will probably have the opportunity to have the gentlemen he refers to present.

Mr. MONK. I think it is important that the gentlemen I refer to should have the opportunity of hearing the statement of the Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will wait a few minutes if the hon. gentleman wishes to send for them.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. member for Hamilton came to my desk a few minutes ago and said that he did not expect that the railway estimates would come on until after dinner, and for that reason he left and went to his room in the Victoria Chambers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Notice was given last evening that the railway estimates would be taken up to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. But it was understood that the hon. member for Macdonald would bring up his question first.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was asked by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) whether I was prepared to make my statement this afternoon, and I said I was. I have no desire to inconvenience hon. gentlemen opposite. I would only like to make this appeal to them. I have been most anxious to be allowed to make my statement in the afternoon, as I have not been in as good health or strength as would warrant me to speak at any length in the evening.

Mr. MONK. We were under the impression that this motion, which, I understand, it will not take much time to discuss, would be taken up at once. In fact such was considered the understanding, and some of our friends are leaving later on in the day. It will not take up any length of time, and it will be possible then for the hon. minister to make his statement before the evening sitting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure that in order to get through the various subjects, I would like to touch upon, it would be impossible for me to do so in any less time than between now and the dinner recess. I have been consulting the convenience of my hon. friends, from time to time, and yielding to their suggestions for the purpose of securing an afternoon, when I would be in better shape to make my statement to the House.

Mr. MONK. I think, under the circumstances, you had better go on.

Intercolonial Railway, $5,500,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I propose, at this stage, with the consent of the committee, to make a general statement respecting the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. I think it is convenient that I should do so now as that will be very much more advantageous than to have a general discussion as each item comes up. In this way I think we could better dispose of the matter, as a whole, than on the individual items.

I would first call the attention of the committee to the subject of capital expenditure. The capital expenditure for the year, which we have so far asked parliament to authorize, is $1,975,000. There will be some addition to that probably in the supplementary estimates, but the amount will not be considerable. This sum is less by $3,073,000 than the estimates on capital account for last year. The Prince Edward Island Railway requires an expenditure on capital account of $510,000, which is $24,000 above that of last year. The capital expenditure on canals will require $1,275,950, which is $1,230,000 less than last year, but it is liable to be increased by some further sum which we will ask in our supplementaries for the year to come. The total reduction therefore on capital account, as compared with last year, is $4,270,000.

As I am at this moment referring to the subject of capital account, I think it well to take this opportunity to refer to some, at all events, of the criticisms which have been passed upon the expenditure made under capital head upon the Intercolonial Railway during the past five years. The opposition and the opposition press have denounced the government in the most unqualified terms because of what they chose to regard as the enormous expenditures we have made. They have not thought it at all germane to the subject to examine into the different items which constitute the total amount. They have not thought it necessary to ask themselves whether or not the various purposes for which this capital outlay has been asked, were proper and legitimate purposes or not, but have totalled the whole amount and have even exceeded the total amount in their statements. They have stood, as it were, transfixed with horror at the idea that so large a sum should have been expended for such general purposes.

My hon. friend who preceded me in this department (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has, I feel, an exaggerated idea of that expenditure, because I remember having heard him say, with all confidence, not very long since either, that the total expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway is $23,000,000. I shall ask my hon. friend to avail himself of an early opportunity to enlighten the House as to how he arrives at that conclusion. I am unable to find that any such sum has been authorized by parliament or has been expended on capital account. I venture to say that the amount he mentioned might have been very wisely and advantageously expended, but we have not asked nor have we received any authority to spend any such sum. The total expenditure for the years for which we are responsible, including the outlay for the purchase of the Drummond County line, is $12,486,961 during the past five years, not including the estimates for the years 1902-3,

and including the estimates for the present year. A very considerable portion of that amount has already been expended, but the whole of it has not, and I think it only fair that before any hon. member concludes adversely against the wisdom and propriety of this expenditure he should take the trouble to look a little into it and ask himself: Were not the various purposes necessary for which this outlay was made? Were they not proper and legitimate purposes in the interests of the government railway and the country?

What were these purposes? In the first place, one of the classes of expenditure, to which a considerable sum has gone out, is rolling stock. On rolling stock we have expended in the five years down to the end of 1901-2 as follows:

1897	$ 14,996 04
1898	65,560 92
1899	619,999 26
1900	573,618 35
1901	1,563,705 77

We expended on rails and fastenings, $400,000, and for building and renewing and strengthening bridges:

1899	$ 50,889 96
1900	77,091 10
1901	167,705 23

On increased accommodation, which includes various items, we expended:

1897	$ 65,602 95
1898	154,222 19
1899	300,272 63
1900	729,471 14
1901	773,317 33

We expended upon the ferry service at the Strait of Canso, $317,000 in 1901.

Upon station buildings, sidings and miscellaneous, we expended:

1897	$ 68,513 53
1898	32,973 89
1899	110,768 09
1900	416,167 70
1901	427,191 41

These amounts make a total of $6,932,461; or, in round numbers, say seven millions of money actually expended, as will appear by reference to the public accounts. Our expenditure on capital account for 1902 is $4,000,000; our expenditure on the Drummond County Railway is $1,459,000. These items together make up the total I gave you a few moments ago of twelve millions and a half in round figures.

Now, I wish to add, is there any gentleman here, is there any one of the critics of the administration prepared to take the ground that it was not necessary, that it was not proper, that it was not in the interest of the railway and of the Dominion that these several classes of expenditure should have been made? I presume that no one is going to revive the controversy over the Drummond County Railway. Therefore, I pass that item by. I ask hon. members to bear in mind, in this connection, that the business of the Intercolonial Railway has been increasing by leaps and bounds. I ask you to compare the amount of business that is now being transacted over the Intercolonial Railway with that of preceding years, and say whether or not the increase of business was not in itself a loud and imperative call for liberal expenditure upon the government railway in order that we might do that business. I need not go further back than the last year of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart). The gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for that year were $2,957,000. For six years before, during which the mileage of the road was identical with what it was in 1896, the gross earnings upon the Intercolonial Railway were practically stationary. The highest year's earnings during that whole period was $3,012,739—barely over three millions of dollars. In 1897, under similar conditions, the gross earnings amounted to $3,066,000; in 1898, before we had the Drummond County Railway in operation, the gross earnings were $3,117,000. In 1899, they increased to $3,738,000, and in 1900 to $4,552,000. In 1901, the earnings amounted to $4,972,000, or only a little less than five millions of money, as compared with three millions prior to 1896. What does that mean? That means an addition of two-thirds, or about 66 per cent. While I am on the subject of gross earnings, I might mention that, from the end of the last fiscal year down to the present day the earnings have gone on increasing at the rate of about $40,000 a month, and, at this moment, our earnings are nearly, if not quite, half a million dollars more than they were for the like period during the last year. So, our business has presented the most phenomenal results, an increase within the last two years of about 66 per cent, and, if you take in this year, about 75 per cent as compared with the last year of hon. gentlemen opposite, I would ask any hon. gentleman who stops for a moment to consider the question whether these conditions do not of themselves call imperatively for a large expenditure upon capital account? I venture to say that in 1896, and prior to that time, the Intercolonial Railway had no more locomotives than it required to do the business it was doing. I affirm with all confidence that it had not any more cars—if it had as many—than were required to do its business. It had not more facilities of any kind than were needed for traffic, giving receipts of less than $3,000,000. If you are going to do a business on the basis of 75 per cent more—and, as I think, we may look forward to some increases still, say even double—what reason, justice or common sense, is there in the complaint that we are making large expenditures on account of capital in connection with such an institution? Let me read to the committee a statement made by the mechanical superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway when the question

was presented to him as to what should be done in order that we might provide for the growing needs of the road. I asked that gentleman to furnish me with a statement of what things were like in 1896, with respect to the condition of the road and its equipment, and what he thought ought to be done. And he proceeded to do so. And, as he is a competent man, a man of large experience in railways, and one whose opinion would naturally guide the head of a department in determining, so far as he could determine it, what the policy of the administration ought to be, I will read his statement to the committee :

To enable you to see things from my standpoint, it will perhaps be best for me to point out the conditions which exist in the mechanical department on a successfully managed modern road, and some of the reasons for its success.

In the locomotive department, we shall find that for main line service the freight engines are heavy, as heavy as the roadbed can bear, that they are kept in good condition by renewals, both the small and old engines being thrown away either because they are expensive to maintain or because they are totally unable to haul trains with the economy required by the diminishing freight rates, which are now, for bulk freight, about one-half of what they were a few years ago ; they do not expect engines to run more than twenty years with any economy, and they are often obliged by keen competition in rates to discard them much sooner than that, and buy still larger engines, which they are enabled to use on account of the ever-increasing capacity of the track on which heavier rails are being constantly laid.

After the locomotive, the most necessary point for consideration is the capacity of the freight car. This is ever-increasing in size, because increase in capacity means a smaller proportion of dead weight to haul in each train. Renewals are constantly made, not only on account of wear and tear, but to enable the capacity to be enlarged to suit modern requirements, and to have them equipped with modern appliances to facilitate business, to quicken transportation, and at the same time protect the lives of train men.

They find that the combined use of heavy engines and large capacity cars, is the foundation of cheap freight transportation, and is absolutely necessary for its accomplishment, and in no other way can the desired end be attained. The combination means reduced expenses on every ton hauled, fewer trains, fewer delays through meeting points for trains, fewer cars to place at sidings, less shunting in yard, and better service to the shipper.

The passenger department on a well managed and popular road is the advertisement on which it relies to attract attention to itself. Its cars are built in compliance with the modern requirements of comfort in travelling and attractive appearance, they are always kept well painted, varnished and clean looking, and furnished with the best known appliances for ensuring speed and safety. We shall find the workshops large, roomy and well built, prosperous looking, equipped with cranes in every direction, and the best known labour-saving devices.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

Then he shows the need of having modern machinery supplied.

It is kept well ahead of the actual needs of the roads, large enough to keep engines and cars in good, healthy condition, and rolling stock is being constantly rebuilt. Its capacity for repairs is flexible, because men can be taken off new work to do repairs when they are accumulating too fast. The general policy being to rebuild both engines and cars instead of wasting time and material in patching up stock that is old and worn out, and which, owing to the march of improvements, has become too small and obsolete.

Now, this is the statement of an experienced man as to what a modern railway requires. Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, is there any reason known to any member of this House why, in equipping, building and repairing we should discard modern methods upon a government road ? Is there any reason why a government road should be an exception to all other roads ? Is there any reason why a government road should remain out of date ? Will anybody tell me why a government road should be an out-of-date institution, that it should be, either as to its passenger equipment or its road-bed, a discredit to the country ? Is not the country entitled to respect from an enlightened and proper administration of the Intercolonial Railway, that it should be as good, as complete, as comfortable, as speedy, as convenient and in as good condition as any other railway in Canada ? Do the people of this country approve, or do they not, of having the railway which belongs to them in such a shape that it will reflect no discredit upon either them or the government ? I venture to say that the man who interprets the sentiment of the people of Canada in any other way, misinterprets that sentiment. While it may suit the purposes of the opponents of the government to give currency to a view among the people that there has been wasteful extravagance in the enormous sums of money, as they choose to characterize them, which have been laid out upon the road, I say they are attempting to deceive the people, they are misleading the people in a way which is not worthy of any political party ; and until they can show that in the expenditures we have made upon this railway, on capital or any other account, we have been wasteful, that we have made expenditures without reasonable necessity, they have no case against the administration of the government railway.

Mr. INGRAM. Whose statement is that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That of the mechanical superintendent, Mr. Joughins. Then he passes from what he considers ought to be and are the requirements of a first-class road, an up-to-date road, to what our conditions and circumstances are in that regard.

On taking an inventory of our locomotives, we shall find that the freight engines are altogether too small to haul freight with economy. In writing to the general manager on June 18th, in the fiscal year 1897-8, I said as follows : 'Referring to the new engines which we think of ordering, it seems to me that we ought first to purchase freight engines exclusively, because the grades on our road are so heavy that our present freight engines are totally unable to handle a paying train of freight, and because our passenger service seems to be fairly well provided for at the present time, at least it does not demand such a radical reform as the freight service. If we decide to get freight locomotives, we ought to buy as large as it is possible to use on our road-bed.' And this still appears to me to hold good. . . . . It is well recognized that very much greater economies can be inaugurated and practiced in hauling freight than passenger trains without detriment to the service, that such improvements persistently carried out are one of the essentials necessary to place a road on a paying basis, and to meet the competition of its neighbours.

Our greatest handicap in endeavouring to reach the goal of economy is the size and condition of the 156 engines employed in hauling freight. They are altogether too small, not one could be considered a modern engine for main line service, and most of them were too small even according to progressive railroad ideas the day they were purchased.

Now, this is a statement of the mechanical superintendent. Whether that statement is correct, whether his judgment is sound or not, I venture to appeal to any man filling any responsible position such as that of mechanical superintendent on any of the railways of Canada, or of any other country on the continent, whether the statement he makes in this regard is not supported and sustained by the judgment of every man of experience in the same direction.

In looking at our list of both passenger and freight engines, we see that we have 143 engines with cylinders 17 inches or less in diameter, and only 57 engines with 18 inches, and six with 19 inches, the latter being purchased only within the last four or five years, and then for passenger service.

That is, prior to 1898.

They were all purchased for passenger service.

Those four or five having nineteen inch cylinders.

For many years engines with cylinders even so large as 18 inches have not been economically useful in freight service, and the smaller sizes should have disappeared long ago from our main line. We are now purchasing engines with 21 inch cylinders, and with almost double the power of the largest we hitherto possessed.

The Canada Atlantic, a level road, have not, I believe, bought less than 18-inch engines during the last fifteen or twenty years, the Canadian Pacific not a single one since 1887, while we have bought or rebuilt 33 engines of less than that size during the last ten years.

Perhaps I could show more clearly what I mean when I say that the engines are too small by comparing the weight and power of a modern freight engine with the engines we now possess. The best of our old locomotives weighed about 50 tons, and could haul 550 tons up a 1 per cent grade, and we have only 12 of that capacity, the rest are smaller, some weighing only 30 tons. A modern freight engine, such as we are purchasing, weighs 83 tons, and has a hauling capacity of 1,100 tons up the same grade. On calculating the hauling power of each freight engine which we own and adding them together, we find that it amounts to 56,000 tons up a grade of 1 per cent, and that if we had the same number of modern engines they would haul 166,000 tons up the same grade.

That is three times as much. And, mark you, in the incidental cost of running the trains, taking into account items such as oil and waste, the rate of wages paid, &c., it would cost practically the same to run a train hauling 300, or 400, or 500 tons as it would be to run a train hauling 1,100 or 1,200 tons.

There is not very much to say about freight cars, except that they have not been designed large enough, and that during the last eight or ten years we have purchased from 2,000 to 3,000 cars of 20 tons capacity, which should have been 30 tons. To me it seems incomprehensible why 20-ton cars should have been made up to 1898, when every one else years ago had recognized the value of the larger car, and it is, I believe, needless for me to point out its advantages.

Now, there is his statement. He winds up with this :

It is difficult to speak with certainty of what ought to be done to meet the demands of the passenger traffic. Both in regard to locomotives and cars it is more a question of competition, appearances, speed, comfort and safety than one of reducing expenses per train mile. I feel that you are quite familiar with the facts and requirements in regard to this, and that I need not say very much about it beyond pointing out that our passenger engines are small and that the condition of our trains is anything but a good advertisement for our road. A stranger visiting the provinces for the first time, would conclude from their appearance that the road was very much embarrassed financially, so poor that it could not afford to make a decent appearance, unable even to spend enough to keep them clean, and when we know that they belong to the Canadian government and therefore in some degree represent it before the world, we cannot help feeling ashamed for their appearance ; our cars were built long before comfort was considered a necessity in railway travelling and we have not been renewing our cars at such a rate as to be able to say that we have a respectable and modern equipment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the date of that report ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This report was written, with the quotations which I have read, in 1899. I have read to you quotations from a report which was made in the fiscal year 1897-98,

in regard to the conditions of the locomotives, engines and cars.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) says that this report was made in 1897-8 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I say that the paper I am reading from is dated May 1st, 1899, and the portion which I have been reading, referring to the condition of the locomotives and train service, is an extract from a report made in the financial year 1897-98.

Mr. INGRAM. And I understood the hon. gentleman to say that during the year 1898 he purchased a large number of 20-ton cars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, no.

Mr. INGRAM. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, he wrote in 1897-98 that during the previous years there had been 20-ton cars purchased. He wrote that :

> During the last eight or ten years we have purchased from 2,000 to 3,000 cars of 20 tons capacity which should have been of 30 tons.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) be good enough to put that report on the Table of the House so that we will have an opportunity of looking at it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I can put it on the Table exactly, but if the hon. gentleman would like to look at it I will let him have it in his own hands.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think it would be better when the hon. gentleman reads a report from a public officer that he should put it on the Table.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These are simply extracts from the report of this officer. I have not the whole of the report. I will let the hon. gentleman have it such as it is. Now, Mr. Chairman, just let me state the condition in an abbreviated form. So far as the equipment of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, we had not a dining car on it. We had not a real first-class car on it. We had not a first-class sleeping car on the road, as everybody knows. Travelling on the Intercolonial over night, leaving our train and taking a car on the Canadian Pacific Railway or Grand Trunk Railway, the comparison which any person would make was open to comment and the subject of general remark. They had all the modern appliances and equipments; we had none of them. The first dining car that was put on the line was put on in 1898, or early in 1899, and so in regard to up to date coaches and sleeping cars. You have heard that we had no locomotives that were capable of hauling more than 600 tons. I can give the committee a list showing when these locomotives were obtained, when they were purchased, how old they were and what the capacity was for hauling. You have the general statement of Mr. Joughins that these engines would not haul 500 tons and everybody who has gone over the Intercolonial Railway in times past noticed the character of the train service, and even down to this date, has seen more trains of perhaps 180, 200 and 300 tons hauled by locomotives than trains of a larger tonnage. One hundred and eighty, or 200 tons was more than the average of the whole tonnage of some of these trains and yet large locomotives which will cost no more for running, although they cost a little more for fuel, would be able to haul five times that amount of tonnage up our grades without any difficulty whatever, and they are doing it to-day. The only thing that I regret is that we have not been able to get these large locomotives manufactured and put into service fast enough. We have not begun to realize the advantages which will accrue from the equipment of the road with large locomotives, so that we are yet in no position to claim that we are fully and completely equipped.

We are spending, this year, $400,000 on capital account for rails. We must put down heavy rails to bring our road up to date. I think that is too obvious to need any argument to sustain it. We must have heavier trains, heavier locomotives and heavier cars, and the truest economy, as well as the safety and security of the travelling public, requires that we should have these heavy rails and that we should have the bridges strengthened so that these trains may safely pass over our line. We have spent $200,000 within the last three years out of capital for the purpose of strengthening these bridges. I would have been better pleased and the road would have been better served if we had spent double or treble that amount during that time. It would have been better if the government had spent more than that for new rails and more rails, but I think hon. gentlemen would be inclined to assume that if it had been possible for the government to have authorized estimates for a larger sum they would have done so. If they had thought that parliament would have approved of larger estimates they would have so asked, but we must move cautiously and moderately in these things. We cannot do as company roads do, circulate their stock, get $20,000,000 at one time and do the things which are necessary. We must go to work in a more moderate way. The expenditures we have made in these years have been less than we would have liked to have made. The expenditure for sidings and accommodations has been very large and will amount up to this time, to about $2,000,000. Does anybody say

that with heavier trains and heavier locomotives we could get along without increased sidings ? I intend to have a memorandum of the exact number, of miles—there were scores of miles—which have been added to the railway in the way of additional sidings during the last two or three years. I will get the information if it can be obtained for me before we get through the discussion on the Intercolonial Railway votes. But, we have spent $2,000,000 for this purpose. Does anybody say that that expenditure was not necessary ? You had better pull up your rails and tear up your road and tell the people that you do not want a railway down there than run it in the two-penny, halfpenny way in which it was going on. If you are going to have a railway that is creditable to Canada you cannot move one peg without doing the whole work. You cannot have locomotives that will economically carry the freight unless you have heavier rails, longer sidings and larger cars. All these things follow in the train, one upon the other, just as naturally as day follows night, and the necessity is just as complete as it would be in any other condition. Now, then, I say that having increased the size of the car and the length of the train, in order that the road may be worked at all, we had to have, as rapidly as we could get them, increased length of sidings from one end to the other of the road.

As to the expenditure at the Straits of Canso, nobody seems to have taken any objection to that. The little freight sheds that we had along the line with their limited accommodation ; the little stations and the little offices which did not suffice ; these had to be increased and multiplied, and during the last five years we have had to spend $1,000,000 in that work. Shall it be said that when people along the whole length of the Intercolonial Railway were crying out for reasonable facilities to enable them to do their business ; shall it be said that we should turn a deaf ear to their appeals because some one on the other side of the House is going to cry out : 'What an enormous expense,' and because some one on the opposite side claiming to represent his party, may say : This is a sinkhole for the money of the country. Sir, I do not think we would be worthy of the positions we occupy as responsible ministers of the Crown if we had yielded timidly to any such outcry as that, and refused to give the people of Canada the accommodation which they demanded on the Intercolonial Railway. My business as the Minister of Railways is to present to my colleagues reasonable demands to meet the needs of the railway. As a matter of fact I have never approached this question in any spirit of extravagance, but on the contrary, I have always been behind the requirements of the road. And when I presented these claims, I must say that they have always been received in a spirit of fairness and consideration by my colleagues. They were not, perhaps, met to the extent which I would have desired, but still they were met to an extent which I could see was as far as the government could reasonably go at the time and under the circumstances. Sir, I am prepared to justify, to justify in the face of the world, what we have done in order to make the Intercolonial Railway a railroad which is creditable to Canada to-day, and which if we have not brought up to an absolute state of perfection at the present time, we hope to attain in the future. I would like to get a candid avowal from the gentlemen on the other side of the House who have gone over that road, as to what they think of the improvements we have made and the increased facilities which we have afforded. They certainly have told me individually that they much appreciate the improvements which have taken place. They have commended in no carping spirit the splendid and convenient service which we have given to the people of the country. Let it be remembered that the Intercolonial Railway is not for the people of the maritime provinces alone ; let it not be forgotten that the commercial people of all Canada, and that the travelling public of all Canada are participants in the comforts and facilities which are afforded on that road. I am satisfied, for my part, that the people of the entire Dominion desired that the Intercolonial Railway should be put in proper shape. Let me ask : What was the condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway before we entered on our era of improvement on the Intercolonial Railway ? Are there not gentlemen here who travelled over the Canadian Pacific Railway before we brought the Intercolonial Railway up to its present standard, and do they not know it to be a fact that the better quality of the service, and the greater comfort and the greater convenience which we inaugurated on the Intercolonial Railway stimulated the other road to our example. I think hon. members on both sides of the House will recognize that there is a place which a government railway can properly fill in every country ; it can be an example and a stimulus to other railway companies throughout the country to attain to the same high standard of service. And, Sir, if a government railroad does no other good than that, it does a very great deal for the benefit of the country.

I do not believe that under all the circumstances, the people of Canada will say that we have expended one dollar more on the Intercolonial Railway than we should have expended. I say that my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for instance, does not represent the people of Montreal or the people of his own district when he speaks in the contemptuous way he does of the Intercolonial Railway. He does not represent the ideas of the people when he treats the Intercolonial Railway as if it were

unworthy of serious consideration. I am quite sure that the people will not approve of what he has said in that regard, for I know that the citizens of Montreal are more than pleased with the results of our bringing the Intercolonial Railway to that city.

Now, Sir, I think I have proven that the expenditure on capital has been necessary and justifiable. But some people have said, as if it deserved serious attention at the hands of parliament: Oh, but you have spent sums on capital account which ought to have been paid out of the earnings of the road. In other words, they declare that we have not adopted a system of book-keeping which would commend itself to an expert chartered accountant. Now that may be all very well; it may be a very nice argument to address to a meeting of shareholders of any incorporated company, if these shareholders were raising the question as to whether the expenditure for the year was an expenditure that ought to be taken from earnings which would reduce the yearly dividends, or whether it ought to be included in bonds, and charged by way of bonded liability upon the undertaking, so that future shareholders would have to bear the charge, and the present shareholders would get a larger rate of interest. The shareholders in these incorporated companies change from year to year; one set of men may be shareholders to-day and a different body of men would be shareholders in the next month, or in the next year, and the question raised by gentlemen on the other side in reference to the charging of the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway would be a profitable one for consideration under such circumstances. But is that the situation with regard to the Intercolonial Railway? I contend that it is not. The Intercolonial Railway belongs to the people of the country, and as such its owners are not in the same position as would be the shareholders in a joint stock corporation. The government lasts for ever; though its personnel may change, yet it is always the government of Canada that is administering the Intercolonial Railway, and the people who own it are Canadians, whether they be the people who are living to-day or the people who will live years hence. It is the country that is concerned; and it is not particularly a question of book-keeping for them. I propose to show, Sir, that even if it were, there is nothing in the argument which hon. gentlemen opposite have advanced upon that point.

My first proposition is this, that if the need of making this expenditure is conceded in order to bring the road up to the condition to which we are bringing it, and in order that it may be still further improved, there is only one way in which it can be done, and that is by borrowing, or, in other words, on capital account—why? Because the earnings of the road do not afford a sufficient margin. Even if they produced each year the largest surplus we ever had, that would only be a mere drop in the bucket for the purpose of reconstituting and reconstructing a great railway. How long would it be before we would put down new rails on the whole road if we had to take the cost of them out of earnings? How long before we could put down new sidings or provide new equipment if we had to wait until we could do so out of earnings? It happens that this road has never been, and perhaps it never may be, a great surplus-paying road. Conditions exist which may for some years to come control the financial results of the undertaking. It would be unfair to hold the Intercolonial to the same strict rule to which you would hold railways which are built for commercial reasons, and in view of commercial considerations exclusively. I wonder to what extent commercial considerations entered into the question of the location of the Intercolonial Railway. If we had been building a road to yield a handsome net return to the government every year from its earnings, who would undertake to build a road by the roundabout route which the Intercolonial Railway has taken? I do not suggest that it should not have taken that route. In the conditions of the country at the time, I think it was important that it should have done so, because the people in that portion of the country would otherwise not have had railway accommodation at all. But do not let it be asserted that because those conditions controlled the location of the route, for that reason the Intercolonial Railway ought to be despised and neglected, and left in the condition of a second or third-class road because, located where it is, it did not promise any large financial results and does not give any such results. I claim, therefore, that the position, so far as the question of improving the road out of capital or out of earnings is concerned, is exactly the same as respects its control by the country, and there is not one dollar of difference either to any individual in Canada or to the Finance Minister of Canada, in the result at the end of the year, whether you improve it out of earnings or out of capital. Would it not be fallacious and absurd for me to come down to parliament and ask for an appropriation of two or three or four millions out of earnings for the purpose of improving the road? If I did so, who would be the first person in the House to condemn such a proposition? My hon. friends opposite; and what would they say? They would charge me with beinig guilty of a shallow pretense; they would charge me with perpetrating a fraud on the parliament of Canada in asking for two or three or four millions out of the earnings of the road when it never had more than $122,000 of net surplus in any year in its whole history. They would say, why do you not honestly and frankly tell the House and the country that you have not the earnings and do not expect

them, and that you intend to add to the debt of the country by taking this money out of the treasury, out of which it must necessarily come? That is the attitude these gentlemen would take if the government laid estimates on the Table for an expenditure in that way. So that you can see at once that if the road is to be improved, and improved promptly, and improved by the expenditure of a large amount of money, then of necessity we must borrow the money in order to do it; and when I say that we must borrow the money, I make the statement upon the assumption that there would not necessarily be in the treasury of the country a sufficient amount, after all the other charges for the government service have been disposed of, to meet this charge. If there should be such a surplus then there would be no addition to the debt, and you would be in exactly the same position as if you had voted the money on account of earnings, and had spent it out of such appropriation. I do not think it is humanly possible for any individual to construct any theory or to advance any argument to show, granting my basic proposition, that the expenditure must be made, that one farthing of difference has been made in the financial condition of the country, or that the people have lost one dollar by reason of the particular way in which it has been made, that is to say, by asking an appropriation on capital account.

I hope that my argument upon that point has been made clear. If it has, then there is no substantial ground for criticism as to the expenditure—I do not say as to some of the minute details. I am not going to affirm for a moment that in a large expenditure of millions there may not have been some items in which the expenditure has been larger than it would have been if a closer scrutiny had been kept. I make that statement so as not to appear to make too broad a claim. But in the main, considering these exceptions, I say that assuming that the expenditure was a proper expenditure, it could only be made in this way; and, so far as I can discover, there is no earthly difference between making it in this way and making it in any other way that can be suggested—except this: The ex-Minister of Finance admitted what I am now stating. In the course of the discussions which have taken place on this question, he admitted that, as a matter of finance affecting the people of the country, or the treasury it did not make any difference; but he said the difference comes in when we as a parliament are seeking to compare the character of your administration with the character of your predecessors'. The difference comes in, he said, when you want to put the two administrations side by side; you have expended sums of money out of capital which you might have spent instead out of any little surpluses you may have had, and have therefore been able to show some little better results than you would have been able to do if you had followed the course pursued by your predecessors. Therefore, he said, for the purposes of comparison, the system of making the expenditure on capital account is not as defensible as the other system.

There is enough in that argument to justify one in taking a few moments of the time of the committee in order to examine it. You will observe that the proposition is based on two or three assumptions. You have to assume two or three things before you get the length of admitting that the argument is one of force or one that has any application in the present case. You have to assume two or three very clear and explicit propositions, and I will tell you what they are. To be of any value for purposes of comparison, the first thing is that the conditions under which the comparison is to be made should be, if not absolutely identical, at all events approximately so. Is not that a fair argument to address to the committee? Is it not fair to say that if you are going to make a comparison at all between this government and the last, then, for the purpose of supporting the statement that your expenditure has not been made under the proper heading, we have to show that the conditions of the expenditure during the period of the ex-Minister of Railways and the conditions during my period have been similar. Now, if you admit that, it will lead us into a moment's digression in order to see whether or not you can get the conditions alike by any possible mode of straining or torturing of facts. I say you cannot. My hon. friend was pegging away on the Intercolonial Railway just sufficiently to keep it up so that it could run. No doubt the roadbed was good. There is no better roadbed in the country—solid and all that—very good as far it went. It was good for a locomotive of the size of 30 or 40 tons and to haul 180 or 200 tons, and to haul eight or nine cars at the outside. And if that was all right, my hon. friend was going along well enough. He was considerably out when we come to consider the question of economy, but economy was not sought for by my hon. friend. He took no practical method to secure economy. He was just peddling along in the same old way, and my hon. friend would have been content no doubt to have gone peddling along in the old way for fifty years if his government had only remained in office that long. But the country woke up, the country was aroused, and when I say the country, I mean the whole country. My hon. friend does not think probably that the maritime provinces, or even that portion of the province of Quebec which is traversed by the Intercolonial Railway is the country. But, supposing he is right in that view, I say that Ontario, which sends the largest part

of its traffic on the Intercolonial Railway down to the maritime provinces—and everybody knows that Ontario furnishes us down there with almost all that we buy in the way of goods not manufactured in that country—is as deeply interested in the efficiency of the Intercolonial Railway as are the maritime provinces. There can be no doubt about that. And if my hon. friend were in my office and in receipt of the letters from the different manufacturers of Ontario which I daily receive, if he could read and hear their denunciations because we have not cars enough, or because we could not move freight and trains fast enough, and if my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) could see these complaints, they would begin to think that there are other parts of Canada interested in the Intercolonial Railway outside of the maritime provinces and that portion of the province of Quebec which it traverses. Therefore, when I say the country, I mean the country as a whole, because the country as a whole is deeply interested. The conditions which existed when the country woke up and called for improvement on the Intercolonial Railway, were totally different from those which obtained during the years preceding. My hon. friend and his associates and colleagues, who have been attending the Public Accounts Committee, and spending no doubt sleepless nights in trying to figure out how many dollars were spent and how many tons of rails were laid down by the late government out of earnings, may take all the benefit they like out of the comparison. They will find that in no one year, during which my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) administered the Intercolonial Railway, was there more than 3,000 to 5,000 tons of rails, laid down, whereas we have laid down 25,000 to 30,000 tons per year, and ought to lay down 50,000 tons per year, while the present generation or perhaps the children of the present generations are living, if we are ever to get the road properly equipped. I do not think there was any year in which my hon. friend put down as much as 5,000 tons of rails. In some years he put down 1,800 and in some 3,000 and in some 3,500. And there is no sense in making a comparison between an expenditure involving the laying down of 3,000 or 5,000 tons per year out of earnings and that involving the laying down of 25,000 to 30,000 tons per year. Are the conditions alike? Can you put the one expenditure beside the other and draw any just or fair inference or make any just or fair comparison as between the two, in favour of my hon. friend's proposition? I do not think you can.

But steel rails are not the only items. Take all the items right through. Take the item of new locomotives. We had to bestir ourselves, we had to be alive and try and accomplish something in our day. We had to buy 25 to 30 locomotives a year. We have not got them all yet, but are hoping to get them so that we will have them available for service during the year to come.

Mr. MONK. By tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, by tender. I am just going to break away for a moment to make an observation for the benefit of my hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER. It will be lost on him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope not. I know how deeply he felt, how full of regret he was, when he came to be informed that this government had, three or four years ago, gone over to the United States and got locomotives built there for the Intercolonial Railway. The picture which he presented when the enormity of such conduct came to his mind, was one which elicited from me a feeling of profound sympathy. I do not think that if he were the bitterest opponent of mine, I should wish to have him suffer the grief which then appeared to weigh him down, but it did strike me with some surprise that he should have been so grief-stricken for the first time. It did appear rather singular that he had not given some evidence of his extreme regret that such a policy should have been tolerated by the country, when the government which he himself supported did exactly the same thing, and did it under conditions which did not make it necessary, as they did in our case, for his friends to take that course. We have a report from the committee upon railway matters to which I can refer. I recollect my hon. friend complaining about the treatment that men who went before that committee received at its hands. He himself did not favour the committee with his presence, so far as I am aware, and how he came to be so impressed with the impropriety of the conduct of the majority of that committee, I do not know. He is very much concerned about all these matters, he is very anxious that information should be secured, yet my hon. friend was never present at any meeting of that committee which I have attended, and I have been present at all its meetings.

Mr. MONK. You would not let us find out anything there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend was not there to try and find out anything. But he fires off his shots at long range. When he has any to fire he fires them through somebody else. I want to tell my hon. friend what took place in that Railway Committee, and if he had been present I have no doubt that he would have had to be carried out on a stretcher. It appears that there was a circular issued by one of the officials of the Intercolonial Railway stating that the

mechanical superintendent of the road had condemned the locomotives which were in use upon the government railway. My hon. friend who was conducting the examination (Mr. Haggart) called a witness all the way from Moncton for the purpose of giving an account of himself and verifying the report in that circular. Of course the inference was that in condemning the locomotives, the mechanical superintendent had condemned those which had been recently purchased by my department in the United States. That is the idea these gentlemen no doubt had in their minds, and which they thought, by bringing the mechanical superintendent of the railway to testify they would be able to establish to the satisfaction of the committee. He came, and my hon. friend questioned him. And what facts did he elicit ? He elicited the fact that this circular was erroneous in that it quoted him as making a statement that he had not made. He had never condemned the locomotives, but had said that they required to be adjusted in some minor particulars in order that they might steam to the best advantage, and he attributed the delay in trains to the fact that they had not been sent to the shops as they ought to have been. He was asked by my hon. friend what locomotives he referred to, and gave the numbers. I think they were 24, 28, 66 and 68. My hon. friend asked where did 24 and 28 come from, and the answer was that they came from the Kingston works. And when were they got. In 1894. So, you see, so far as two of these locomotives were concerned, these hon. gentlemen were not able to show, as they had expected, that they were locomotives which had been improperly bought and which were inefficient in working and unfit for the service. Where did the others come from ? They came from the Cooke Locomotive Works in the United States. And when were they bought ? They were bought in 1893.

Mr. MONK. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Was that not when we had no shops to build them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will come to that in a moment, but, for the present——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend had better not shout until he is out of the woods——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has misstated the facts about there being so many locomotives. If he will refresh his memory he will know that there was only one. and that was at a time when there were no locomotives built in Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend stated that afterwards. The fact was that my hon. friend got the locomotive or locomotives—the numbers of which were given as appears in the evidence of the committee—in the United States. Now, my hon. friend can say that it was sufficient justification for him getting locomotives in the United States that he could not get them in Canada. But is he willing to acknowledge that that is a sufficient excuse for me. Has he ever been willing to acknowledge it ? I have not heard a whisper from hon. gentlemen on the other side suggesting any acknowledgment of the fact that if we could not get the locomotives from Kingston we had an excuse for going outside to get them. As ex-Minister of Railways, I supose the hon. gentleman hopes that when a change of government may come, if it ever does come during his lifetime, he may by my successor. So I suppose he is foreshadowing his future action when he says that there is justification for a minister to get locomotives in another country if he cannot buy them in his own.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then I stand on that. But what becomes of the statement of the hon. gentleman alongside of him ? Of what value are his strictures ? What justification for the contemptuous reference he made to my administration within a recent period when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has informed us that two years before he went out of office he went to the United States and bought locomotives there. Will not this same fact justify the purchasing of locomotives outside by this government, and has there not been abundant evidence of that ? Were not the works actually shut up ? And had they not orders on hand from me when we begged and entreated them to fill and to try to keep their staff together for that purpose ? When they closed the establishment, they left those orders unexecuted, and we were obliged to go to the United States or suspend altogether the increase of the equipment of the road. So, I have brought myself within the exception announced by my predecessor in his place in this House. That being the case, let us ask these hon. gentlemen for ever after this to hold their peace.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A dozen.

Mr. MONK. Is it not a fact that, since the government gave orders to the Kingston Locomotive Works without tenders those works have been reopened ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why, the last locomotives got by the late government were got without

tender from the Kingston Locomotive Works. But what I am saying is that these hon. gentlemen should hereafter hold their peace as to the whereabouts of purchase of these locomotives. And let their press understand that all this ado that they have been making from one end of Canada to the other about the enormity of the conduct of this government is wholly without reason, because that conduct has been justified and approved by the leading members of their own party. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) asked me a question a moment ago. I did not choose to stop at the moment to answer it but said that I would refer to it later. I will do so now. He said that the locomotive works of Kingston were closed down and the late gvernment could not get locomotives in Canada later than 1893. His excuse is a futile one. The hon. gentleman's memory is at fault. I have in my possession at the present moment, and I will bring here before this debate is concluded, correspondence between the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) himself and the Kingston Locomotive Works in 1893 in which they begged and entreated him to take locomotives from them and the government declined to do so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The evidence the hon. gentleman has is that taken before the committee, which is that of a witness who stated that a certain locomotive, bought in 1891 or 1893, I have forgotten which, was from the United States. I asked him whether the locomotive works of Kingston were open at the time and he said he thought not. My hon. friend (Mr. Blair) can refer to the sworn evidence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is entirely in error. This shows how utterly unreliable his recollection is even in a matter which transpired a few days ago. He was told by Mr. Muhlfield that he did not know anything about it, and, if the evidence has been recorded, a reference to the minutes of the committee will show that that is the case. Now, I will go further and say that when the hon. gentleman tells us that the locomotive works were not in operation at the time and gives that as an excuse for what he did, he is stating what he could not know. Because, it is contrary to the fact. In 1893, the Kingston works were in full operation and turning out locomotives. And in 1892 and also in 1894 they were in full operation and only too anxious to sell locomotives to the government.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman approve of sending out the circular to the superintendents——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. INGRAM. Do hon. gentlemen opposite object to the House gaining information ? Does the hon. minister approve of that circular stating that the Kingston engines were not good engines, that they were faulty and that their construction was wrong ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) want to know my private opinion as to a subject that is not at all material to this discussion ? How can that possibly affect the question whether the locomotives were properly bought in the United States or not ?

Mr. INGRAM. I want to point out to the hon. gentleman that Mr. Russell, whom he imported from the United States did not know what he was writing about. And I can prove it, too.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the hon. gentleman asserts that I imported Mr. Russell from the United States he asserts that for which he has no warrant. Mr. Russell is a Canadian, born down in the county of Charlotte, in the province of New Brunswick, and has many relatives and friends there. Mr. Russell commenced to learn railroading on the Intercolonial Railway, and remained in the service until he was grown up, went off to the United States, and rose degree by degree until he got into a high position on railroads in that country. We were only too glad, from all the representations that were made to us with regard to him, from the statements that we received from the men in whose employ he has been, to ask him to return to his own country and give us the benefit of the experience and ability he had acquired. Why does my hon. friend interpolate the remark about importing him from the United States ?

Mr. INGRAM. Because he did not know the difference between construction and adjustment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is it necessary for the hon. gentleman, when asking a question, to put a sting into it, as he did when he referred to Mr. Russell as an importation from the United States ?

Mr. INGRAM. I am a Canadian in the first place, and when any man imported into this country runs down the manufactures of Canada, I am opposed to him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman wants to be set right, I can tell him that there was nothing in the statement he made which could be construed as running down the products of Canada as such.

Mr. INGRAM. I simply said, and I say it again, that Mr. Russell wrote to the different superintendents calling their attention to the unsatisfactory way these engines were performing their duty, and the reason he gave was the construction of the engines. Now, the hon. gentleman's own officer imported here from Moncton the other

day, proved it was not the construction that was a fault, but that they required readjustment.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, if the hon. gentleman is anxious that his certificate should be given as respects the character, quality and workmanship of the engines we are getting in Canada, I will be only too glad, and I am sure the officers of the road will be only too glad, to give the highest certificate of their qualities. I have never hesitated to say in this parliament that the locomotives we got from Kingston always gave us great satisfaction, and in saying that, I am expressing the opinion of the officials of the road who are competent to pass an opinion upon that subject. And I have said that we were only too sorry we could not get them all here.

Now I say that for the purpose of comparison it would be utterly absurd to complain of our charging expenditures of this character against capital, when they charged the expenditure of trivial amounts against capital, and where we are absolutely reconstructing the line in many important particulars; so that the force of the argument they resort to does not weigh in the present instance. It is in fact only a mere technical controversy ; the hon. gentlemen are chasing a shadow. The substantial fact is that the country has not suffered in the slightest, to the extent of a farthing, by reason of the way in which these expenditures have been charged. Has the country suffered under this administration as compared with their administration? I say no. To charge us up, as compared with their administration, with the millions we have spent in improving, renovating and recreating the road, would be an outrage upon all fairness, all reason, and all justice; therefore I entirely repudiate the force of the argument, and claim that there is nothing in it, and the country I think will be of that opinion also. Now there is a way in which a comparison can be made between this administration of the railway and their own, in which every element of justice and fair-play will be found, and by which they may obtain every advantage that possibly belongs to them. There are certain classes of expenditure which may properly come out of earnings year by year in order to keep up the standard of the road. Those are classified under a few heads and are very accessible. You can easily get at them, and you can easily see what is the gross amount of those expenditures. Now, take up the expenditures which are made for maintenance of way and works under the late government, and we find they expended in the gross, we will say, a million dollars. Now if I take the expenditures under this administration and show that under the same heads, for the same general purposes, we have expended less than they; or if they can show that they have expended more than we, making allowance and charging up against us what would be a fair proportion for additional mileage, then they have got an argument. But if they cannot do that, they have not got an argument. They cannot show where we have expended less for those purposes, comparatively, than they expended, making allowance for the increased mileage ; then they cannot say that the comparison tells in their favour and does not tell in ours, or they cannot argue that we have taken out of capital money which we ought to have expended upon maintenance, in order to keep up the comparison and to make our position good as compared with theirs. I think I have made my proposition clear, and if so, then I will endeavour to elucidate it by the actual facts.

After all there are these different heads : Ways and works, which include all that is laid upon the track, all that is laid out for improvements upon the stations, and all that is laid out for sidings, repairs to locomotives, and renewals of locomotives, repairs to cars and renewals of cars. These are the three heads under which the various amounts are found which have been laid out upon the road, and the fair comparison can be made from them. We can take these three items, these three general classes of expenditure by the late government, we go into them, we ascertain that they spent so much each year in respect to ways and works, so much in respect to repairs and renewals of locomotives, so much in respect to repairs and renewals of cars, we add these up and get year by year what they have laid out on the road. I do the same with the years of our administration. For the purposes of this comparison I have taken the last year of the late government. It is a fair year. They expended as much that year and rather more than in any previous year. It is a fair year for comparison, as I think my hon. friend will allow. I will take, of our administration, the years 1900 and 1901. I will compare their last year with two years of our administration. The expenditure upon ways and works in 1896 was $774,556—the last year of the administration of the late government. The expenditure for the same purpose during the year 1900 was $962,978. For repairs to locomotives and renewals of locomotives in 1896 the expenditure was $230,000 in round numbers, and in 1900 it was $317,000. In 1896, for repairs to cars and renewals, the expenditure was $290,000, and in 1900 it was $472,500. Now, the total expenditure, therefore, of the late government for these three classes of work was $1,294,372. But we had more mileage than they. We had 15 per cent more mileage, we therefore had the earnings of 15 per cent more railway, and we are entitled to add 15 per cent to their outlay to put them on the same footing with us in 1900. If you will add 15 per cent to $1,294,372, you will find that it

amounts to $1,488,000. The gross expenditure by this department on the Intercolonial Railway in 1900, for these three purposes was $1,752,000, or $264,000 more when you add the additional mileage and percentage than was expended by the late government. Now, that $264,000 more was paid for the keeping up, repairing and improving of the road in its various departments out of earnings in 1900, and in the name of common sense is it possible for any hon. gentleman to construct the argument, or to support it, that we have taken money out of capital to do what they did in order to make a comparison with them? Is it not an unmeasured fallacy? Will it hold ground for a moment? These are the facts and hon. gentlemen have the records and they can go through them. I do not deny that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) can, as he no doubt will, pick out a few of the items which go to constitute these three classes of work, and make a long speech, and to those who are interested in minute details connected with railway expenditures, he can make an interesting speech. He can say, that, whereas the late government in some year, in any year that he chooses to select, spent $75,000 on one item, we have only spent $25,000. He can do that in a hundred instances, or twenty or thirty instances, perhaps, and what is the value of it after it is done?—Because to make a fair comparison, you must take the totals. The totals show that in the year 1900 the expenditure for all these purposes put together, taking the larger with the smaller and the smaller with the larger, by this government was $264,000 more than the expenditure in 1896, and that just so much more money was taken out of the earnings for the betterment, improvement and maintenance of the railway.

Now, I will ask to be allowed to make another comparison. I will give, for the benefit of my hon. friend, the result of the operation of the road in 1901, in which year we had a deficit of $488,000, and I will show what was spent for maintenance, ways and works, repairs to locomotives, renewals of locomotives, repairs to cars and renewals of cars. The late government spent in 1896, as I have already stated, for these purposes, $1,488,000, while we expended in 1901, under the same heads, $2,051,182, or $562,000 more, after adding 15 per cent for the additional mileage. More than half a million of money in excess was laid out on that road in these various departments, under these different heads, for the purposes which I have named, that is to say for betterment and improvement out of earnings. If we had not spent any more on the Intercolonial Railway for maintenance out of earnings than these hon. gentlemen did, making allowance for the additional mileage, we would have had a surplus of $80,000 instead of a deficit of $488,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) laughs. I do not know what the laugh is indicative of. I would like to be able to interpret that laugh but he renders me no assistance. Does he laugh because he thinks the comparison of that kind is of no value? Well then, if it is of no value, figures and accounts and statements are of no value. If the hon. gentleman thinks that figures are of no value then let him live up to his statement, because, if he does, he will have to hold his peace instead of offering any criticism upon the administration of the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) would not like to subscribe to that, because, when he comes to make his speech, he will simply overwhelm us with statements of figures and calculations which will go to show, as he would say, that the comparisons were favourable to the late government and unfavourable to this government, but here are the figures which can be found in the public accounts and in the 'Hansard,' and they can all be criticised. Here are the figures as they are furnished by the department in the ordinary way, and they prove this, that if comparisons are of any value at all, if there is anything in the argument which hon. gentlemen make that we have taken money out of capital and spent it, which we ought to have taken out of earnings as they did, then that fact would appear on the record and would be evidenced by the results for that financial year. But, these things disprove any such inference, and absolutely nullify any such argument.

In connection with the question of capital expenditure, I must crave the indulgence of the committee, if I refer to another matter which I quite overlooked in the course of my digression for the benefit of my hon. friends opposite. I want to make this statement, and it is a somewhat important statement. The hon. gentlemen opposite who have been criticising the method we have pursued in charging expenditures to capital, wish us to understand that they never did such a thing when they were in office, and that therefore they are on strong ground when they now condemn this system. They would wish it to be inferred that their condemnation of the system was the result of their ripe experience in carrying out an entirely different system when they managed the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway. Well, Sir, even that ground, weak as it would be in view of the other arguments I have presented, is not available to my friends opposite. They cannot stand even on that narrow platform, because I will be able to show that they were equal sinners in that respect with us, if sinners we be. I will show that these very gentlemen, time after time, came to parliament and asked parliament to give them money on capital account for exactly the same purposes as we have spent money on capital account, and which they now condemn. Of course the expenditure was not exactly upon the same scale; I do not

say that they were called upon to spend as large sums as we have been obliged to expend, but surely when a question of principle is under consideration, the question of the amount does not seriously affect the argument. If they asked for $100,000 on capital account, and if for similar purposes I ask $1,000,000, their position is not one whit stronger so far as the principle is concerned. They claim that in reference to this expenditure on capital, they are contending for a principle upon which they have lived, upon which they died, and to which they say we should adhere. Let us look at the records which are at our disposal. These records will afford some enlightment to the House. I go back to the year 1891, and I find the Minister of Railways in the Conservative government asking parliament for capital expenditure for the construction of a 'Y' at Truro, $1,500. Surely nobody will say that a 'Y' at Truro was the introduction of something that was entirely so exceptional as to call for its payment out of capital account, if there is any reason at all in the argument now advanced by these gentlemen. Surely if they were justified in charging $1,500 for a 'Y' to capital account, the cost of laying rails and of material for the equipment of a whole yard could be properly charged to capital account. Here are the expenditures for 1890-1 on capital account:

Intercolonial Railway.—Statement of capital expenditure.

1890-91.

Construction of a 'Y' at Truro	$ 1,500 00
Increased accommodation, Moncton	10,608 73
Increased accommodation, St. John	4,355 17
Dartmouth branch	413 94
Indiantown branch	402 63
St. Charles branch	12,033 49
Rolling stock	50,083 44
Construction	531 94
Total	$ 79,929 34

It will be noticed that there were even some very small sums charged to capital account. I do not say that these gentlemen opposite were not justified upon the ground which I justify myself in asking for every one of these expenditures on capital. I am not condemning their expenditures. I never have, but I think it is rather more than human patience should be asked to stand to hear these gentlemen opposite venting their indignation and condemning in unmeasured terms my action when they themselves were the originators, and the adopters of exactly the same policy. If I were of opinion that they did wrong, I could not justify myself, but as I am strongly of the opinion that what they did in that respect was right, I think I may refer with some little confidence to their own record as in some degree tending to mitigate the wrath which they now pour out on my conduct, for doing the same thing as they did. In 1891-2, the Conservative government charged the following sums to capital account:

1891-92.

Foot bridge over railway at Truro	$ 5,983 70
Stairs at Halifax station	691 00
Halifax Cotton Factory siding	3,184 09
Increased accommodation at Moncton	710 00
Increased accommodation at New-Glasgow	11,107 91
Increased accommodation at St. John	1,086 65
Extension along front, city St. John	176 15
Additional property accommodation, St. John	79,960 42
Dartmouth branch	796 46
Indiantown branch	642 75
St. Charles branch	45,171 27
Rolling stock	22,026 25
Train Ferry, Strait of Canso	10,297 65
Oxford and New Glasgow Railway	48,745 23
Cape Breton Railway	89,639 31
Total	$320,218 84

These are the items of 1891-2 on capital account expended by the Conservative government, and you would hardly credit it. To sit here patiently listening to the violent condemnation of these gentlemen upon me, you would hardly credit that they spent such sums on capital account. And mark you, that condemnation does not come from the men who simply sat by and zealously supported them in doing this, but it comes from the very men who did it themselves. It would almost try the patience of Job if he had to sit here and listen to such absurdities from these gentlemen opposite. Surely we are endowed with no ordinary quality of patience when we can sit here listening to the denunciations of these gentlemen. Surely we may congratulate ourselves on the patience exhibited by some of us, and by myself particularly. In 1892-3 these gentlemen spent the following sums on capital account:

1892-93.

Increased accommodation at Halifax	$ 56,934 62
Additional sidings at Halifax	4,500 00
Increased accommodation at New Glasgow	5,999 47
Increased accommodation at Moncton	8,590 00
Increased accommodation at St. John	9,512 58
Additional property accommodation at St. John	120,526 49
Extension along the front, City St. John	2,816 63
To pay interest and costs, Gallivan vs. the Queen	476 30
Stations and sidings at Eureka Junction	9,000 00
Siding at Campbellton to Mowatt's wharf	1,914 00
Rolling stock	16,813 06
Construction	125 65
St. Charles branch	1,061 59
Total	$238,260 39

That amounted to $238,000. Of course it does not amount to $2,000,000, but I suppose these gentlemen opposite will not claim that there can be a line drawn between capital expenditure which may be justified, and capital expenditure which may not be justified, and that they are the persons who shall determine where that line shall be drawn.

Surely these gentlemen are not impressed with the idea that what they did must have set the standard of propriety, and that they have figured out that the very expenditure on capital account which they made should be the guide for all future governments as to the limit of the expenditure on capital which future governments should make. In 1893-4 they spent the following sums on capital account:

1893-94.

Increased accommodation at Halifax.	$ 855 41
Increased accommodation at Moncton —machinery..	2,700 00
Extension along the front, City St. John..	30,821 01
Construction..	1,678 19
Rolling stock..	11,251 13
St. Charles branch..	33,349 19
Purchase of two heavy locomotives.	22,244 47
Train ferry between Mulgrave and Point Tupper..	63,463 03
Oxford and New Glasgow Railway..	112,382 75
Cape Breton Railway..	158,770 61
Total..	$437,515 79

In 1894-5 they spent the following sums on capital account:

1894-95.

Increased accommodation at Halifax.	$122,708 28
Increased accommodation at Moncton	7,494 17
Increased accommodation at Ferrona Junction..	1,981 57
Construction..	1,920 18
St. Charles branch..	890 65
Indiantown branch..	1,291 07
Dartmouth branch..	118,153 94
Rolling stock	9,984 24
Oxford and New Glasgow and Cape Breton Railways..	62,610 41
Total..	$327,034 51

Now we come to 1895-6, the following sums were expended on capital account:

Increased accommodation at Halifax	$124,910 00
Increased accommodation at Moncton	1,000 00
Increased accommodation at Sydney.	11,374 41
Construction..	1,948 35
St. Charles branch..	1,271 96
Indiantown branch..	1,436 10
Dartmouth branch..	107,402 17
Rolling stock..	10,000 00
Oxford and New Glasgow Railway..	80 40
Total..	$259,423 42

I am assuming that my hon. friend will admit that this was his year; but probably I am assuming too much. Perhaps he will not admit it. In case he will not admit it, I want to read to you a document which my hon. friend presented to me—not personally. He did not hand it over to me, but I received it as a bequest from my hon. friend when I was deputed to occupy the place which he so efficiently and worthily filled. I have a document here which bears my hon. friend's sign manual and endorsation. He said, 'Here it is written on the record which I present to you as the incoming Minister of Railways.' Well, I innocently took it up and adopted it, and I did not expect, I frankly acknowledge to you, in doing that, that among the first persons whom I would find sitting in unhesitating and unqualified condemnation upon my conduct would be my hon. friend who left this as a legacy to me after his departure. You can judge how grave and serious was my hon. friend's conduct when I read to you the items which I propose to read now—the items of my hon. friend's last will and testament; the very estimates which the government of which he was a member prepared, to which they laid on the Table of parliament, which they struggled for many weary months to get the assent of parliament, and failed. If these estimates did not become the law of the land, it was through no fault of theirs. If they had become the law of the land, the expenditure would have gone on, and where would be the critics who are now condemning the expenditures? If all that they have said in reference to our mode of making these expenditures is well founded, what must be the punishment of those who would initiate such outrageous expenditures as these? My hon. friend first proposed to purchase rolling stock on capital account.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). What is the date of that?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The fiscal year ending the 30th of June, 1897.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. gentleman say that it was presented to parliament?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do. Does my hon. friend say it was not?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not know.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then, what my hon. friend does not know, would, I think, form a very large volume, indeed. My hon. friend does not know that the government of which he was the Minister of Railways, presented estimates to parliament early in the session of 1896, struggled to get them through, and ultimately failed; and my hon. friend, who undertakes to criticise the different items of our railway expenditure, does not know that in that year he put before his colleagues, got their consent to, and brought down to parliament with their entire approval, the items of expenditure on capital account which I am now about to read to you; and the first item is for rolling stock. Could anybody imagine such a thing as that? This incident is fresh, mind you. It is not as if some years before he left the government he had got new light and changed the error of his ways; it was not as if my hon. friend had struggled with this question in all its length and breadth, and had come to see how monstrous was

the course he had been pursuing, and at the last moment had got conversion and had been put in the right way. But in the very act of dissolution, in his last extremity, my hon. friend's last kick was to perpetuate a system which he is now condemning. No wonder my hon. friend would like to take refuge in ignorance, because, while it is not a justification, it is the only excuse my hon. friend can offer. I am not able to yield even to the force of that as an excuse, because I cannot credit the possibility that these items could have been submitted to council, could have passed council, could have been laid on the Table, and yet my hon. friend, as the head of the department, which fathered them, could not have known of their existence. I cannot reconcile these things at all, and I do not think he can when he comes to give them a moment's reflection.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have not heard any of them yet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will hear them soon enough. The first is $15,000 for rolling stock. Does that not strike everybody as amazing from the hon. gentleman who said when we got the Drummond County Railway, that rolling stock could only be charged to earnings and must not be paid out of capital account——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hear, hear, says my hon. friend. Does my hon. friend say that this $15,000 was for rolling stock that was got by reason of an extension of the Intercolonial Railway during the preceding year ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, perhaps.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will my hon. friend enlighten me as to when and where the extension took place for which this rolling stock was asked ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For the Cape Breton extension.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend makes a positive statement, and I will hold him to it. I ask him to tell me now where and when the extension took place ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Cape Breton extension the year before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does my hon. friend say that there was an extension of the Intercolonial Railway in Cape Breton in 1896 ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There was shortly before that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How shortly before that, does my hon. friend say ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Go ahead. Do not be sparring for wind.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend declines to answer. I am afraid my hon. friend has got himself into a snarl. My hon. friend may have forgotten for what purpose the particular rolling stock was bought, but he cannot forget, what was the fact, that it was not got for any extension of the Intercolonial Railway. It was got because they wanted that much rolling stock, and the only way they could get it was out of capital, because they could not hope to supply it out of earnings—exactly the same reason that has necessitated the same thing in the present case. Then my hon. friend proposed to expend $30,500 for increased accommodation at Moncton. Mind you, this is all right; I do not complain of any of these items, because there was no other way of doing the work. Then, he proposed to build a coal shed and trestle at Mulgrave at a cost of $500, and he gets the amount out of capital. Look at my hon. friend and say whether you think it possible that a gentleman who has taken the high ground that he has, who has stood so stoutly against this pernicious system which I have pursued, would come to parliament and ask for an appropriation of $500 out of capital account to build a coal shed and trestle at Mulgrave ? No; it must be a different gentleman. Some strange metamorphosis has taken place in my hon. friend since 1896. Then, here are some other items :

Extension to deep water at North Sydney	$ 20,000
Increased accommodation at Halifax	105,000
Increased accommodation, Dartmouth branch	20,000
Provide wells at stations	500
Increased accommodation at Pictou	5,000
Extension of freight shed at Truro	1,000
Increased accommodation at St. Flavien	1,500
To furnish water supply at Grand Narrows	$1,500 00
To provide station and siding at No Man's Brook	2,000 00
Purchasing sluice at Etchemin	1,500 00
Improvements at Little Metis	1,200 00
Improvements at Sussex, Trenton and Orangeville	800 00

I have read you the items of my hon. friend's own proposal. They do not total a million, but they do amount to $211,000, a substantial sum, sufficient at all events to afford very cogent evidence as to what he thought it would have been proper to ask parliament to do and for the government to do. This country cannot afford to listen to the charges, repeated ad nauseam, which these gentlemen are making about the expenditures on capital account, citing their long experience in support of their position, in the face of such statements as those and the facts shown by the public documents.

I am now going, Mr. Chairman, to pass on to a brief reference to the condition of things during the year for which the accounts are before us. The gross earnings were $4,972,235, as compared with our gross earnings in 1896 of $2,957,000. There was therefore an increase of 66 per cent in the gross earnings, as compared with 1896. Our working expenses last year were $5,320,000, showing a net loss of $348,000, to which we must add the rental upon the portion of the Grand Trunk Railway line that we use of $140,000, which makes a total of $488,000. Our gross earnings appear to have been increasing since the end of last year at the rate of about $400,000 per annum.

It is fair that I should give the committee an explanation of why the deficit for the last year was $488,000, when the year before we were able to show a substantial surplus of $120,000, and in making this statement I wish to call attention to the conditions and circumstances which existed last year, and which did not exist the year before or in years previous. In the first place, let me point out that, as compared with the year before, when we had a surplus of $120,000, we spent $300,000 more on maintenance of way and works. We spent $300,000 more under that head. Therefore if we had only expended in 1901 the same amount which we did in 1900, when the mileage was exactly the same, if we had kept the road only up to the same standard, instead of $488,000, our deficit would only have been $188,000. I may say here that when we made our arrangements for a very large portion of the expenditures on improvements, we did not anticipate the conditions which proved to exist, and that outlay was larger than it would otherwise have been. I am not saying that the outlay was not of value or that it does not tell. It does and will tell and was usefully made. I know of no amount that has been expended which was not usefully expended, and which will not save expenditure this year. But on the Intercolonial Railway, as on all railways, you never reach the acme of perfection. If you think that you are going to have the money, you will make this thing a little better or improve that, and you will make this improvement in anticipation of your increased revenue. We did that last year expecting a good year. We did not have a surplus and in that sense did not have a good year, and therefore our expenditure on improvements was not kept so much within our control, or was not curtailed so much, as it would have been had we foreseen the conditions which proved to exist. We expected, in the first place, that we would have had a larger proportion of our large locomotives at work upon our road, and you can haul three times the amount of tonnage by one of these large locomotives than you can with the small ones. In consequence of our disappointment in this respect, the cost of operating the road was increased very materially. We counted upon getting these locomotives, but the locomotive shops did not supply their locomotives as early as promised, and we did not have, by three or four big locomotives, the number that we thought would have been available to us for the year. I think I am entitled therefore to set down a considerable portion of the loss we suffered to that cause.

There were other causes also. Our coal last year cost us much more than the year before. In that respect we are in the same position as many other railways. If any of you have followed the newspaper reports with reference to the net results obtained from the operating of railways in England, you will find that their dividends fell off very considerably. Some of these companies paid no dividends at all this year, and that they attribute almost entirely to the fact that the cost of coal had so materially increased. Some of our local roads here were more favourably situated because they had large contracts which had not run out. Take the Grand Trunk Railway, that company had a contract, which had been running some years, at very low prices for all the coal it required on that portion of its line which practically reaches half way to Toronto, but even that company, enjoying this advantage, called attention in its last report, to the shrinkage in profits owing to its increased expenditure on coal. Our condition, however, is entirely different. We make our contracts from year to year. We have not deemed it desirable or proper that such large contracts should be made for a long term of years. Probably if we were to make contracts with the coal companies for a long term of years, and the time came when the price of coal, under that contract, would be very much below the market rates, we would have more trouble in enforcing our contract and getting our supplies than the whole thing would be worth. We therefore make our contracts from year to year, and last year we had to pay $3.30 per ton from the 1st July down to the end of the fiscal year. We asked for tenders in May, and I think about the 1st of July they came into effect. We therefore had to pay $3.30 per ton for a grade of coal which we got the previous year for $2.20. There is 50 per cent increase on the item of coal alone, or $1.10 per ton on the enormous quantity which we consumed on the Intercolonial Railway. We could not help ourselves, there was no remedy, we could not get the coal anywhere else at a lower price, and we had to pay this figure. When you deduct the difference in the cost, you get a very large sum, and a sum which accounts for part of the deficit of the year. There was a difference of $1.10 a ton on the great bulk of the coal, there was a difference of $1 on a portion, and a difference of 90 cents on another portion—keeping in mind always the quality of the article delivered. On the whole, I have counted the difference as $1 a ton. I had Mr. Pottinger

examine the statement carefully and give it to me accurately. And he states that the calculation of $1 a ton of increase is against myself rather than in my favour. There were 280,000 tons of coal which would mean that $280,000 more money was actually paid for the same quantity of coal than we paid the year before. We cannot increase our rates merely because an item of expense like this is increased. We would need a very large margin of profit in order to have as favourable a showing as we would desire to make. We cannot, I say, increase the rates, though, in some cases it would be quite reasonable. I did attempt it in one matter, and what occurred ? There was not a Conservative newspaper in the country that did not announce the fact with large head lines, declaring that I was attempting to impose upon the people.

Mr. FRASER. 'Judas Iscariot.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, they put it as strongly as they knew how. I had made the increase very mildly and in a very small way. And these gentlemen showed their desire to assist me in bringing about better results on the Intercolonial Railway in the manner I have mentioned. And not only that, but in newspaper editorials, and in public harangues, they tried to make the people believe that this was the policy entered upon, the object of which was to impose enormous additional burdens upon the people of the maritime provinces. So, you have $280,000 of this increased expense accounted for. Then, we paid increased wages to all our men—enginemen and firemen, conductors and train hands and all our trackmen. I am willing to submit to the committee the question whether or not I was justified in increasing the wages of the men employed on the Intercolonial Railway, even though it told in further diminishing a net surplus or in further increasing any deficit. We are prepared to take the responsibility of our action in that regard. We are paying our men something less—in some instances, considerably less—than men in the same class of employment are receiving on other railways. They claimed that they were entitled to equal consideration with other men. Our men are reasonable in their views. But we could hardly expect them to be satisfied with the showing that we had not earnings enough to enable us to pay wages that were paid on other railways. We could hardly expect them to yield to the force of such an argument. They naturally replied that the government of the country surely cannot rely upon that as justification for asking men to work for less wages than they could get elsewhere, or for less than men in similar employment are receiving. I believe that there are no considerable number of hon. gentlemen in this House who are not desirous of doing the fullest and amplest justice to the employees on our railways and canals, and giving them the wages to which they are reasonably and fairly entitled. We know, as a matter of fact that, to a certain extent in all sections of the country and to a very considerable extent in some sections, there has been an increase in the cost of living. Labouring men in our towns and cities who used to work for $1 a day without any question, now get $1.25. And in some of our more prosperous cities, where the labour market is greater, the wages are even higher. We now pay our trackmen—and we have hundreds of them—$1.20 a day. They were getting $1.10 a day. I think we could afford to give them that increase. I believe that this country—this is how I feel myself, at all events, let the consequences be what they may—this country can afford to pay its employees reasonably well for their services. On the government railway we can afford to pay wages at least approximating the wages that men are getting on other railways under about the same conditions. And I may be asked to meet the views of the labouring men in the different departments to a greater extent than I have yet been able to yield to them. But the extent to which I have gone, moved by a sense of justice, imposed upon us last year $120,000 of expenditure in excess of the previous year. This is the increase of wages, let the committee note, paid to the same number of employees, for I am not speaking of the increase of wages due to the employment of a larger number of men during that period. But even with the increases that have been made the men are not getting unreasonable wages. I do not think the government could do better than to treat our employees fairly and justly both as to wages and to everything else. While I am dealing with this matter, I may mention a point which will tend to show the spirit with which we seek to meet the needs and the wishes of the employees of the railway. I have already, in effect, organized, as respects a large portion of the staff, a system of schedule employment under which youths come into the service and rise in grade as their merits justify, and as the years go by, with each rise receiving an increase in their pay. That schedule has been thought out very carefully, and I am happy to say that it is giving very general satisfaction among the employees of the road to which it applies. It has created very good feeling. I think it is most desirable, if it can reasonably be accomplished, that a good feeling should be maintained among our employees. And I think, I can say of the employees of the road that those who travel by our trains are unanimous in their expression of satisfaction at the kindness, the attention, the courtesy, with which our train hands treat them. I wish to pay that tribute to our men as a body. I know of no exception. Commendation reaches me on

all hands from people who are accustomed to travel on our road. They say that the attention they receive and the courtesy always exhibited by our employees compare favourably with that exhibited on other roads in the country.

Now we have adopted that schedule, and it has gone into operation in shops where we have hundreds of men employed. We are preparing schedules with regard to other classes of men employed, and one object I have in view is to secure permanency in the service. I want to see continuity; I want to see the men have something to look forward to, so that they can realize as years go by that their condition is improving up to a certain point—beyond which of course you cannot increase the wages of your men. We have fixed upon that point, it is satisfactory, and is not beyond what is being paid under the same conditions elsewhere. This has led to a feeling of contentment and satisfaction among the men. The fact that men are going in young and growing up in the service, and are able to see as time goes on, their condition improving, tends to make the service more lasting, and eliminates from it an element which has been very patent in times past, and which I think will not be evident hereafter. I mean that the men hereafter will not have to depend upon political pull in order to get an increase of wages, nor a set-up in the service, or a rise in grade. Each man now knows that he has to advance by regular and fixed progress, and when he goes into the service he knows that he cannot expect to rise over the heads of others, because he may have some friends who have influence with the powers that be. That is not fair, it is not just. I think we have eliminated that element from the service, so that when a young lad goes into the service he will go with the prospect of rising by his own merit, that he cannot hope to get any benefit from the intercession of any friends, and that he need not fear to suffer any detriment from the opposition of his opponents. He stands therefore in a fair position, and I think the service will be advantaged from that system.

Then we are doing something more than that. I am planning a system by which the men, when they get to be advanced in years, and when they become unfit for real useful work, may retire upon a pension. I think we have practically reached an agreement by which we make a substantial contribution towards the fund, and the men make a substantial contribution towards it out of their own wages. They have a right to the tenure of the positions in which they are employed, by reason of their contributions to this fund, and they get the full benefit from them. I believe a fine spirit will be brought into existence amongst the employees when these plans are in full operation, as I hope they will be before long.

I have been passing away from the items of increases in order to mention what has been done in this direction, which I hope may not be without some interest. You see, therefore, that when you add these items together, we expended $300,000 more during this year than we did last year upon maintenance and improvements of the road out of earnings. You see we paid $280,000 more for our coal than we would have paid if the price had been the same as it was the year before. You see we have increased the wages of our men by $120,000, on the same number of men; we had on the whole therefore to provide for $700,000 more than we did the year before. We did that, Sir, as the result of the operation, and we have got a deficit of only $488,000. I am not ashamed of the result of the operation of last year; on the contrary, a proper understanding of what has been achieved justifies me in claiming with some pride that we have come out very well. We have shown an enormous increase in our business, we have shown an enormous increase in our earnings; we have shown a betterment; we have shown an improved condition of the men; we have shown that although our outlay was upwards of $700,000 more than it was the preceding year, we have a deficit of less than $500,000. Taking all these things into account, not considering these other matters at all—because they are not susceptible of being stated in dollars and cents, not considering the economies which must necessarily result in the future from the improvement in our methods and manner of equipment, not taking these things into account at all, but only the mere facts which I have related, the results have followed which I have just described.

I think, therefore, there is reason to look forward to better results during the present year, there is reason to look forward to better results in the future. I am not one of those who think that the Intercolonial Railway has either reached the limit of its progress, or that it has ceased to be an important factor in the business of this country. I have looked forward, and still look forward, to the time when there will be important extensions of the Intercolonial Railway. When we reached Montreal, that was regarded by me as the first step in the onward march of progress; but I do not think it ought to be the policy of the government in the future to stop there, but that when the proper time comes we should carry that road forward to another point westward, and then perhaps still further westward. I have always felt that when the time was ripe, one of the best things that could be done in the interest of this country, would be to extend that road from Montreal to the Georgian bay. I believe that the expenditure of a moderate amount of money upon the acquisition of that road, and upon doubling the track, if necessary, would put the people of this country in a position in which they could control a national route, national in every sense, be-

cause every foot of it would be in Canadian territory, national because it would carry those western products in the winter season as well as in the summer season to ports which lie on the Atlantic seaboard. I believe that with a line, double tracked if necessary, running from the ports of Halifax and St. John to Montreal, and thence in the neighbourhood of Ottawa through to the Georgian bay, we would be able to control a very large portion of the traffic of the western country by our own Canadian routes. Would not that be an object well worthy of the consideration of this parliament and of the country ? I am not going to say at this moment that the time is ripe for undertaking such a scheme, that is a matter about which there might well be a difference of opinion. Many persons think it is ripe; however, I do say that we are to keep it in view, and hold it before our minds as one of the things which time will bring to us, and which a sound and progressive policy will demand at our hands, by which we may conduct a great national highway as far west as we possibly can, to the advantage of the business of the country.

Now, Sir, I do not despair at all of the Intercolonial Railway. I denounce this attempt on the part of some to belittle it. I think it is unfair and unjust. I do not think that any man who wants to be fair to the institutions of the country—because it is one of them—or who wants to be fair to that portion of the country that it traverses, should deal with this subject in a sneering and contemptuous way. Why should the Intercolonial Railway be made a question of controversy between the political parties ? It is not a political road. It has not been a political road under the present administration. I say with all confidence that it has not been a political road in the sense in which the term is used. I am not going to make any pretense of saying anything more than I can properly say. I am not going to make any pretense that if we have positions to fill and if we can get good men among our own friends we will not take them from among our own friends, but I am going to say, that, if we have good men on the road and that if we want good men on the road and we cannot get them from among our own friends, we will take them from among our opponents, and we will keep good men even though they may have been our political opponents. I dare say I am not preaching a doctrine that will commend itself to everybody, but it has been my endeavour since I have been in charge of this department to see that the Intercolonial Railway should be raised above the level of a purely political machine. I venture to say with all confidence that it cannot be successfully contradicted that I have done that since I have had the honour of being a member of this government. My hon. friends know, my friends as well as my opponents, being familiar with the facts, what kind of a system it was that formerly obtained. They know that the Intercolonial Railway was available for party purposes in the interest of the friends of the late administration, and that when elections came on it was used to serve party purposes. They know that people in the employ of that railway who happened to be, or who were suspected of being in political sympathy with the Liberal party, were either prevented from having an opportunity of recording their votes, or by some means obstructed in the exercise of their franchise. I know it and I know that political favours were given to persons who were travelling in the interest of the political party which was dominant at that day. There has been a rule adopted which I have rigidly endorsed upon the Intercolonial Railway ; I have said that if elections are going on anywhere on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, if favours are extended to one party they must be extended equally to both. I have never allowed passes to go out. I have absolutely prohibited the system which was in vogue before and which was a discredit to the Intercolonial Railway and to the country. They allowed these passes to be distributed in unlimited quantities, the evidence of which we have had presented to us, and one of the instruments for the dissemination of these passes by the late government was the gentleman whom the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was anxious to introduce as a witness before the Public Accounts Committee. I have said that we have stopped this system and we have adopted a system of giving excursion rates. There are a great many people who want to vote to whom we give excursion rates, and these rates will be given to one party as well as to another. The fact that not one single whisper was heard from hon. gentlemen opposite after the elections which took place since this administration came into power affords the strongest possible proof of the truthfulness of what I say. There has been in this respect no criticism of the conduct of the Intercolonial Railway, or of its minister, or of its officials in that regard from the other side of the House since the time that I took charge of this railway, and which shows that we have enforced that rule with fairness to both parties. I found that the employees upon the Intercolonial Railway, as a matter of practice, train hands and others, were not allowed a chance to get away to vote under the former system. I ordered a reversal of that policy notwithstanding the fact that some of our friends complained. Not only that, but I gave an order that every facility should be accorded every man in the Intercolonial Railway service to go and vote at the election whether he was a Liberal or a Tory. In that respect I am bound to claim that I am right in making that statement by reason of the fact, to

which I referred a moment ago, that there was not a semblance of a complaint made on the other side of the House as to any favoritism shown to one party or the other during the fight of 1900. Every man upon the Intercolonial Railway was left free to exercise his franchise as any man ought to be. I am not claiming any credit for it. I do not think it would be very worthy of any man who is administering a department if he knowingly allowed the contrary to take place. I do not accuse the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) of being a party to knowing that a system of political favouritism was going on. The fact is that every man on the road, Grit or Tory, during the last election had a free chance to cast his vote just as he pleased.

I think I have fairly shown, in view of all the necessities which have arisen that the estimates which we have asked parliament to support in times past in favour of this road have not been unreasonable, that they have been necessary and that they have not been in excess of what the actual necessities of the service require. I claim, that as respects the year just past, we have done, I think, admirably well in view of the fact that under all the adverse circumstances against which we have had to struggle, we kept the amount down to what it was last year; besides saying which we will be able to make some large improvements. I will conclude what I have to say to the committee by giving a statement of how the accounts stand down to the present moment, so that hon. gentlemen may draw their own inferences as to the balance for the year, or the eight months which cover the full period for which we are able to give the committee a satement. The working expenses were $3,837,119 and the gross earnings were $3,700,859, showing that up to the end of February, or for eight months, or two-thirds of the year, we have a deficit of $136,000. Hon. gentlemen might assume that this is rather an unpromising outlook and that we may expect a deficit for the whole year, but let me call attention to the accounts for the same period of last year. I had hoped to have a statement for the same period of several years back, but it is substantially the same so far as the general principle or the inference is concerned which hon. gentlemen might be justified in drawing. Last year the gross earnings were $3,260,000 for identically the same period. Hon. gentlemen will observe that that is $440,000 less than the earnings this year. The working expenses were $3,917,662, or the deficit to the end of February 1901 was $657,000 as against $136,000 this year. With a deficit of $657,000 we picked up last year until we reduced the deficit to $488,000, which would be about $175,000 of an improvement in the year. Well, if we make the same improvement this year—and I am inclined to think that we will make a better showing, but I cannot pledge myself positively to the statement—but if we make an equally good showing we will transfer what is now a deficit of $136,000 into a surplus of $40,000 or $50,000. I think, Sir, I am safe in saying that it will be somewhat better than that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Chairman; at six o'clock the Minister of Railways finished his speech, which he commenced about three o'clock, in reference to the Intercolonial Railway. I presume that he assigned some reason, in my absence from the Chamber for a few moments, for confining his discussion entirely to the Intercolonial Railway, and at some future time I suppose we will have a discussion upon transportation, and upon the canal system of Canada. Following the example of the minister, I shall confine my observations to a discussion of the Intercolonial Railway and its management from 1897 down to the present. When I left the department, in 1896, I thought I left the Intercolonial Railway in as good a state of efficiency as was possible. I thought the rolling stock was in good order, and that the roadbed was perhaps the best of any railway in Canada. I had the gratification of receiving reports, after I left office, from the managers and chief engineers of that road, telling me of its efficiency, and giving me a creditable account as to the rolling stock and everything appertaining to the railway. The Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) prides himself on comparisons, and he puts himself on a pedestal almost too high for us sublunaries to worship at. His comparison between my management of the Intercolonial Railway and his is nevertheless somewhat ridiculous. To listen to him to-day one would think that no railway manager on the face of the globe could be more efficient than he, and that none could have more neglected the road than I did when I was minister. I left the department when the Intercolonial Railway was comparatively a small road of 700 or 800 miles, but since then, on account of the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway and other extensions, it has been increased in importance. Fortunately we have good memories. We remember the glowing terms in which the minister described to this House the advantages that would be derived from the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. The Minister of Railways, like his right hon. leader, found that the Intercolonial Railway ended in a bog opposite Quebec, and they proposed to make its terminal in the great city of Montreal. But the Minister of Railways is not satisfied even yet. He sees a grand future for government railways in this country. He sees the day not far distant when the Intercolonial will reach out to the Georgian Bay,

and when later on we will have a government system of railways extending not only from the Atlantic to the Great Lakes, but on to the Pacific ocean. The Minister of Railways has grand views for the future, but let us examine for a moment his management of the comparatively small line of railway which is at present under his charge. In 1897 the hon. gentleman made this statement to the House :

Again we are told that we are adding to the public debt by this proposal. So we have been reading in the newspapers which are published in the interests of our hon. friends opposite. And so we have heard from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. They have told us that we are adding $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 to the public debt by this proposal. A little consideration will convince anybody that there is no ground at all for that statement. I entirely and absolutely repudiate the soundness of any such claim. You might just as well charge a merchant who happens to think that it would be an advantage to his business if he were to remove his store from a back street to a front street, with having added $8,000 or $10,000 to his liabilities, because he has agreed to pay an increased rent of $300 or $400 a year. These gentlemen say: You are adding to the public debt. I deny it. You are entering into an arrangement, which, I will show you, as far as our foresight and the judgment and experience of the men who have been operating the Intercolonial and are responsible for it, are able to assure us, will enable us to pay every dollar of rental we have engaged to pay, and have a surplus besides. Is it possible that these gentlemen can say that we cannot increase the business of the Intercolonial by getting into Montreal ? Is it possible for them to make the statement, against the experience of railway operations and of business men the world over, that we cannot hope for an increase in the earnings of this road, and cannot hope to pay any portion of the rental we are incurring by means of the earnings upon this additional mileage, over and above the expenses of working and so extinguish the debt which the hon. gentleman says is being incurred under the proposal of the government ? We shall not add $1 to the public debt, unless we fail, by the operation of the railway under the conditions agreed upon, to pay the rental we have engaged to pay upon acquiring these roads. If we fail in that, then, having engaged to pay this rental for 99 years, we shall certainly be assuming what will be equivalent to an addition to the public debt. No man can say with absolute certainty what will be the result ; we cannot demonstrate it with geometrical positiveness, but we can form a judgment upon it, we can take the experience of business men, we can learn from the experience of other railways, and draw a fair business conclusion. And if the conclusion that we arrive at is that these new roads acquired under the conditions proposed, will enable us to pay the rental, and that conclusion is justified by experience, we are incurring no debt, and the charge made by hon. gentlemen opposite is an assumption, and has no solid ground upon which to rest.

And so on, the hon. gentleman led the House to believe that the country was virtually incurring no fresh debt by purchasing the Drummond County Railway and acquiring the entry into the city of Montreal. The facts are against him, as I will soon show. His purpose was, he said, to put life into the old concern, to make it a going and prosperous business, to show what the energy and ability of a man of business could do in the management of a concern that was put under his control. You would have thought that the hon. gentleman had been a railroad expert from his birth up. He is good at declamation ; he is good at making statements and promises, but none of them ever pan out. Nothing he promises to the people of this country is ever fulfilled. All his promises in reference to the Intercolonial Railway have proved to be nice to the ear, so far as his supporters are concerned, but false when they come to be examined. What was the hon. gentleman's object in bringing the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal ? His object was, as I will show from his speech in the city of St. John, to provide a competitor for the through traffic from the west to the city of St. John and the city of Halifax. That was his reason for asking for these enormous sums—for the purpose, as he alleged, of putting the Intercolonial Railway into good order, and acquiring rolling stock, which to a great extent he finds he cannot use on the road. That was the reason he expended over $1,000,000 at St. John and a large sum at Halifax for increased terminal facilities. Any sane man knew that to enter into competition with the Grand Trunk Railway in carrying through freight to the seaboard, or with the Canadian Pacific Railway, which carried it a much shorter distance to St. John, was altogether out of the question. The hon. gentleman took that upon himself ; he did it off his own bat ; for, according to the evidence of the chief engineer of his department, the chief engineer did not believe that it was possible to accomplish the object. He has shown that we could not accomplish it. Where are the large quantities of grain flowing out of the Intercolonial elevator at St. John ? What has become of the through traffic that was to be carried to that city ? Let us judge of it by the words of his own paper down there to the effect—I will not read the article, because it is too long—that although he has not been able to accomplish his object, he has been able to make an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway by which they maintain their traffic to St. John. What has become of the hon. gentleman's denunciations in which he said that no one but a stupid, a fool or a knave would enter into the arrangement which existed between the Intercolonial Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway ? He was bound to put an end to that arrangement. Did he put an end to it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He tried it for a year or two. Did you not have to cancel

the arrangement you made afterwards with the Grand Trunk Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Under that arrangement you had a special rate for carrying freight from Montreal, where it was delivered to the Intercolonial Railway. You had to back out of that as you had to back out of the arrangement you made with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and you are at the present moment in precisely the same position with reference with these two roads that you were in when you took office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, no.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are without through traffic ; you have no oceanbound traffic, though it is increasing year by year. If the traffic of the Intercolonial Railway has increased at all, it is on account of the prosperity of the country in which the Intercolonial Railway is located, particularly on account of the development of the mines and mining industries at Sydney and elsewhere. What we told him has turned out to be perfectly true. The idea of a government entering into competition with two lines of railway which had their termini at Point Lévis, and whose interest it was to pick up freight all through Ontario and the west for the purpose of furnishing traffic to the Intercolonial Railway. He was to come to Montreal and cut them out of that business. He expected to get through traffic, but where did he expect it to come from ? From the Canadian Pacific Railway ? He could not get it from them ; they had a road to St. John themselves. From the Grand Trunk Railway ? They had their own road to Portland. Who was to furnish it to him? The Canada Atlantic. They did furnish a few loads of grain which he carried from the Georgian Bay down to St. John at 6 cents a bushel, the greater portion of which was paid to the Canada Atlantic for their part of the traffic. He carried from Montreal to St. John for the purpose of carrying out the promise which he had given to the people of this country, a few loads of through freight. But we are going to have a bridge over the St. Lawrence at Quebec ; we are going to have communication with that great system of railways to be built from Quebec to connect with the Mackenzie and Mann system, and that system will have the outlet the hon. gentleman desires. But this country is furnishing locomotives, is strengthening the road and doing everything else long precedent to anything that may possibly occur to warrant this expenditure.

When the hon. gentleman got the House to sanction the purchase of the Drummond County road, he told us that he would not touch it if it was not up to the standard of the Intercolonial Railway. But I find that nearly $200,000 have been spent on it for the purpose of keeping it in repair, and I drew out the statement from the hon. gentleman that before locomotives of this size which he uses on the Intercolonial Railway between Point Lévis and Montreal can be used on the Drummond line, he has to build new bridges on that whole section of railway. And this, notwithstanding the sworn statement of his officers before the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, that the steel bridges, which were newly put down on the Drummond Railway line, were up to all the requirements of the Intercolonial Railway. The minister excused himself by saying that he has changed his mind as to what the requirements of the Intercolonial Railway are, and has decided that that road shall be up to the standard of modern railways, that it shall be equipped with large locomotives and freight cars and heavy rails and bridges which to sustain them. He tells us that the gradients of the road are heavy. But why is it that such expenditure is required ? The only possible excuse is that he wants to use it as a through line, for the local trade could be better served with the locomotives and bridges and the material that were on the Intercolonial Railway when he took office than with the heavy rolling stock he is putting on at present. The hon. gentleman expected to make this road a magnificent through road, and for the purpose of carrying out that scheme of his, in competition with the different railways, and building up an ocean-bound traffic through this country over the Intercolonial Railway, which would take its departure from St. John and Halifax, he entered on this lavish expenditure, but he has found out that he could not do it.

Why did he buy his locomotives before his road was ready for them ? Can any man in his senses explain that ? From 1897 up to the present, he has bought over eighty-five heavy locomotives, as the return shows, and after buying these, he proceeded to make his bridges able to bear them. He puts on rails which can carry these locomotives, and he orders these rails and these locomotives immediately before the election. I heard the hon. gentleman express his surprise at the corruption of his predecessors. We heard him tell us that he did not follow the precedents of his predecessors. That he never gave tickets to parties going to vote or prevent them from going to vote as they chose. Did any of his predecessors ever prevent a man from voting or ever influence him in any manner against voting as he thought proper ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, Sir, no corruption was ever used by the late government for the purpose of influencing the electorate. But we cannot say the same of the hon. gentleman. He let out large contracts immediately before the election. He supplied the capital and everything else necessary for the purpose of starting locomotive works

in Kingston and thus getting his candidate elected. He bought 1,250,000 ties for the Intercolonial Railway when there were only 500,000 ever used and the balance is still on hand. He could write notes himself to the contractors to hand to the inspector, instructing the inspector to pass the ties, though they were not up to the standard of inspection. He got the inspector to pass these ties just the same as if they were what the contract called for. There were 800,000 ties more than were required, but he did not care, nor did he care what kind they were. He had them accepted, although not up to the specification at all. According to the return, we find that nearly one-third of them were not up to the specifications, yet they were taken and paid for. Black spruce ties were required under the contract, and white spruce were accepted and paid for, and it is generally reported that the payments are in excess of the quantity delivered. There is one naked and bald fact which stands out clearly. It is this, that these ties were delivered in May last, and have not all been inspected up to the present and counted. That fact stands out boldy and plainly, that ties, which were delivered in May last, have not been inspected and counted up to the present. That was the evidence of Mr. Pottinger on the subject, and this is the gentleman who talks about the corruption of his predecessors, who charges them with having corrupted the electorate, who grows eloquent on the servile crowd that was following his opponents. But besides all that, the hon. gentleman poses as a sage. He not only knows the past and the present, but, like that other great Grecian, he the future knew. While he lived or while I live, he says, there is no prospect of the Conservative party returning to power in this country. That is the hon. gentleman's idea. But I hope that the people of my country have not become so debased, so servile, so debauched, so corrupt, that when they come to understand the position of affairs, when they come to realize how their money has been lavishly and foolishly expended for the purpose of corrupting constituencies, they will not turn the present government out of power. What other reason than corruption could there be for giving a man a price for steel rails over the price he tendered at ? What other purpose could there be for breaking into the time-honoured manner in which contracts were formerly let on the Intercolonial Railway by awarding them as was done in Kingston? Fancy a government assisting a company by advancing it the full extent of money necessary for the purpose of starting and carrying on its business. Sums were advanced on what are called 'progress estimates' on the material to be supplied to the government. Who judges the progress estimates ? A Mr. Davis, who was not then an officer though he may now be on the Intercolonial Railway. We all knew him as an officer of the North Shore Railway some time ago until it entered into the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We knew him at a later date in the employ of the city of Montreal for some engineering purposes. But now, with the experience he has gained in these places, and being considered a fit person for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway, he is sent to pass these locomotives in the city of Kingston, and also the supplies that came with the Intercolonial Railway locomotives.

The hon. gentleman was amusing when he spoke of my criticising his purchase of locomotives in the United States. Perhaps he referred to what my colleague said. I never criticised him for having gone to the United States. My idea is this, we afford a protective duty to encourage manufactures in this country, and having afforded them that protection, we have a perfect right to purchase in the United States if we cannot do as well here. If the hon. gentleman could get better locomotives at that price in the United States, I do not blame him. I do not know that he could have purchased them anywhere else at the time. But as to the charge against me of buying them from the United States, I heard the evidence before the committee the other day, when one witness said that one of these locomotives was purchased in 1893. That may have been before my time. Here is the evidence which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) disputed :

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not dispute the evidence, but the hon. gentleman's statement of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will read the evidence as it is printed :

Q. Do you know the Cooke locomotives were purchased in 1893?—A. I am going by the record.

Q. You remember the record?—A. Oh, yes, I remember the record.

Q. Do you remember whether any locomotives were manufactured in Canada during 1893 ?—A. No, I remember they were in 1894.

Q. Do you know whether any locomotives were going——

—I suppose this means locomotive works.

—were going in 1893 ?—A. No, sir, I could not state that.

I was only referring to the evidence given by that party.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the way the hon. gentleman stated the evidence.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the way I intended to state it. I understood from the evidence of this witness that there were no locomotive works going in 1893.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He said he did not know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) read the evidence, I understand that the witness

said, not that there were no locomotive works going in 1893, but that he did not know they were going.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When I interrupted the minister, it was in reference to the statement made by this witness when he was examined before the committee. I offered to read his evidence, and that is the evidence he gave. I came to the conclusion which, now that I have read the evidence, I still think was correct, that he was aware of no locomotive works going in 1893.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He was not aware of anything about it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, I have read the evidence. It is not a matter of much importance anyway. The hon. Minister of Railways was like a good many others who have a bad case. He did not deal with the principles, but went into details—he has a genius for details. He said that the members of the opposition had circulated it throughout the country, that he had pursued a different principle than that followed by his predecessors, and was charging expenditures to capital that had heretofore been charged to revenue. The whole question was a paltry one, so far as the interests of the country are concerned. The money comes out of the pockets of the people however it may be charged. But, for the purposes of a fair comparison between my record on the Intercolonial Railway and the record of the present minister, I want to see the books kept in the same form as that in which I kept them. It was my intention, when in office, to follow the policy advocated by Alexander Mackenzie in this House. He declared that it was time that the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway should be closed. A road that has been running since 1867 should have no capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman did not have much respect for that principle when he was in office.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That was my intention when in office—to abolish altogether all the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. However, it is a trivial matter whether expenditures are charged to capital or to revenue—the people must pay them in any case. But no fair comparison can be made if a change in the methods of keeping the accounts is made. The minister in his opening statement referred, as I suppose, to some statements made by me about some expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. He said that it had amounted to the enormous sum of $23,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. The statement was not mine but his. He stated the other day in the House that the total capital expenditure incurred by this government on the Intercolonial Railway account was $23,000,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman does not remember correctly. If he will refer to 'Hansard' he will find no such statement. What I said was that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway, and the deficits year after year represented a sum sunk in that institution of nearly $22,000,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman said $23,000,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here are the actual figures :

Spent on Capital Account—	
1897..	$ 149,112 52
1898..	252,756 80
1889..	1,081,929 94
1900..	1,796,348 29
Drummond County Railway, 1900..	1,459,000 00
Governor General's car..	1,290 31
Spent in 1901..	3,652,313 46
Voted in estimates in 1901-2.....	3,255,000 00
Voted in estimates in 1902-3.....	1,975,000 00
Loss on working expenses over receipts in four years..	514,852 00
Total..	$14,137,693 32
Rental on Grand Trunk Railway capitalized at 3 per cent——	

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman laughs at that. Of course, we are not paying $140,000 a year for the Grand Trunk, and if we are, of course, that is not worth counting.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Does he think that any sort of calculation can be justified which includes the figures he has already given of the actual rent he paid, and in addition, the sum which that rental represents ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have taken care of that in my calculation, I deduct the rental paid annually.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have got it in there now, and have read it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will give it to you : Rental Grand Trunk Railway, capitalized at 3 per cent, $4,666,667 ; subsidy to the Victoria bridge, $500,000 ; Prince Edward Island, $1,359,911.81, for the same time. Add to that the deficits, and you have $1,686,543, making a total of $21,317,445.39. From which is to be deducted the rental paid to the Grand Trunk Railway for the present year, as it is included in the capital expenditure, $140,000. To this is to be added the $213,000 of capital suspense account, which does not appear in the hon. gentleman's state-

ment at all, and which we would have known nothing of but for the Auditor General's account. In looking up the stores account we find the hon. gentleman had covered up $213,000 of a further expenditure in the capital suspense account of the Intercolonial Railway. Adding that, you have $21,400,445.39. Is there a single figure of that which can be attacked ? The only possible difficulty is the capitalizing of the amount given to the Grand Trunk Railway. But we borrow money at 3 per cent. The hon. gentleman may deduct it and say that we pay nothing to the Grand Trunk Railway for the right to enter Montreal. The expenditure is in the neighbourhood of $18,000,000. What have you got for it ? It is going on from year to year. The hon. gentleman says, Oh, let us do it by leaps and bounds ; do not go at a snail's pace in renewing the Intercolonial Railway, as the hon. gentleman did in renewing his rails. We laid more rails in a year when we were renewing them, than the hon. gentleman has ever done since ; we charged the total amount to the revenue of the road, and the hon. gentleman is charging it to capital. Let me give him some more facts with reference to that. The Intercolonial Railway was originally laid with steel rails weighing 56 pounds to a lineal yard of track, or 88 tons of 2,240 pounds to the mile. The fish plates were 19 pounds per pair. Between 1880 and 1896 practically all the main line between St. John and Halifax and Moncton and Chaudière Junction, about 760 miles, was renewed with new steel rails weighing 67 pounds to the yard, or 105 tons to the mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did not the hon. gentleman relay at least 140 miles of the section he has named ? Were not the new steel rails on the main line taken out of capital ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not that I am aware of. Is the hon. gentleman making the mistake that his deputy, Mr. Pottinger, did the other day, thinking the road that was newly built ought not to be charged to capital, the Oxford and New Glasgow road ? Before the hon. gentleman makes a statement, he ought to be informed as to the facts.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask a question of the Minister of Railways and Canals ? Will the Minister of Railways and Canals point out where that 140 miles is charged to capital, a part of the old road ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, the hon. gentleman is making a statement he knows nothing about, there is no such fact. The hon. gentleman will have plenty of time; the estimates will last a week or ten days, and we will have that threshed out with the hon. gentleman. I think he has fallen into the same mistake that Mr. Pottinger did the other day. He was asked, Where were these rails ? And he answered, On the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway—Was not the Oxford and New Glasgow Railway a new road built for the first time when you laid the rails ?—and he had to admit it. Between 1880 and 1896, as I was saying, practically all the main line between St. John and Halifax, and Moncton and Chaudière Junction, about 760 miles, was renewed with new steel rails, weighing 67 pounds to the yard, or 105 tons to the mile ; the angle plates, 36 pounds. The original rails and plates, and fastenings, for the 760 miles weighed 69,160 tons per mile. Although the above figures show a betterment of about 15,000 tons in actual weight of metal in the track, no additional charge was made against capital account, but revenue had to bear the whole cost. The Minister of Railways and Canals now proposes to replace those 67 pound rails with a heavier rail and heavier fastenings, weighing 80 pounds per yard, and the fish plates 110 pounds.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. member be kind enough to state what document he is reading ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is a memorandum which I took myself from conversations and evidence that I secured.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will have no objection to telling me whether Mr. Archibald is the authority for his statement?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have no objection whatever to tell the Minister of Railways and Canals that I have had frequent conservations with Mr. Archibald in reference to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought likely Mr. Archibald was coaching him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will tell him that I have had letters frequently in reference to it, and have consulted Mr. Archibald about it, because I thought Mr. Archibald could give valuable evidence, and that no man I know in America could inform me better upon the subject than Mr. Archibald. I was prevented from furnishing this evidence before the Public Accounts Committee by the Minister of Railways and Canals, who thought that Mr. Archibald knew too much about how things are at present conducted on the Intercolonial Railway. The Minister of Railways and Canals now proposes to replace those 67 pound rails with a heavier rail and fastenings, the rails weighing 80 pounds to the yard and the fish plates 40 pounds. 67 pound rails and fastenings weigh 83,600 tons per mile, the 80 pound rails weigh 99,940 tons. This shows a betterment of about 17,000 tons against only about 15,000 tons between the original 56 and 67 pound rails. Capital instead of revenue has now to meet this charge ; and so it goes on in the estimates. My point is that when we renewed

and replaced the old rails on the Intercolonial Railway we charged them to revenue account. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who is at present renewing the rails, charges them to capital account and when he makes the statement about the snail's pace at which we proceeded with the renewal of rails I will tell him that we laid 80 miles in one year. Could the hon. gentleman show such a result as that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What year was that ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman will wait until afterwards I will show him that I have it in one of his own papers, published either in St. John or Moncton. The hon. gentleman is talking about the amount of the betterment of the road and the necessity of increasing the capital account and he will see in his own paper a statement of the number of miles built each year. I will hand it to the hon. gentleman afterwards.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no year in which the hon. gentleman laid 80 miles. There is no year in which he laid more than 5 miles. I would not say 5 miles but 5,000 tons.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Fortunately I have the paper here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not prove anything.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is what the paper says :

> The record of rail renewals for four years previous to 1890 is as follows :—
> 1889—129 miles of 67-lb. rails laid in place of 56-lb. rails.
> 1888—88 miles of 67-lb. rails laid in place of 56-lb. rails.
> 1887—78 miles of 67-lb. rails laid in place of 56-lb. rails.
> 1886—68 miles of 67-lb. rails laid in place of 56-lb. rails.
> Total—363 miles.

How many of these did the hon. gentleman lay ? What does the hon. gentleman think of the progress he is making in the laying of these rails, and how does the statement contrast with his attempt to impose upon the credulity of this House when he spoke of the wonderful celerity with which these rails are being laid ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me understand the question if the hon. gentleman would be good enough. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the rails which were laid in 1886, 1887, 1888 and 1889 were laid out of earnings ? I would ask the hon. gentleman to tell us if that is what he is referring to ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My statement as to the quality of rails laid not exceeding 5,000 tons had reference to the period when the hon. gentleman was managing the Intercolonial Railway, and had reference likewise to the rails which were laid out of earnings. It had no reference to those which were laid out of capital. Does the hon. gentleman say that this number of miles was laid out of earnings ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I made the statement before that all of the miles of rail renewals, excepting on the new portions of the road which were built, the Oxford and New Glasgow branch, and the Cape Breton branch, were charged to revenue. Does the hon. minister deny it ? What the hon. minister was speaking about was this ; he was comparing the velocity with which he was proceeding with the slow pace of his predecessors in doing work on the Intercolonial Railway, and he was saying that only so many miles of rails had been replaced. He wants me to tell him whether some of the 80 miles were laid on the New Glasgow and Cape Breton branches. It is possible they may have been. I do not know. After having heard the remarks of the hon. minister this evening I happened to pick up this paper, or, rather it was sent to me. It is dated March 22nd, and it is the 'Daily Times,' published at Moncton. I do not know whether it is a supporter of the hon. gentleman or a supporter of the Conservative party.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course the hon. gentleman knows——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I do not know. I do not know anything about the papers down there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What does it say ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It says, in reference to Mr. Pottinger's evidence :

> We have been at some pains to refer to the old reports for six years previous to 1890, and find there is not a record of a dollar of this expenditure having been charged to capital. Mr. Pottinger's own reports show that it all went to working expenses. The record of rail renewals for four years previous to 1890 is as follows :—

That I have already read. Then it continues :

> That there can be no mistake about it, we quote from the general manager's own report of 1886. After describing in detail the large improvements, such as sidings, new stations, four iron bridges, five new water tanks, 159 cars, two locomotives——

That is the authority which I had not the time to look up. I did not look it up because I recollect perfectly that my instructions were that all these amounts should be charged to revenue. What is the record of the expenditures of the hon. gentleman on the Drummond County Railway, and on the

Grand Trunk Railway coming into Montreal ? Has he performed the promises he made to this country that the acquisition of that road would pay interest on the investment besides making the Intercolonial Railway a paying concern ? Has it performed the promise that he put in the mouth of the right hon. gentleman his leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) when the right hon. gentleman stated in Montreal that the Intercolonial Railway was no longer to be a burden as it had been in the past upon the people of this country ? Has the hon. gentleman fulfilled a single promise he made in reference to it ? Well, the hon. gentleman is going to branch out. He is going to extend the Intercolonial Railway up into the Georgian Bay. He hopes at some future date to reach the North-west. I wonder is it in the syndicate of the hon. gentleman's friends who are trying to negotiate the sale of the Intercolonial Railway, at the present moment in New York city. Is it under the auspices of the Dominion Securities Company ? I suppose the hon. minister has heard of that for the first time. It may be amusing and interesting for the House to know all about this concern. I did not know that the hon. gentleman intended to acquire the Intercolonial Railway. I saw some notices in the papers the other day that the president of the Dominion Securities Company, Dr. Webb, had obtained possession of the Canada Atlantic Railway and also of some railways of a speculative character in the province of Nova Scotia, and that he is also president of the Adriondack Railway.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Not in Nova Scotia.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross, Victoria, N.S.) is entirely ignorant of anything that has occurred outside of his own little circle in Nova Scotia. I intend before I conclude to produce indubitable evidence, I intend to read the prospectus issued in New York and I intend to read the reports of Dow & Company——

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). These are the prospectuses of railways to be built.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are you certain of it ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think you are labouring under an hallucination.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Except the road from Sydney to Louisbourg, all the railways in Nova Scotia are owned by the Dominion government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will be obliged, I see, to read this prospectus. I would like to have the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals hear this as it is interesting to him :

Dominion Securities Company.

A corporation organized under the laws of New Jersey in May, 1901.

The object of the company is to acquire properties and securities of railway and other corporations in the Dominion of Canada and elsewhere, constructing and managing the same, &c..

It has acquired the properties and franchises of the Cape Breton Railway Company (Limited) of Nova Scotia, and is now engaged in the construction thereof.

It has acquired other properties and franchises since its organization, which are in the process of development.

The capital stock is $1,500,000, all fully paid and non-assessable. Shares, $100 each.

The company has no funded debt.

On January 15th, 1902, the company paid 2½ per cent semi-annual dividend out of the earnings of the business for the six months preceding.

Officers—President, W. Seward Webb, New York city; vice-president, Henry L. Sprague, New York city; secretary and treasurer, Henry L. Meyer, New York city.

Directors—W. Seward Webb, Samuel R. Callaway, Alfred Schiffer, F. Egerton Webb, Henry L. Sprague, Arthur L. Meyer, Edgar Van Etten, Chas. H. Johnson, of New York city; Thomas Robertson, of Nova Scotia.

Corporate Office—Jersey City, N.J.

New York Office—25 Broad street, New York.

Transfer Agent—Continental Trust Company of New York.

Registrar—Standard Trust Company of New York.

Annual Meeting—First day of June, at Jersey City, New Jersey.

This was also issued by the company :

Dominion Securities Company.

(Capital Stock, $1,500,000.)

W. Seward Webb, president.

Samuel R. Callaway, John J. Astor, Henry L. Sprague, Arthur L. Meyer, Percival L. Clement, Thomas Robertson, M.P.P., Edgar Van Etten, Alfred Schiffer, directors.

Will build 600 to 800 miles railroad in Nova Scotia. Receive cash subsidy from Dominion of Canada and province of Nova Scotia of $6,400 per mile; also land grant equivalent to $1,600 per mile.

Issues $15,000 first mortgage bonds per mile.

Issues $5,000 second mortgage bonds per mile.

Nova Scotia agrees to take and pay for at par 10,000 first mortgage bonds, making actual cash from government of $16,400 per mile, besides the land grant of $1,600. Engineers estimate maximum cost of construction and equipment of $15,000 per mile, leaving to the Dominion Securities Company :

Profit of cash per mile..	$ 1,400
Land grants, per mile..	1,600
5,000 first mortgage, per mile.. ..	5,000
5,000 second mortgage, per mile..	2,500
Say, at 50 per cent.	
Or profit of (per mile)..	$10,500

In addition to which the entire common stock of $20,000 per mile. On the above figures of $10,500 profit per mile, the Dominion Securities Company would have a profit on a minimum of 600 miles of road, $6,300,000, besides the common stock of $12,000,000.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). That, of course, is a prospectus of a road to be built. They commenced that road from Point Tupper to build towards St. Peters in Cape Breton. That is really a prospectus of some American capitalists as to something they are going to do in the future.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The names of the gentlemen attached to this statement are as follows: W. Seward Webb, Samuel R. Callaway, John J. Astor, Henry L. Sprague, Thomas Robertson, M.P.P., Edgar Van Etten, Alfred Schiffer.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). All good people.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) taken the trouble to ascertain what the operations of the company had been, or whether there is any truth in the statement set forth?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I know all about it as far as I can possibly be informed. If you will read the letter that Dr. Webb published in the papers a couple of days ago, it will explain the connection with the Dominion Securities Company. I understand that the Dominion Securities Company had communication with Mr. Murray, the premier of Nova Scotia; that they expected to get the Mackenzie & Mann contract, and that they issued the prospectus upon that, hoping to obtain, if not the Intercolonial Railway, at least the Oxford and New Glasgow branch.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). May I interrupt the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly. I do not want to state anything but what is fair.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Does the hon. gentleman say that they made overtures to the premier of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I know nothing about it except the circular that is published by this company, which has an excellent standing before the whole world, as great as Bradstreet and others have in this country. Here is another circular issued by that company:

> Dominion Securities Company, opposite Grand Central Station, 51 East 44th street, New York city (organized under the laws of the state of New Jersey), has a charter similar to the Harriman charter, enabling it to deal in stocks, bonds and securities of all kinds, and to loan money on the same, &c.
>
> The company has acquired the franchises, rights of way, concessions and subsidies which the Dominion of Canada, and also the province of Nova Scotia, grant upon fulfilment of its undertaking to extend the Nova Scotia system of railways, under which it is estimated that 600 to 800 miles of railroad will be built within the next four years.

They made a nice arrangement, they intended to secure this railway bonus and the committee themselves have secured a majority of the stock in the contracting company, the object of which will be seen later:

> The company has now 48 per cent of the capital stock of the Manhattan Contracting Company, 95 per cent of the capital stock of the Cape Breton Extension Company, and also $2,400,000 bonds of said company and assignment of the Nova Scotia government's subsidy for the building of the Cape Breton Railroad, as the first of a series of concessions, franchises, &c., receivable on account of the construction of railroads interlacing the province of Nova Scotia; all subsidies and grants, &c., by enactment of the House of parliament, as fixed under the laws of the government, together with the whole capital stock, bonds and benefits going direct to the Dominion Securities Company.

I want the Minister of Railways to listen to this part of the Subsidy Act in which he gives half of the amount to the different railway companies when the cost is in excess of $15,000 per mile:

> The cash subsidies granted by the Dominion of Canada and the province of Nova Scotia are $6,400 cash per mile. Land grants and other inducements of the governments increase this about $1,600 additional per mile. The government permits and authorizes the issue of bonds upon this railroad construction as follows:
>
> | | Per mile. |
> |---|---|
> | First mortgage bonds.. .. .. | $15,000 |
> | Second mortgage bonds.... .. .. | 5,000 |
> | Total mortgages.. .. .. | $20,000 |
>
> Of which the Nova Scotia government agrees to take and pay for at par $10,000 per mile of the above first mortgage bonds.
>
> In addition, the government agrees to advance one-half of the cost of building the railroad in excess of $15,000 per mile, up to an excess of $6,400 per mile. Thus, for example, upon railroad costing $18,000 per mile, the government will pay an additional $1,500 cash per mile, i.e., one-half of the $3,000 per mile in excess of the $15,000 per mile, cost of construction as well as all of the $6,400 cash per mile, already provided for. The Dominion of Canada and Nova Scotia governments pay a cash subsidy per mile of $6,400.

Why do they state in the prospectus that they have secured arrangements with the Manhattan Construction Company for the purpose of building the road?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Will the hon. ex-Minister of Railways allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I asked the hon. gentleman a few moments ago whether he had taken the trouble to ascertain whether there was any truth in the matters set forth in that prospectus in regard to the arrangements made with the Nova Scotia government. He replied to me that he had satisfied himself of the truth of the statements set forth in the prospectus.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I read the contract with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). We are not discussing the Mackenzie & Mann situation at all. We are discussing the prospectus which the hon. gentleman has in his hands at the present time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman deny that it is true ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I deny certainly the statement set forth in that prospectus with regard to the arrangements entered into by the Cape Breton Railway Company and the Nova Scotia government. It is untrue, and every member of the House of Commons is aware that it is untrue.

Mr. MATHESON. It is not true, because the government of Nova Scotia does not guarantee any bonds or give them any land grant.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is a circular issued by the persons who are alleged to have purchased $10,000,000 of stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who own the Rutland and the Adirondack Railway, who have at present a contract for building the Cape Breton road, and it is signed by W. Seward Webb, president ; Samuel Gallaway, John Jacob Astor, Henry L. Sprague, Arthur L. Meyer, Percy Clement, Thomas Robertson, Edgar Van Etten, and Alfred Schiffer. We are to understand that these gentlemen stated a falsehood when they issued this prospectus in New York.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word on this subject ? I read that prospectus when it was first published by the Montreal 'Herald' some weeks ago, and I have seen it republished since that time. I do not hesitate to say that the statements in it are absolutely false in the main; and I base my statement on this ground, that they represent in that prospectus that the Dominion government has given them certain subsidies and promised them other subsidies. I say in all confidence that these people have never had, nor has the Cape Breton Railway, from Point Tupper to Port St. Peters, received any subsidy from this government or the definite promise of any such subsidies as they allege. I do not see the relevancy of my hon. friend's introduction of this matter now; but if it has any relevancy, then it is relevant for me to give an unqualified contradiction to the statements made in that prospectus so far as they relate to the Dominion government. It is a most extraordinary production.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I saw the contract which was to be passed by the Nova Scotia Assembly; that was the contract with Mackenzie & Mann. I examined it in every detail. This prospectus does not apply to the Cape Breton extension alone. As I stated before, these gentlemen had assurances from parties in authority in Nova Scotia, and they allege that they had in other places too, that the Mackenzie & Mann contract will be handed over to them. Are not these conditions the main ones that are embodied in the contract with Mackenzie & Mann ? And when this circular was put on the market in New York, it had reference to the Mackenzie & Mann contract which they thought they had secured.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where is the relevancy of all this ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I want to show the whole connection. I want to show that the hon. gentleman was down in New York in reference to it, and that he had his agents in New York negotiating for the sale of the Intercolonial Railway—Mr. Pugsley and others; it is so reported down there. I would not have brought the matter up were it not alleged that these parties had purchased the Canada Atlantic Railway, which they say is part and parcel of their scheme. Mr. Webb has published the statement in the papers that he has bought the Adirondack Railway, and that its stock has advanced from 40 to 106 or 107, and that the stock of this Dominion Securities Company, which had not an asset in the world except the contracts or agreements which they professed to have made with the Dominion government, and the possibility of arranging this grand scheme with the province of Nova Scotia, has been selling up to 5 or 7 per cent premium. Will the hon. gentleman be quiet until I finish reading this circular ?

The maximum cost of building the railroads according to the best experts and engineers will not exceed, including equipment, $15,000.

Here is a statement made by a company in New York of which these parties are members, all well known and responsible people. They say that in order to obtain a certain sum of money over and above the $15,000 a mile, they have made arrangements with a construction company by which they get half of whatever it is proved the railway costs over the $15,000 a mile; and they will divide that amongst the subscribers.

The maximum cost of building the railroads according to the best experts and engineers will not exceed, including equipment, $15,000, leaving net profits per mile of $8,900 or for minimum of 600 miles, net profits of $5,340,000. In addition to the $1,600 per mile of land grants and a stock issue of $20,000 per mile, amounting on the above minimum of 600 miles to a par of $12,000,000; the cash value of the stocks, of course, depending on the earnings of the road and requiring a period of two or three years after construction for dividends.

I notice that in the agreement it is mentioned the Nova Scotia government are not obliged to pay interest and are not obliged

to any forfeiture of the road until the earnings of the road are such that they will be able to pay the interest out of them.

The capital stock of the Dominion Securities Company is $1,500,000. The contractors and officers are as follows :

Mr. Wm. Seward Webb, president; Samuel R. Callaway, John J. Astor, Henry L. Sprague, Arthur L. Meyer, and others.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to get that circular after you get through with it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not like to buy any stock in that company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here are a few words of the circular of Theodore S. Meyer & Company, Bankers and Brokers of New York :

The Dominion Securities Company holds control of stocks of various companies which have been consolidated with the St. Lawrence and Adirondack into a trunk line of railroad from the lakes to the Atlantic, together with other franchises of immense value, including an annual subsidy of 5 per cent on the entire capitalization, in perpetuity, as soon as connecting links of road are completed, work upon which will begin as soon as the winter breaks.

Here is a circular issued to his friends and the general public by this same man and calling attention to his stock manipulations and what a good hand he is at that business :

My reason for calling your attention to my new enterprise is the fact that my purchases and stock manipulations of recently acquired railroad properties have proven so successful I desire to extend my field of operations, and want the co-operation of a large clientele.

My first venture was that of the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railroad. This stock I advised purchasing at a round $57 per share. My friends heeded the advice, and to-day the stock is listed on the New York stock exchange, is selling at $135 a share, is considered a gilt-edged security, and pays 5 per cent dividend.

My next venture was in Dominion securities. This company has a subsidy from the Canadian government equal to 5 per cent in perpetuity on its capital stock. . . .

My object in quoting the above is this : The firm of Theodore S. Meyer & Company, of which I am a member, will be able in the near future to give you valuable information relative to a large company which is about to be organized, and we will put you in a position to get you in on the ground floor and make as large, if not larger, profits than my followers made in the St. Lawrence and Adirondack and Dominion Securities deals.

I wonder what that large company is.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the broker's name at the bottom ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. D. L. Meyer.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think that is the same Meyer—but it may be a connection of his—as Mr. Seward Webb's. I think the initials are different.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a brother.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He refers, as directors of the concerns he is interested in, to Mr. William Seward Webb, Chauncey M. Depew and F. G. Smith. He gives the range of prices and everything else and is a broker.

Here is some current gossip of New York—a clipping from Dow, Jones' & Co.'s circular of Wednesday, June 19th, 1901.

Nova Scotia Railways.— Attorney General Longley, acting premier of Nova Scotia, being interviewed in Halifax regarding the story that New York millionaires were about to engage extensively in railway enterprise in that quarter, is quoted as saying :

The names mentioned look really heavier than they are. It is doubtful if John J. Astor is a director, and the connection of the Vanderbilts with the scheme is very faint, even supposing the report to be correct. Dr. W. Seward Webb is a connection of the Vanderbilts by marriage, but is not very much more than a figure head, so far as being a factor in railroad manipulation is concerned. There is a proposal before the government at the present time to build a small railroad in the eastern part of the province, and that is the only one of which the government has cognizance. The proposition before the government is one to build a railroad from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, with a branch to Sydney. It is from the company known as the Cape Breton Railroad Extension Company, which obtained a charter in 1899, and was composed of the following : Lorenzo Shute, New York ; Joseph Shute, Atlantic City ; John Crump, superintendent of docks, New York, and others. The proposal to build this road is being pushed by Edward Guerin, Montreal, who probably obtained his charter from the above.

Then there is a statement in contradiction to that from Meyer & Co., to Dow & Co.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That will be interesting.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You can have the whole of it. This is only hearsay in New York. The Dominion Securities Co.'s officer made a statement down there that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was dickering with them with reference to the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is absolutely untrue.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it is entirely untrue. My informant goes so far as to state that he doubts very much the truth of the assertions. He doubts very much the power of Mr. Pugsley who is down there conducting negotiations, to make any conveyance of the kind. He states that the opinion was given by Mr. Blair after visiting New York, that there was such opposition to any proposition of that kind from both Conservatives and Reformers that it would be almost impossible to carry it through. But still Mr. Pugsley is negotia-

ting. However, my informant wrote me to this effect, that it is possible that one of the branches of the Intercolonial Railway not being of any use to that railway, might be signed over to the company when they formed their connection with the Canada Atlantic and secured the southern road—and I notice that they succeeded in accomplishing something in the way of expedition which was never known in the legislation of this country before. They introduced a Bill in the New Brunswick legislature. The same day it was introduced it passed the committee stage, got its second reading in about two hours—in connection with the same firm, which are financing it, and they intend, it is alleged, to build a railway from the state of New York for the purpose of connecting with this line. There is a grand future before it. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will have to be on the alert if he is going to have the Canada Atlantic Railway part and portion of that grand scheme of his from Lake Superior to Depot Harbour. I am afraid Mr. Meyer has got ahead of him. I am afraid that Mr. Webb and the Dominion Securities have made the purchase, and it surely will not do for the government of Canada—although they did it already—by assisting a competitive line from Point Lévis to Montreal where there were two roads already in existence—to put money into an undertaking for the purpose of destroying capital which is already invested.

I have not gone into details with reference to the Intercolonial Railway. We shall have an opportunity to discuss the various items as they come up, and of getting the fullest information concerning them from the minister. What I have sought to do is to draw the attention of the country to the enormous sums of money that have been expended on that road. What the people of Canada promised the people of the maritime provinces when they came into Confederation was this—to build the Intercolonial Railway and to make it a good, efficient connection between these upper provinces and the maritime provinces. We contributed cheerfully to the building of that road, and what we expected from our officers in administering it was to keep it in a state of efficiency equal to that of any road in America. We thought we did it. We fixed the tolls at rates which would not be remunerative, though a different course could have been adopted had we desired, for I state upon my authority as one who has had control of that road, that by charging the freight rates which are paid by the people in other portions of this Dominion, it would have been as easy to cause that road to contribute a million dollars a year to the revenues of this country as to sink three or four millions a year by the rates which were adopted. But we said: We will not exact the uttermost farthing, and so we gave them the cheapest transportation enjoyed by the people in any part of the Dominion. But we have right to say—and this is what we expected at Confederation—You have the road, now let no expenditure be made upon it beyond what will be covered by the receipts of the road itself. That would be only just and fair to the rest of this Dominion. It may be said that we of the upper provinces are participants in the benefits of the road. It is true that, to a large extent, we are participants, but mainly it is for the benefit of the people of the maritime provinces. And the people of the maritime provinces should not support a minister who makes it his policy to get as much as possible out of the funds of this country for the purpose of expending it in those provinces, buying stations at St. John, building elevators here and there, when any man who knows anything of the commerce of this country knows that not a bushel of grain can be profitably exported by the Intercolonial Railway——

Mr. EMMERSON. Will the hon. gentleman answer a question?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I'll try.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who built the elevator in Halifax—the first one that was built?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In what year was it built?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give the date—it was some years ago.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was not in my time. The last elevator that I know of was built by the present minister——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In part only.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought the old elevator was burned, and this one was to replace it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who built the first one—under what government was it built?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman can tell me the year, I can give him an answer. I do not know whether it was built between 1874 and 1878, or between 1878 and 1896. I do not know of anybody who would be more likely to build an elevator in that section or who took a greater interest in the people of Nova Scotia than my old friend and leader Sir Charles Tupper. Perhaps he was the minister at the time—I would not doubt it. And I can tell the committee that when I was Minister of Railways—this is a confession—we carried grain from Quebec to Halifax at prices that did not half pay the cost of transport.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How much did you carry?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Two or three hundred thousand bushels.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very little, for the elevator was seldom used.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is an unprofitable business. You cannot compete against nature. But, if you wish to make the Intercolonial Railway a live road, and one that will be useful, make it the means of reaching the port that is the nearest to Europe, and so make the road the link in the chain of communication between Canada and Great Britain. Start a fast line of steamers, with Sydney or Louisburg as the port on this side. In choosing your port, pay no attention to local politics or to anything else except the interests of the whole country. So far as I know, the question would be between Louisburg and Sydney. Then, keep your road up to a high state of efficiency, connecting with other railways in Canada and the United States. In this way you will develop the traffic that will be most advantageous in many ways, and you will have a road that will do more for the maritime provinces than all the schemes of through freight and building of elevators and other absurdities that a Minister of Railways is often urged to go into. The people will have this. As I said before, they are not so servile, so corrupt, so debauched that they will support a government in expenditures which are needless. By the course we are now pursuing, we are simply flinging immense sums of money into a sink-hole—these expenditures are of no benefit to the country whatever. This idea of developing the Intercolonial Railway as a heavy freight line, providing heavy locomotives, and then making heavy tracks and strong bridges to bear them, is an absurdity. The road can never have the heavy, long freight trains of a western road, and these new locomotives are not as suitable for traffic upon the road as were those the road already had.

The necessity to put the old road in a good style! He says 83 locomotives of this large size within the last number of years are not sufficient to carry on the increased traffic of the Intercolonial Railway. But they have plenty to spare, they loaned 11 of them the other day to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The excuse was that the mechanical engineer said they were not fit for the use of the Intercolonial Railway. To have a railroad up to the standard you must have locomotives burning a minimum of coal with a maximum of power. You can get a good 500 horse power engine and run it with the same cost as a 150 horse power engine. Where is this traffic for which they want a 500 horse power engine, with a long train of 40 or 50 cars, unless it is from some coal mine to some port near by? There is nothing of the kind required. The Minister of Railways and Canals has made a statement concerning his administration of the Intercolonial Railway, which railroad men, when they read it, from one end of the country to the other will laugh at. It is a perfect farce. Look at the amount expended. What is the necessity of the increased expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway? In every department there is an increase. Let me give a few instances for the Minister of Railways and Canals. Compare the pay-lists and extra wages this year and last year. In 1900 the pay-list and extra wages for the Intercolonial Railway amounted to $2,706,023.71. In 1901 the expenditure on the same account was $3,403,645.92, or an increase of $697,612.21. Can there be a possible justification for that? Now the expenditure in the Moncton office, in 1900, was $132,531.21; in 1901, it was $178,118. Expenditure on offices outside of Moncton. in 1900, $27,949.58; in 1901, $32,656.48. Car shops, Moncton, the expenditure increased from $121,000 in 1900 to $131,000 in 1901. In locomotive shops, the increase is from $145,000 to $163,000.

The hon. gentleman talks about the efficiency of the road, about the esprit de corps that he is building up. He says that no man should be dismissed on account of his political opinions, that a young man can go into the employ of the Intercolonial Railway and work up, and his position cannot be taken from him by any means. He talks about providing a retiring allowance, and everything else. But the Minister of Finance will please look at the enormous increased expenditure in 1900 just before the election. What a commentary it is upon the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals in reference to his non-interference with political affairs during the election. I listened to him, and thought possibly that I was mistaken in my understanding of what he said. When I heard those words of wisdom and honesty coming from the hon. gentleman I was astonished. I said to myself, is it possible that an hon. gentleman who can speak in this manner has been guilty of such acts as were laid to his charge? One would hardly believe it. It reminds us of Shakspere's saying, 'Methinks she does protest too much.' Whenever you hear the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals speaking on behalf of virtue, begin to suspect him.

I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I have said enough at present. I may have an opportunity of referring to this subject again. I want to speak on the trans-Atlantic service and on the question of transportation, and I may have an opportunity of doing so on some of the canal estimates. But as concerning my administration of the Intercolonial Railway, I think it will compare very favourably with the administration of the hon. gentleman. I am confident the country from one end to the other will be able to judge on which side economy was practiced, on which side there was an honest and efficient administration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not wish to engage in the general debate, but while this matter of the Dominion securities circular is fresh in the minds of the House, I would like to say a word. As I heard it read, and as I read it some weeks ago, it relates entirely to rail-

ways in Nova Scotia. Whatever may happen with railways in other parts of the Dominion, there are not many railway enterprises projected in Nova Scotia that are not brought to my notice in one form or another by gentlemen who come round looking for my interest in the matter. I am bound to say that I never heard from the Dominion Securities Corporation, or any people in connection with them, regarding this great railway enterprise which appears in this circular. I think the issue of that circular, if it was issued by any respectable broker, is a disreputable transaction, and if Dr. Seward Webb permitted the use of his name in the way it is used there, I certainly think he has not given a very strong reason why we should regard him with favour in any railway enterprise in Canada. Of course his name may be used without his authority.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the Minister of Finance will read his letter in the paper, he says he is interested in the Dominion Securities Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But in the letter Dr. Webb published a day or two ago he does not say anything about these huge railway schemes in the province of Nova Scotia. As a matter of fact, the company with which Dr. Webb is connected has a contract for 35 miles of railway from the Strait of Canso to the town of St. Peters. That is the beginning and end of the whole enterprise so far as it relates to the government of Canada. I think I am in a position to say that is the beginning and end of the whole enterprise so far as it relates to the government of Nova Scotia also, though I can only speak from information in that case. But I say the issue of that circular is something which should not come from any broker of good repute. I say there is nothing in the relations between the Dominion government and that company, and I believe I can go further and say that there is nothing in the relations between the Nova Scotia government and that company, which justifies that circular or anything like it. I repeat what I have already said, that the only foundation for the whole transaction is a contract which was made for 35 miles of railway running from the Strait of Canso to the village of St. Peters ; beyond that there is no foundation whatever for the statement.

Mr. MONK. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said that these facts mentioned by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) and relating to a circular were false in the main.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have stated the only point in which I believe the statements to be true in relation to railways in Nova Scotia. I believe I know as much about Nova Scotia railway proposals as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I said that the only transaction that has occurred between the government of the Dominion and the people who are connected with this circular is a contract for thirty-five miles of railway from the Strait of Canso to the village of St. Peters. There is talk of an extension at some future time to Louisburg or Sydney. But that is still in the air, and the whole matter, so far as any transaction between the government of Canada and the company is concerned, is a contract for that thirty-five miles.

Mr. OSLER. Some of the duplicate circulars that have been referred to have been received by me at my office in Toronto. I have had circulars from Mr. Meyer. I do not know him, and I never heard of him until I received a circular. I have had circulars and letters advising the purchase of Dominion Securities stock. At first the stock was quoted at about 92. These were the ordinary circulars sent out from brokers offices in New York. A later circular quoted the stock as having advanced to 105, and later on a circular was received, not personally by me, but in the course of business by my firm, again advising purchase and stating that the stock had gone to 115 or 120. I do not know anything about this matter except from the circulars I have received. But the impression that these circulars left upon my mind was that the New York speculators, seeing the reckless manner in which bonuses are given by the different provinces of this country, and by the Dominion itself, have concluded that Canada is an easy and profitable mine to work, and that they may be able to float wildcat and visionary schemes. But, evidently, the statements contained in the prospectus that has been read are statements that are believed by men who stand very high in the city of New York.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Will my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) allow me to ask him a question ? I simply want to ask my hon. friend whether he is acquainted with the contract entered into between the Cape Breton Railway Company and the province of Nova Scotia, and whether he is prepared to characterize it as a wildcat and reckless scheme ?

Mr. OSLER. I do not know anything about the matter except what I have learned from the circulars I have seen. These circulars are sent out by reputable houses in New York. The firm of Dow, Jones & Company are to my knowledge a very reputable firm. There can be only one conclusion drawn from this series of circulars, and it is that the Dominion government and the provincial government are looked upon as absolutely soft and ready to be bled, so soft that these people are able to publish the statement that they believe will not go uncontradicted, that they believe will not cause their contracts to be cancelled, saying that the province of Nova Scotia and the Dominion government will grant sub-

sidies which will net them a profit of $6,000,000 over and above the whole cost of the railway. In that circular, which has been issued under the authority of Dr. Webb, Mr. Astor, and other well known men, they say that they have made a contract with the governments here that will net them from $5,000 to $6,000 a mile over and above what the engineers estimate the cost of the railway. The only inference I draw from that is that both the Dominion and local governments ought seriously to look into the policy of granting bonuses to railways that are simply being built for speculative purposes, granting bonuses to railways which are of no general benefit, but which are being used for local purposes, granting bonuses to railways which are absorbed by one or other of the great railway corporations, and the only reason for granting which is to give contractors and promoters a pull enabling them to make money. That is the result of nine-tenths of the bonuses given to local railways in Canada, and I think a good purpose will be served by the reading of the circular, which has been quoted by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), if it will bring the attention of the government of the Dominion and of the various provinces to the absolute waste of money that is being carried on through the bonusing of railways.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) is the possessor of an idea which is shared by some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, but of which he is the chief father, that it is a waste of money to subsidize any road which is not a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. OSLER. Excuse me. For five years or more, before I entered this parliament, whenever I spoke in public, or whenever I expressed an opinion I voiced my belief that the time for granting railway bonuses by this government had passed.

An hon. MEMBER. The Canadian Pacific Railway had got all it wanted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, it had not.

Mr. OSLER. I, for one, will vote against every railway bonus that is submitted, unless it be for a road in a new country, or for a line in a portion of the country which is not already served. I will vote against any bonus to the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway company which may be submitted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman is repeating in somewhat different terms an idea which he has advanced on previous occasions, and which idea was that it was time we ceased granting bonuses to railways in the older provinces. Now it happens that the one part of the country in which he makes an exception is the part of the country where the Canadian Pacific Railway is anxious to build branches, so that the hon. gentleman will agree to let the Canadian Pacific Railway get all it wants and deny fair consideration to those older parts of Canada which have as much interest in securing railway connection as any part of the country in which the Canadian Pacific Railway is interested. I therefore say that the position taken by the hon. gentleman on a previous occasion and repeated here to-night is not a sound position. However, what I wish to call the attention of the committee to is that the hon. gentleman, in referring to this circular, said that it was issued under the authority of the Astors, the Webbs and the Vanderbilts.

Mr. OSLER. I beg pardon. I said it was issued under their names.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If I issued a circular and used the names of a lot of people that would not prove that it was issued by their authority.

Mr. OSLER. It has never been denied.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will give the hon. gentleman the denial here. Dr. Webb has within a few days made a statement respecting the Canadian railways with which he is connected. I have sent for Dr. Webb's letter, and what does he say :

> Editor 'Journal,'—My name, and incidently the Vanderbilt interests, has been so frequently of late mentioned in the Canadian press, that I feel it due the people to say that I am connected with only three enterprises in Canada so far as the railroad situation is concerned.
>
> First. I built, some eight years ago, the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway, and I am president of that corporation to-day.
>
> Second. At the request of some friends, a year ago I undertook on behalf of the Dominion Securities Company, the construction of the Cape Breton Railway, in Nova Scotia. I did it because I am a strong believer in the future of Canada, and the proposition interested me. The property is owned by the Dominion Securities Company.
>
> Third. I am interested in the purchase of the Canada Atlantic Railway and its boat line.
>
> These comprise my interest in Canadian enterprises.

Mr. MONK. He does not deny that he is interested in the Dominion Securities Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the question.

Mr. OSLER. The Dominion Securities Company is the only company that I referred to. As far as I have seen, it contains this gentleman's name. I never saw that letter which was read now.

Mr. MONK. It is no denial ; it is an admission.

Mr. OSLER. He admits he is connected with that company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not the point. The point raised by my hon.

friend (Mr. Haggart) was whether this government and the government of Nova Scotia had entered into an arrangement with these gentlemen for the granting of subsidies to many hundreds of miles of railway at a price which would give them millions of profit.

Mr. OSLER. That was not the point you raised. You distinctly stated that the letter you were going to read showed a denial by these gentlemen. So far as you have read, it confirms what I have said.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will come to that later, but I have a pardonable weakness for always dealing with the main question first, and the main question was whether or not this government had some arrangements with this set of people—

Mr. OSLER. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member did not, but the member for Lanark read this circular in terms which, if they meant anything at all, conveyed the impression that the government of the Dominion and the government of Nova Scotia had made arrangements with these people for granting enormous subsidies to many hundreds of miles of railways out of which they were going to make immense profits. If that is not what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) meant I do not know what he was driving at. Mr. Seward Webb mentions the three enterprises with which he is connected. One: The St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway; third, the Canada Atlantic Railway, and as to the second he says: I am interested in the Cape Breton railroad. Now, I have stated that that is a railway of thirty-five miles in length, for which a company holds a contract. Therefore Dr. Seward Webb has stated over his own signature that the only connection he has with any railway in Nova Scotia is that known as the Cape Breton Railway, which I stated is thirty-five miles long.

Mr. OSLER. Does Dr. Webb deny that he has connection with the Dominion Securities Company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Finance quotes that letter in order to show that my statement was incorrect. Well, I said nothing that is not contained in the exact words of that letter. I thought Dr. Webb also stated that he was not connected with the South Shore Railway or the Montreal tunnel.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. He says a lot of other things, but I did not read them as they have no bearing on the case.

Mr. MONK. Does he deny that he is interested in the Dominion Securities Company?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is not in question. The point is whether or not this government has made arrangements to allow this set of American capitalists to build railways at rates which would give millions of dollars profit. Dr. Webb said that he has no connection with any railway in Nova Scotia but the Cape Breton Railway, and the railway is only thirty-five miles long.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Dominion Securities Company does not allege anything else. That company issued a circular to which Dr. Webb signs his name as president.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think Dr. Webb's name is mentioned but I do not think he signed it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then it was a circular issued by the Dominion Securities Company alleging that Dr. Webb is the president.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I can tell the Minister of Finance that they endeavoured to secure the building of that particular road and that they failed. When they issued that circular they were so sure of it that they presented it as one of the inducements to take stock in the company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say they never tried to get it. They never made an application for any such scheme. I take the responsibility of saying that they never made an application to this government in conformity with the terms of that circular.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not speaking of this government at all. They wanted to secure the control of the charter for the building of that road in Nova Scotia for which the contract was awarded to MacKenzie & Mann. They were trying to and expected to get the contract. I could give the hon. gentleman a great deal more information on that subject. I know the whole inner circumstances of the case. They did not succeed in getting it from the provincial government, and so they had to abandon that portion of the scheme altogether. Dr. Webb is perfectly right in saying now that the Dominion Securities Company have nothing to do with any undertaking except the three he has mentioned.

Mr. OSLER. I can tell the Minister of Finance that there is but one inference to be drawn from that circular issued by such a man as Dr. Webb and naming such men as his directors. The only inference is that there is a connection between these governments and that company. As a business man I state without hesitation, that if that circular came to my office I would place a great deal of confidence in it, because it is seldom that a circular under such auspices and with such names has not substantial facts at the back of it. If such circulars

were issued in New York or any financial centre, and were not immediately repudiated if the statements they contained were not true, the men whose names were attached would at once lose credit and would never again attain to any respectable position. I repeat that the only inference that can be drawn from such a circular as that is that there was a solid foundation for it, and it is quite clear that the president and the directors were led to believe that there was a solid foundation for the statements made as to the contract with the various governments. That was believed in New York to such an extent that the stock of that company, the securities of which consist solely and entirely of the contracts which are stated to have been received from the provincial and the Dominion governments; the stock of that company was quoted some weeks ago at 110 or 120 when I last saw it. It may be down to nothing to-day or it may be 200 for all I know, but the last quotation I saw was 110 or 120. The inference to be drawn from that was that they had substantial grounds for believing that they had, or were going to obtain such contracts. I say that it is a slur upon the legislatures of the various provinces and of this parliament, that men of financial standing in New York or elsewhere could believe that they could make such a bargain with the various governments in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, there is no gentleman in this House who does not desire that the government railways should be worked at a profit, or at all events without loss; and if any gentleman does wish that these railways should be worked in that way he must also desire that the accounts shall be so kept that it will be possible for us to say whether a surplus when one is claimed has really been earned; or whether when there is a deficit, that that deficit is not less or is not more than is represented.

Now, Sir, if we are to have a reliable statement as to profit or loss in the working of railways, we must have a certain and distinct system of keeping the accounts. The hon. minister seems to think that there is some distinction between a railway owned by shareholders who may be looking for dividends and a railway owned by the government of Canada. I think the people of Canada take a sufficient interest in this question to desire that accounts shall be properly kept so that we shall know positively whether the returns made by the minister are correct or not. I want to do again what I did last year—state in as few words as possible what is the well recognized rule as to charges to capital account and charges to maintainence account on railways. The a b c in this matter—and there is no exception in this respect in any railway company between this and Mexico—is that when capital has once provided a property, whether it be a rail or a locomotive or a coach, the going concern shall maintain that at the expense of its revenue. That is the first principle, and that nobody disputes. If capital has provided, say a 56 pound rail, when that rail comes out, either in a week or a month, if broken, or after 20 years service, the revenue of the concern must replace it. If a company has 200 locomotives, it must maintain those locomotives at the expense of revenue. If locomotives are smashed up or worn out, revenue must replace them. When it has done so, when it has kept every locomotive of the 200 up to a state of efficiency, and the company buys 50 more, it may charge those 50 to capital, but it cannot charge one locomotive to capital so long as the old list is incomplete, and so as to coaches and cars, and indeed everything provided by capital. That is the rule, a throroughly recognized rule, which there is no question about any where, except, apparently, in the mind of the Minister of Railways. I wish to apply that rule to the hon. gentleman's charges on capital account; and having done so, I shall take the liberty of showing what the hon. gentleman's deficit would have been if he had thus applied the ordinary rules of railway companies.

Before doing that I wish to say a few words on the little controversy that arose a few minutes ago between the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and the Minister of Railways as to the system adopted by the ex-minister of railways and the present minister. I have gone back only as far as the year 1895-6. In that year the hon. Mr. Haggart laid 45 miles of rails of a heavier description than had been on the track before. Every pound of those rails was charged to revenue. In 1896-7, the present Minister of Railways was in office. That hon. gentleman, in his first report, said: 'I have continued the system of renewing the track with heavier rails'; and the hon. gentleman himself charged the whole to revenue. In the year 1897-8 the hon. minister laid 19½ miles of heavier rails, every pound of which was charged to revenue; he was following the example of the hon. Mr. Haggart, and very properly so. I will admit presently that perhaps he was not obliged to charge every pound of the heavier rails to revenue, but certainly he was right so far as he charged to the extent of the weight of the old rails. Now, we come to the year 1898-9, and the minister will recollect that that was the time he was preparing for his first surplus, the surplus just anterior to the general election. The hon. gentleman does not report that he laid one rail in that year. If he had done so, his little surplus would have gone to Halifax. In the next year, 1899-1900, the hon. gentleman set off on his new career. In that year he asked parliament to give him $420,000 for heavier rails, to be charged wholly to capital. By some means the hon. gentleman man-

aged to get that through ; there does not seem to have been any discussion about it ; and for the first time the replacing of rails, which ought to have been charged almost entirely to revenue, was charged entirely to capital. In the last year, the accounts of which are before us this session, the hon. gentleman spent $402,000 upon rails, and charged every dollar of that to capital. I will show in a moment or two just how much of that ought to have gone to revenue. I have calculated it here, and I rather think the hon. gentleman knows it ; at all events, I will give him the figures. Before giving these figures, I may say that the hon. gentleman is asking in his estimates $600,000 for rails and fastenings for the coming year; and in the current year he is expending even a larger sum for the like purpose ; the whole to be charged to capital, and added to the public debt of this Dominion. So something like $2,000,000 for rails will have been charged to capital when nearly two-thirds of that amount ought to have gone to revenue account. I asked Mr. Pottinger what he thought of charging to capital all the cost of replacing rails. The hon. gentleman will recollect Mr. Pottinger's answer : 'Why should I object so long as parliament votes the money ?' The general manager knew perfectly well what the proper system was, but it was a little too much to expect him to want to charge to revenue what parliament was so willing to give on capital account.

At page W-41 of the Auditor General's report, we find the details of the hon. gentleman's capital expenditure for rails. He began with 82 miles laid upon the Cape Breton division. These were old 56 pound rails which were admitted by Mr. Pottinger to be worn out. They had served their day, and the time had come to replace them in the ordinary course. If those 56 pound rails had been replaced by rails of similar weight, nobody for a moment would have supposed they would have been charged otherwise than to revenue, along with the fastenings, and the expense of laying the new rails ; and the hon. gentleman would have credited the revenue with the value of the old scrap rails taken up. That is the ordinary system. Bue he laid 80 pound rails, and charged the whole cost to capital. All he was entitled to charge to capital was the extra 24 pounds of rail laid. If he charges the 80 pounds to capital, he has a great deal more in his capital account than is represented by the weight of rails on the road ; that is, he has the original 56 lbs. and the new 80 lbs., in all, 136 lbs. He charges $350,491 for these rails. It was his duty to charge 56--80ths of that amount to revenue. That would be $245,336. He was entitled to credit to his revenue the old rails taken up, which would have given $108,240, leaving a net charge to revenue of $137,096. In the same way, the fastenings would have cost revenue $17,197 and the stores $7,000. Then the hon. gentleman decided to charge the expense, i.e., the labour of relaying the track to capital. Why, these rails were there some 20 years. We had to replace them by new rails. The expenditure was an ordinary working expense, and yet he charges $200 per mile to capital account, thus adding to the debt of the country and relieving this deficit. That amount alone is $16,400. Adding all these together, we find that on that Cape Breton division he charges $177,692 to capital which should have been charged to working expenses. In other words he improves the appearance of his deficit by that amount.

Take the Moncton and Truro division, where we may make the same calculation, except that he took up 67 pound rails and replaced them by 80-pound rails. His charge against revenue should have been $47,240. On the Campbellton division in the same way he should have charged $33,133 against revenue. And totalling up these three divisions, he should have charged against revenue $258,548, and his charge against capital should have been only $144,000. But he charged $402,000 to capital. If he had added that $258,548 which he should have charged against revenue, to his $488,000 deficit, he would have come so much nearer the mark.

Now take his rolling stock. He reports that he has 228 old locomotives and has added during the year 20, making 248. If the hon. gentleman had kept up his 228 locomotives in a thorough state of efficiency, he would have been entitled to charge the extra twenty to capital, but, let us see exactly how he kept them up. The committee called as a witness the present mechanical superintendent, Mr. Muhlfeld. The report of the hon. gentleman, giving the 248 locomotives, is brought to the first of July last year, and Mr. Muhlfeld entered on his duties the 1st September, just two months later. Here is how this gentleman found these 248 locomotives. He was asked :

Q. What about the locomotives ? I suppose they were in good condition ?—A. Some were and some were not. Some were pretty old.

Q. Some were pretty old.—A. Yes, it is not a matter of age, it is a matter of the time of service they have been in. There are some of the age that they are being condemned.

These are the locomotives which the hon. minister affects to think are in an efficient condition.

Q. How many of them ?—A. I cannot say exactly, I presume 25 or 30 that I know of.

That is the evidence of the mechanical superintendent. He says that 25 or 30 of the locomotives are in a position to be condemned, and yet the minister adds the 20 new ones to capital account, instead of charging them against revenue account as replacing so many of the 25 or 30. Further on this gentleman says something more on that subject :

Q. Would you hang on to a number of old locomotives, you could not work economically, when you could get some revenue out of them, and charge up to capital account those you replaced them by ?—A. No, sir, I would charge them up to revenue.

That is the statement of the hon. gentleman's own officer. It shows that the hon. Minister should have taken those new locomotives to replace condemned ones, which are either old scrap or should be sold to some people who are constructing new railways and would give $1,000 or $2,000 a piece for them. But the 20 new locomotives he has charged to capital account, and I repeat he had no right to so charge them until he had replaced the 25 or 30 condemned ones by 25 or 30 new ones. What is the result of that ? The hon. gentleman paid for his locomotives, which he bought this year, $346,000. Assuming that he could have sold the condemned ones for $46,000, that left a clean $300,000 that he had to charge against his revenue account. Take his admitted deficit of $488,000 and add the $258,000, that he ought to have charged for steel rails and these $300,000 for locomotives, and his deficit would be $1,046,000, and that is what any railway company would have made it.

The hon. gentleman took a lot of pains to show that if he had not spent so much his deficit would have been less. That is hardly controvertible, but I point out that if he charged to revenue what he did spend on revenue account, the deficit would be a great deal more.

Before I leave this question of locomotives I want to point out something else. The hon. gentleman got in all in the year 28 locomotives. He says that 20 were added to his stock. He really added 22, so I suppose there is some clerical error. But he charges 6 to revenue. He went that far but did not go far enough. He should have charged not only the 6 but the other 22 as well. The 6 are numbered small numbers, showing clearly that they replaced old locomotives, thus recognized the principle I am contending for, but he would not go far enough lest it should make his deficit worse.

He knows that he is bound to buy locomotives to replace the old ones that are condemned, or should be condemned, but it is too much for him to charge the whole to revenue, so he quietly charges 20 to capital.

Mr. Muhlfeld was examined about some locomotives leased by the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said that they were very old ones, which could not be used economically, and so they leased them to the Canadian Pacific Railway which could afford to use them. The very fact that the hon. gentleman had, in addition to the 25, 10 or 11 that were so old that he could not use them economically, shows that even the 25 or 30, which Mr. Muhlfeld speaks of, are not all he should have thrust aside and replaced out of revenue account.

The same with his cars. The hon. gentleman saves his expenses on car account as he does on locomotive account at every point. Mr. Muhlfeld is asked about the condition of the rolling stock, and he said it was in a very fair average condition. Well, considering that in the past three years the minister has added 1,861 new cars to his stock, or 27 per cent of the whole, at the expense of capital, I do not suppose that we need be surprised that a new man would think that the rolling stock was in pretty fair average condition. It must have been in a terrible state, if the 27 per cent addition did not bring it up to a pretty fair average.

Let us see what he did to maintain his old stock. At the beginning of the year there were condemned cars, 442 of all kinds. During the year he condemned 145 more, making a total of 587 that were unfit for business. These were not cars which were laid aside for repairs, but condemned absolutely. He says in his report that he rebuilt 223. But still he leaves 364 unfit for service—condemned cars. I do not know that anybody would object very much to the hon. gentleman leaving these 364 cars to be re-built on a future occasion, provided he did not want the cars. But in the year we are dealing with, he buys 1,119 cars, and charges every one of these to capital. His duty, clearly, was to charge 364 of them to revenue account, and then the remainder he could charge to capital. The 346 cars cost him a little over $250,000. That was a charge he made to capital account every dollar of which should have gone to revenue account. If we add this to the other items, we find that the hon. gentleman's real deficit, carrying every charge to revenue that any other railway company would, is $1,296,000. But by his system of accounts he comes out with an apparent deficit of $488,000. No wonder the hon. gentleman wants to draw a distinction between what ordinary shareholders would expect and what the government expects in the administration of a railway. The hon. gentleman may say that this is mere book-keeping. The hon. Minister of Finance last year asked us what it mattered—that if you had a deficit of $1,000,000, it is added to the debt of the country, and if you have a charge of $1,000,000 to capital it is added to the debt of the country. But there is more than that in it. What can be expected of the staff at Moncton if they are told in effect that it matters not how wasteful they are or how little attention they pay to the economical maintenance of the property. The effect of the hon. gentleman's method is to encourage waste and destruction. A mechanical superintendent finds that he has four or five hundred cars which will cost him a good deal to repair and maintain. What does a long-headed mechanical superintendent do when he is operating under methods such as we find here ? He says : Let the cars run for a year or two and the minister will get us others out of capital account, and so we will not have to repair them at all. And the same is

true of locomotives. I do not care how honest a man may be, the temptation you put in his way by this method is too strong. He is not going to run up his maintenance account, upon which his very reputation depends, when he has an opportunity to keep that account down by having items charged to capital. With such opportunities offered him, an official will not repair anything if he can avoid it. Laxity and indifference are induced. That is the policy the hon. minister deliberately encourages. The result is shown in the enormous proportion of actual working expenses on this road, as admitted by the hon. minister himself.

The hon. minister spent about three-quarters of an hour before six o'clock referring to various items of expenditure in the old accounts of the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart). He spoke of new bridges constructed, of extending sidings, and enlarging accommodation at stations. Nobody has ever disputed that all these items might be charged to capital. What we question is the hon. gentleman's charging other items to capital. We question also the hon. minister's methods in dealing with charges properly against capital. I call attention to it because I think it is high time that the estimates of the Minister of Railways were more carefully considered. In 1900 the hon. gentleman took a vote for improvements and increased accommodation at Sydney, $39,000. Did the hon. gentleman limit his expenditure to that? No; he spent $137,324 on that work—$58,000 being for land alone. I am speaking now of real capital expenditure, but I want to show how the hon. minister deals with these things. Having spent $137,324 he transferred $41,324 of that to an entirely different item, a blanket item to which he had no right to charge one cent of this expenditure. He came down the following year and asked for a vote of $57,000 to make up the balance. Now, it would be far better and more business-like if we had given the hon. gentleman power to spend what he pleased, and held him responsible. He gets these estimates, but does not hold himself bound to them—spends what he pleases. The Minister of Finance has taunted us with taking two days for the examination of the Auditor General, and thought it was ridiculous, because the Auditor General knew nothing about the matters we asked about. It is true that we spent an hour and a half on each of two days in an earnest effort to show that the Auditor General did not know anything about these matters. The Minister of Finance seems peculiarly happy over the fact that the Auditor General could not tell us anything. But that was the very thing we were trying to demonstrate. People think when they see the Auditor General's great Blue-book, with the Auditor General's certificate to the accounts, these things must be all right. But the Auditor General freely admitted that he knew nothing about many of these matters, and the hon. Minister of Finance was——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I think he is hardly right in his representation of what I said. It was not that I objected to the cross-examination, but I did call attention to the fact that the greater part of the time was occupied in asking the Auditor General about matters of which he could not know anything, was not expected to know anything, but the facts concerning which could be ascertained best from the officers in the department.

Mr. BARKER. We asked the Auditor General concerning nothing except items in his report to which he had certified.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But what I said was that the hon. gentleman again and again asked the Auditor General questions which could only be answered by a railway expert.

Mr. BARKER. Our object was to show that the Auditor General who had professed to certify to these expenditures did not know what he was certifying about, and he admitted that himself. I will take another example to show what we object to with regard to the expenditures at stations. Our objection was not with regard to charging to capital account all these expenditures, but to the way in which the expenditure was made. Take, for instance, Westville. The minister obtained authority to expend $8,000 to increase the station accommodation at that place. The minister advertised for tenders for that $8,000 work, and it was pointed out in the committee and proved that he paid $649.99 in advertising. He would not go the $650, but he got within one cent of it.

Mr. MONK. That must have been the Montreal 'Herald.'

Mr. BARKER. Well, he let the contract. The minister knew he had authority to spend only $8,000 at that station, but what did he spend? He spent in the year $15,-719.53, and there is $1,575.26 yet to pay, making a total expenditure of $17,249.-79, upon the authority of this House to spend $8,000. That is the objection we are making. The Auditor General said such expenditure was all wrong, and he would write that that sort of thing must not occur again.

Then I will take another item. The Minister of Railways and Canals got the authority of this House to build three engine houses. He advertised for tenders, and what do you suppose the hon. gentleman spent in advertising for that work? One thousand three hundred and sixty-four dollars and ninety-eight cents. The hon. gentleman wonders that we criticise his accounts; he says we are objecting to them

as capital expenditure. We are not objecting to them as capital expenditure, but we object to the methods of the hon. gentleman.

Take another station in which the hon. gentleman has great interest. He happens to represent the city of St. John. The expenditure there was $219,752 in this one year. That is a very small item compared to the expenditures there since the hon. gentleman has become Minister of Railways and Canals. I think in that city something over $1,000,000 has been spent. Now he wants to make a fine station yard at the outskirts of the town. He got 36 acres of marsh land and paid $475 an acre for it, or $17,138 for marsh land upon which to lay sidings. Well, he did more. He charged for the materials for those sidings. He is going to lay 12 miles, and he charged for the rails and other materials for these sidings, $46,620.77. That was in 1900, and to this hour not more than one mile has been laid. That is another thing that we object to. The hon. gentleman says: You are objecting to capital expenditure, you are objecting to the sidings at stations. It is convenient for him to put it that way. I repeat again, it is the method of the hon. gentleman we are objecting to. If he had spent that money properly for needed sidings, nobody would raise any objection. But he charges capital with material which, it is admitted by Mr. Pottinger, is lying along the track at this hour. It is not at St. John at all. He has charged for ties 30 cents apiece that are lying in heaps 100 miles away, he has charged for spikes, and bolts and rails that are not delivered there at all. Yes, he charged in 1900 to capital $46,620.77 on that account.

There is another thing I may as well comment upon, showing the methods of the hon. gentleman. He charges capital account $20 per ton for these rails that have just been taken out of the main line, and into store at only $15. So he makes for his store account 33 per cent profit in that transaction. That is a pretty fair profit, even if you are selling to a stranger. But what is the result of it? He has a store account of three or four million dollars in the course of a year, nearly every item of which is charged out at some profit; thus every year or two there must be a considerable accumulation of profits in that store account and nobody hears what becomes of it. I do not charge the hon. gentleman with pocketing it, but I have no doubt whatever that it goes to the benefit of his working expenses, and that the deficit would otherwise be so much the worse.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all, you are mistaken.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think I am. I asked Mr. Pottinger how much of that went into working expenses, and he did not know. I said: A hundred thousand dollars in the year? No, he would not be sure, but he did not think so much as that. That was the answer Mr. Pottinger made. Well, there is another example of the way in which the hon. gentleman deals. There were the Copper Crown works at Pictou. Those are smelting works started at Pictou that nobody ever expected would amount to anything, they have become a bankrupt concern as I am told. The hon. gentleman has spent $20,000 for sidings at those works at the expense of this country. The ordinary course of a manufacturing concern dealing with a railway company is, when they think the works will pay, to put in the sidings and if they have got traffic they get rebates until the amount is wiped out. But the hon. gentleman was more generous than that. He led them to expect that if they would put in the siding he would pay for it in due time, just as soon as he could get the order of this House. Let us see how this was done. One peculiarity about this business is that there was a Mr. E. N. Macdonald, who was a candidate at the general elections on the ministerial side, was the solicitor for this Copper Crown Works Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose somebody had to be solicitor for it.

Mr. BARKER. I will read where the coincidence comes in. This is a letter dated at Pictou, December 20, 1899:

Hon. A. G. Blair,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I learn that the department are preparing estimates for next session, and that the estimated cost of the Copper Crown extension is about $17,500. The extension and the consequent extra work will necessitate a larger yard at Pictou beyond all doubt, and I would like to ask that that vote be made $20,000 for the whole extension to the copper works, and improvements of the public service at Pictou.

But the richest part is still to come, and I call attention to it:

Any possible discussion of the vote would be avoided in that way.

This gentleman wanted to get $20,000, but we were not to have the opportunity of discussing it.

And there are other reasons of an important character why this should be so made, which I could personally explain to you better when I see you.

Mr. BROCK. That is disgraceful.

Mr. BARKER. I think it is a pity we have not Mr. Macdonald here as a member, it would be so pleasant to hear him and the Minister of Railways and Canals go through that little conversation again, tell us what it was which is so interesting, and which he could so much better explain verbally than in writing.

Mr. MONK. Was he defeated?

Mr. BARKER. Undoubtedly he was.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). He will be here at the next election.

Mr. BARKER. But there is another little picture of this Copper Crown Company that I may as well mention. Approaching the period of the general election, Mr. Macdonald became very anxious to get the money. Letter after letter and telegram after telegram were sent. Mr. Pottinger would telegraph the minister, and Mr. Macdonald would write to the minister. There was about $15,000 claimed by the Copper Crown Company, and on the 1st of November, just six days before the polling day, Macdonald's friends got a cheque for $14,500 on account. That is another coincidence. It is all perfectly innocent, of course.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Macdonald did not get a cheque at all.

Mr. BARKER. I just take this as an illustration. Now leaving the capital feature of the question I want to say something about the earnings of which the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) was so proud, and upon which he congratulated the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his budget speech, which he intended to be distributed in print all over the Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, congratulated the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals upon the magnificent results of last year. He told the House and through the House, every public and business man of this country that the hon. gentleman had earned $4,972,235 and he congratulated him upon that, just as he was congratulating everybody else about him ; but the hon. gentleman on the very page, and almost in the very sentence in which he found these figures, would have also found that to earn this $4,972,235 the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals spent $5,460,422. He did not tell that to the public.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was nothing kept back. I stated the deficit. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is wrong.

Mr. BARKER. That is one of the hon. gentleman's mild weaknesses. He will just tell that which would suit his own purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I said that there was a deficit of $488,000.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman just told half the truth.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman has no evidence of that.

Mr. BARKER. I say that not with the idea of casting a personal reflection upon the hon. gentleman. I have taken some little trouble to look up the working expenses of other roads both in Canada and the United States, and at the outset, I may say that the working expenses of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals on the Intercolonial Railway are just 110 per cent of the gross receipts. I think he stands alone in that. He is unique. I think it was the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade), who, the other night, timidly gave us a hint that the rates were low on the Intercolonial Railway and that therefore the hon. minister could not be expected to keep to a low ratio of working expenses.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are just the same as they were in the past.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman last year and the year before claimed that he had made a profit. Did he reduce the rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the rates have not been reduced.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman claimed a profit last year and he was as boastful about his service the year before. He claimed a profit of $60,000 last year and of $120,000 the year before. According to my contention he was behind fully half a million dollars on each occasion. I am going to show that under the methods of hon. gentleman it is a wonder he did not have working expenses of 150 per cent instead of 110 per cent. There is no excuse at all for the hon. gentleman. He is getting a very good traffic upon the Intercolonial Railway. It is not at all, as the hon. gentleman perhaps thinks, that this large traffic is due to himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not claim that.

Mr. BARKER. I am glad he does not. I was afraid he would do so.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am too modest for that.

Mr. BARKER. There is no railway in the United States or Canada which has not increased its traffic in proportion to the Intercolonial Railway, but we find that all these railway companies are workink at a lower rate owing to their improved receipts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And they were increasing their traffic during a period when our earnings were absolutely stationary.

Mr. BARKER. They all increased their traffic during the last four or five years owing to the great prosperity of the United States and Canada. The hon. gentleman gets $3,820 per mile. This is the revenue for a road 1,302 miles in length. Let us compare that with some other roads that are not in anything like so good a condition. There is, for instance, the Canada Eastern Railway in the hon. gentleman's own district having a mileage of 136 miles. The gross earnings per mile are $981. It is much more difficult to work a short road of that kind having a small traffic at anything like a low rate.

That company works the road at 91 per cent. It is a high rate. But, if the rate at which the company works that road be applied to the Intercolonial Railway the latter would have given a profit of $447,500 instead of a loss of $488,000. We will take a still smaller road, the Massawippi Valley Railway in the province of Quebec, a very small line. Its earnings per mile are almost up to those of the Intercolonial. That company works its railway at 85 per cent. It is a high rate, but if that ratio of expenses were applied to the Intercolonial Railway it would give a profit of $745,000, instead of a loss of $488,000. I would like to point out some lines which are a little greater in length. There is the Canada Atlantic with a mileage of 458 miles which is worked at 79 per cent, the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway with a mileage of 180 miles which is worked at 60 per cent and the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway which is worked at 76 per cent. All these roads are worked at a disadvantage as compared with the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not so.

Mr. BARKER. I beg your pardon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your's.

Mr. BARKER. Some of those I have just mentioned are in a better position than that of the hon. gentleman in one respect. They earn more per train mile. That is the only difference. But, take the Canadian Pacific Railway for example; that company only earns $4,170 per mile as against $3,820 per mile of earnings on the Intercolonial Railway, and it works the road at 60¾ per cent. I have taken one hundred railways in the United States, roads of all classes, long and short, roads that run at high rates and roads that run at low rates, having all classes of traffic, and I find that the highest working expenses of any road amongst the whole one hundred were 78·5 per cent, while the average of the one hundred roads was 65·57 per cent. The Canadian Pacific Railway's working expenses are 60¾ per cent, the Grand Trunk Railway's working expenses are 67 per cent and the government's 110 per cent. But if we cannot have the profits in money, let us see if we cannot have the figures. If the Intercolonial Railway were worked even at the highest ratio of expense, amongst those one hundred railways of the United States it would have shown a profit of $1,029.000. As the hon. minister is working at a loss of $488,000, that makes a difference of $1,517,000 in the comparison of their work. If they worked at the average rate of 65·57, the profit would be $1,690,000, which considering the loss of $488,000, makes a difference of $2,178,000, against the hon. gentleman. And I desire to add that, as I have already shown, $488,000 is by no means the full deficit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) should regulate the British North America Act before he begins to make that comparison.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It would be very interesting to give us the figures before 1896.

Mr. BARKER. I shall be glad to do so at the proper time. Now, 'station expenses' is a thing that does not vary much from year to year, but the salaries of station masters, agents, clerks, telegraph operators and so on, have been increased by $74,000 over the previous year. The salaries of the general manager, traffic manager, and so on, have increased by $29,000 over the previous year, and in the chief accountant's office there was an increase of $6,500. But there is another account here, the general stores account, which deserves some comment. The minister purchased in the year on this account $3,433,823 as against $1,752,-911 in the preceding year. That is a very important difference. He purchased just about double in the year of the general election what he did in the preceeding year. The minister issued stores during the year to the extent of $1,665,000, so he purchased twice as much as he issued, and he carries over in stock at the end of the year, beyond what he used, to the extent of $1,824,-977 or nearly $900,000 more than he did the preceding year. I just mention these items to give a general idea of the extravagance of the minister in this year and as tending to show why he lost $488,000 in working in 1900 when he claimed a profit of $120,000 in the preceding year.

We have heard a great deal about the purchase of ties. That is a public scandal in the province of New Brunswick. I have given a good deal of attention to it and I intend to deal with it to-night, because I believe it requires the utmost attention of every hon. gentleman in the House. It is one of the most extraordinary stories that has ever been narrated as regards any administration whether by a government or by a private railway company. In 1900 the number of ties actually used was 495,000. Mr. Pottinger told us that the largest number ever used in any year in the history of the road was 650,000. The minister began the year with 127,000 in stock so that if he bought half a million he would have been still on the right side and would have at least 120,000 surplus at the end of the year, after using the 495,000. But I must repeat again, and it cannot be repeated too often, that this was election year. Mr. Pottinger tells us that about September he had a conference with the minister, and decided to ask tenders for 800,000 ties, but he got only about 335,000 under the tenders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) quite certain about that, because my recollection is that Mr. Pottinger had no conference with me as to the quantity he would purchase, but that he had a conference with me after tenders had been received.

Mr. BARKER. I gave my recollection as to what Mr. Pottinger said, but I will take the ministers explanation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. gentleman looked up the report of the evidence upon that point.

Mr. BARKER. I have a very distinct recollection of what Mr. Pottinger said, but I will accept the ministers statement and that is enough I suppose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have a very strong recollection that Mr. Pottinger did not make that statement.

Mr. BARKER. Well, here are the facts. Mr. Pottinger represented that in August or September, 1900, he decided to take tenders for 800,000 ties. He called for tenders and he got a limited number. Having got that smaller number he fixed upon a price and he made arrangements directly with certain people who were willing to furnish ties at the price he fixed. He said that he gave out these contracts and did not limit the number, and that instead of getting 800,000 the result was that he got 1,300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I doubt if that is exactly correct.

Mr. BARKER. That is the original statement, but I will at once refer to what the papers show.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know the hon. gentleman does not mean to state the facts incorrectly but he is astray. He says that Mr. Pottinger gave out orders without limitation in awarding on tenders and that he got 1,300,000 ties. My recollection is that under the tenders he awarded the contract or notified the parties what he would take from them and that it was much below the quantity which he required. He gave some additional orders following that up, and later, away along in November or December, being still in his opinion short, without any conference whatever with me and on his own judgment as to what it would be well for him to do, he arranged with some parties to furnish a quantity. It was only to two or three parties whose names he mentioned that he gave that carte blanche order. They furnished more than he anticipated or expected they would supply. That is my recollection of it.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, perhaps I can set him right by the evidence :

Q. Will you tell me how many ties you purchased during the year ?--A. I have not got the exact number, but it was in the neighbourhood of 1,250,000 or 1,300,000.

Just exactly what my hon. friend stated.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That does not bear on the question.

Mr. BARKER. I think I may accept the minister's statement that he was not consulted. These statements have been brought down. One statement gives all the ties delivered after the 1st of July, 1900, on contracts made previous to November, 1900, and quantities supplied. The quantity contracted for prior to November, was 405,792, according to Mr. Pottinger's report. The quantities delivered from July to October, were : July, 106,579 ; August, 98,741; September, 86,935; October, 176,705; or a total delivered up to October of 468,900 ties. On the same contracts there were delivered afterwards 150,777, making a total delivered under the contracts made prior to November, 619,737. Now, I want to call the hon. minister's attention to this. Under contracts made prior to November, he had delivered 619,737 ties, and he had in store 127,000. That gave him about 750,000 ties. Now, 495,960 were all the hon. gentleman used in that year, so that it is quite clear that under the contracts made before November, the hon. gentleman had nearly 50 per cent more ties than he needed for the whole year. Now, let us see what the hon. gentleman did in November.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What I did ?

Mr. BARKER. I presume the hon. minister is going to take the responsibility of his officers ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not pretend to say that I am not responsible.

Mr. BARKER. I speak in reference to the hon. gentleman's department. His department made contracts after October on which there were 681,489 delivered.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was it not after November ? Was it not in December ?

Mr. BARKER. The first deliveries ended in October. Mr. Pottinger said he began to get the tenders in about September, and they ran on until November.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The tenders were in before that.

Mr. BARKER. I am only taking Mr. Pottinger's statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Pottinger did not state that.

Mr. BARKER. There is the fact that he had 619,737 on the first contract, 127,000 in store, making 746,737 or 246,000 more than he needed for the whole year; and yet in November he entered into contracts under which there were delivered up to June, 681,489, making a total of 1,301,226. The point is this, that the hon. gentleman knew he did not want those 681,000 when he ordered them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You mean the manager knew ?

Mr. BARKER. I am stating that Mr. Pottinger or the Railway Department had 746,000 ties already purchased and in stock when they entered into contracts under which 681,000 more were delivered during the fiscal year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is the hon. gentleman right when he says that they entered into contracts for 681,000 more ? Is it not a fact that the general manager gave the general order to go on and get out all the ties they could, thinking he would be short ? What the hon. gentleman is stating, that he made a contract for a specific number, I do not think is quite correct.

Mr. BARKER. The numbers and the contracts do not come out quite the same; but I think I can give the contracts. The contracts in November were for more than a million. They did not deliver anything like the number the contracts called for, fortunately for the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there is any point at all in informing the committee, it is just as well that it should be informed correctly. My hon. friend knows that Mr. Pottinger says that he held no conference at all with the minister, and that the minister was not informed of the matter. He says he told those people to go ahead and get out what ties they could, and in doing that he did what every railway company does. Sir Thomas Shaugnessy told me only the other day that his men did it repeatedly.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman is responsible for it all the same.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not shirk the responsibility.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Pottinger's statement is under two distinct heads. One is : 'Ties delivered after July, 1900, on contracts made previous to November, 1900, and quantities supplied.' The other is : 'Under contracts made after October, 1900, and delivered subsequent to November, 1900.' I will give you the figures. They contracted before November for 405,792 and they delivtered 468,960. After October they contracted for 1,113,449, of which 681,489 were delivered subsequent to November.

Mr. BARKER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had not any contract at all, and Mr. Pottinger does not say so.

Mr. BARKER. All I can say is that he gives every man's name, the date of the contract, the price and the place of delivery.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Suppose he does. He says the contract consists of a letter, and he said it was in December, if my memory serves me, that he gave the firm of Curran and some one instructions and authority to go ahead and get out all the ties they could. That was not a contract made in October, or a contract for any specific quantity.

Mr. BARKER. All I can tell the hon. gentleman is that the statement is there in writing. Mr. Pottinger in his evidence refers to the different qualities of ties. He said the life of a white spruce tie was about four years, the life of a black spruce tie six years, and the life of a cedar tie from six to ten years. But what I wish to call the attention of the committee particularly to, is the difference between white spruce and black spruce. The white spruce tie is practically worthless. As it only lasts four years, it is hardly worth the expense of putting it into the track and taking it out again. When you add the price to the cost of putting the tie in and taking it out again, the road was better without it. I wish to call attention to that, because there were enormous quantities of spruce ties ordered without specifying whether they were to be black or white spruce, and of course the contractors delivered the white spruce. And I may also say that owing to these enormous orders in that year, the result happened which might have been expected. Up went the prices from 25 per cent to 30 per cent, owing to the enormous demands made by the department when they did not need anything like the quantity they ordered. They have now on hand a supply for two or three years ahead, and are only ordering in consequence a very small quantity, and the prices this year have gone down to the normal figures from 17 cents to 20 cents so far as any purchases have been made.

Mr. BOYD. Was that election year ?

Mr. BARKER. That was election year. Mr. Curran, of whom we heard a good deal in the committee, delivered 185,819 spruce ties. There was no word about white or black, and no body has heard much about black spruce being delivered or found anywhere. He got 25 9-10 cents per tie, which is a high price even for cedar ties. He got a contract for 185,819 spruce, and was given a monopoly over 100 miles of railway to get out the ties, the government undertaking not to buy spruce from any one else in the district. Another contractor delivered 49,201 cedar ties of the same dimension at 24 cents. Mr. Curran got 25 9-10 cents for white

spruce, the life of which is only four years, and in the same district the government got 49,201 cedar ties, good for six to ten years, and paid only 24 cents. Mr. Curran, I believe——

Mr. BOYD. He had a pull.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, he had a strong pull. Mr. Curran, I believe, is the treasurer, or something of that kind, of the political district.

Mr. MONK. That was just a coincidence.

Mr. BARKER. Let us see what a good thing this Mr. Curran had. He had a contract for 105,070 Princess pine at 29 and 30 cents; 84,224 cedar at 28 cents; and 185,819 spruce at 25 9-10 cents. Then he had 25,893 hemlock, 3,380 tamarac, and 338 juniper, altogether his contract was for 408,724 ties, or nearly one-third of the whole quantity purchased that year, and he was paid $177,248. Thus Mr. M. Curran got in the election year $25,000 more than the total sum paid for ties on the Intercolonial Railway in the previous year. They did not require one of those spruce ties. They had more ties than they needed of a good class, yet they were so anxious that this Mr. Curran and a few others should get contracts that they purchased an enormous quantity which they did not want and got ties the road would have been better without. One hon. gentleman on the committee suggested to us that the real owner of these Curran ties was a Conservative. He seemed to think that that was an answer to the whole thing, that it was all right because a Conservative owned the ties. It struck me that it was the old question of the intermediary. The contract was given where it would do most good, and Mr. Curran, a friend of the government, got it. A Conservative probably could not have got it in any other way. It went where it would do most good, and among gentlemen no doubt who understood, as another minister has told us on one occasion, that 'business is business.' There is another extraordinary feature about this. In May of last year a complaint was made to the engineer of construction that a great many bad ties had been received. Mr. Pottinger was asked at the Public Accounts Committee about these bad ties, and he knew absolutely nothing about them in April of the following year. He had heard that complaints had been made and that there had been an investigation, but he did not know whether any report had been made. Several meetings later he heard that a report had been made in November last, and that nothing had been done since. That is all Mr. Pottinger could tell us. Well, Mr. McManus was called, but before I refer to his testimony I would like to read the result of the investigation or reinspection of these ties so far as it has gone. A Mr. Williams was detailed by the engineer of construction to inspect these ties which Mr. McManus had passed. On the 4th November, Mr. Williams made a report. I have gone carefully through it, and I find that he inspected 306,000 ties, over about seventy or eighty miles of road, that is, up to November, 1901, he had inspected less than one-quarter of all the ties purchased in 1900-1.

Mr. BRODER. Were they paid for before being inspected?

Mr. BARKER. They were inspected by Mr. McManus at the time of delivery and after his inspection of course they were paid for.

The following summer an investigation was ordered, and Mr. Williams was sent to inspect the work of Mr. McManus, and as so far has reported on 306,000 of the ties with these results:

> The ties are of two classes—a tie eight or nine feet long, six inches thick, and seven inches face. Another class, six inches thick and six inches face. Those would be classed as passable ties under the contract. Of the 6 x 7 there were 55,113 good ties. Of the 6 x 6 there were 54,941 good ties. That made 110,054 out of 306,000.

Let me tell you what the others were:

Ties, 6 in. x 5 in...	41,760
Ties, 6 in x 4 in..	19,605
Under 4-ins face..	4,654

Ties less than six inches thick, and now mark what Mr. Williams means by 'less than six inches thick.' He says that 'under six inches thick,' means any tie under six inches and down to three. Of those there were 103,307. Rotten hearts, 4,954. And there is this note:

> Except in cedar, rotten hearted or hollow headed ties mean bad ties. In cedar only ties with a very bad heart or hollow hearts are shown.

He passed to ones that were not very bad in cedar. Then were fir ties, which everybody agrees should not have been used as ties at all, 21,172 and poplar, 57. Or a total of 195,509 bad ties out of 306,000, and less than one-quarter of the whole inspected.

Mr. BROCK. All paid for.

Mr. BARKER. All paid for. The money all gone out. Then there were switch ties which are very much more costly than the ordinary ones, especially the ties for what are called three throw switches. Out of 59 three throw switches, not one came near the specification. They were utterly useless for switch ties, and Mr. Williams points this out. Of 194 two throw switch ties, only three were up to the standard. That is the result of this inspection up to date. I do not wonder that the inspection has not gone any further.

In connection with this inspection Mr. McManus was brought up and examined. He, it appears, had been sent for by Mr. Burpee, when he got his report in Novem-

ber, from Mr. Williams. Mr. McManus was questioned about the inspection of the ties. When he was brought up in this way he told Mr. Burpee that he had a letter authorizing him to accept certain ties contrary to the instructions given him by the engineer. He brought that letter to Mr. Burpee and left it with him. It was a note in pencil from the Minister of Railways to Mr. McManus, telling him to inspect Culligan's ties in the same way that he had inspected those of a man named Ueltican. I looked into the schedules of the Ueltican contract and found that he had agreed to supply 15,000 ties of spruce and cedar—not a word as to whether it was black or white spruce; and, of course, he delivered white. Now, Culligan made his contract on the 12th of October, 1900—he agreed to deliver from 15,000 to 20,000 black spruce ties. The black spruce were a fairly good tie. But when Mr. McManus came to inspect Culligan's ties Culligan insisted that he was not to give black spruce, and he went out to see the minister. He saw the minister, and the minister, without consulting the department, without a word to the engineer or manager or anybody else, but simply on the statement of the contractor, gave him a note to McManus to inspect Culligan's ties as he had inspected Ueltican's—one being a contract for black spruce, and the other simply for spruce. So, McManus passed the white ties delivered by Culligan as if under the contract. Now, McManus brought this letter to the engineer, and left it with him. I can quite imagine that after that, there would not be much desire to pursue the inquiry further. Burpee, being human like the rest of us, would realize the position. He would see that he was bucking up against the minister. McManus knew the importance of the memorandum, he knew that there was going to be trouble about his work, for it was not merely a matter of Culligan's ties, for he was the inspector in chief of all these ties. McManus knew the importance of this memo. or letter which he left with Burpee, and afterwards went back and got it and kept it. We tried in the committee to get McManus to tell where that letter was. He said he did not know. After a good deal of trouble, we foud that he had put it in a drawer in his boarding house. That was last fall. But, about the time he heard he was to be brought here, he went to his lodging and searched for the letter, knowing that he would need it for his protection when he got here. But the letter was gone, and he could not tell us what had become of it. He said he had not given it to anyone. It seemed quite clear, if we believe his evidence, that the letter was taken without McManus's knowledge—stolen. I confess that at first I did not believe his story about the letter being taken away, and thought he had it somewhere concealed. But, to the astonishment, I think, of the whole committee, when we stopped the examination of McManus, an hon. member of this House, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) stood up, and opening his coat, produced the letter from his pocket, he walked up to the witness and handed the paper to him and asked: Is that the letter? McManus looked at it and said he thought it was a copy. The letter was handed to the Minister of Finance, who examined it carefully and said he was satisfied that it was the genuine signature of the minister. Then the letter was handed to the Minister of Railways, who gravely examined it and said it was his letter. Then it seemed to be as the expression is 'up to' the hon. member for Westmoreland to explain how he had come by the stolen letter. I had better read from the public accounts proceedings.

Hon. Mr. EMMERSON—I would like to make an explanation. I have been attending the meetings of this committee previous to the Easter holidays, when I was much interested in this question. When I returned to Moncton, I did not want to talk to Mr. McManus, the inspector, with respect to his testimony or anything of that kind or anything he might know with respect to the matter, and I went to his brother and inquired. I asked him if he knew about the paper and he said 'Yes,' and he could get it, and I asked him for it. I saw him afterwards—he had it, and I asked him to give it to me. He said that his brother Charles knew nothing about him having it and he had not consulted him in any way in respect to where it was. I told him that I was anxious to have it, and I brought it here with me. I told the minister about it this morning for the first time.

And the hon. gentleman produced the stolen goods. I think that is the most extraordinary story ever heard from the lips of a member of parliament. I wonder why the hon. member for Westmoreland wanted that letter. It was never mentioned in the committee until the other morning. How had he heard of it? If that were a perfectly innocent and harmless letter what right had he to take the property of the Intercolonial Railway? What had he to do with it, what did he want it for? If he wanted to get it for the minister why did he not give it to the minister when he got it, instead of keeping it for weeks in his pocket. We have heard for some time past that the hon. member for Westmoreland was not on the best of terms, some weeks ago, with the minister. Did he want this letter, so to speak, as a shot in his locker? I leave him to settle that with the Minister of Railways. One would have thought that if he were a friend of the Minister of Railways he would have told him about the letter and not have waited until we had got almost the very words of the letter out of the witness on the stand before he produced it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can tell us what his motive was, and where he heard of the letter. We had not heard of it. But he seems to have known about it, and he went and got it. He did not go to the man whose it was and who had possession of it, but he went to his brother, and when

this brother got the letter and gave it to the hon. gentleman, he told the hon. gentleman that the man to whom the letter was addressed and from whose possession it had been taken knew nothing about his having it. And the hon. gentleman actually accepted that stolen letter and kept it in his pocket. I do not think the minister can be held responsible for that. But it is only another step in the downward path. If that letter had never been written it never could have been stolen, and the hon. gentleman could not have produced a stolen letter before the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. The trouble with the hon. gentleman is that the letter was delivered.

Mr. BARKER. I read the hon. gentleman's statement as taken down by the shorthand writer, and there is no mistake about it

Mr. EMMERSON. I stand by it.

Mr. BARKER. Very well. When one thinks for a moment of the way the ties were bought, of the reckless extravagance in their purchase, one can no longer be astonished that this road was worked at a loss of 110 per cent. If that is the way the business is conducted, how can the railway possibly be worked at a profit ? The hon. gentleman has been telling us what his stores cost him, that ties were high, that everything was high. But instead of taking an opportunity to cut down the quantities when he found prices were high, he simply revelled in ties, there was a carnival of ties, everybody must have been rushing over the country to get ties for the Minister of Railways and Canals from 6 to 3 inches thick ; anything would do, any scantling was good enough for the Minister of Railways and Canals, spruce was as good as anything else.

Now about the coal. The hon. gentleman had a good deal to say about his coal contract. The average cost of coal used in the four years ending June, 1900, was $458,562. In the last of those four years the quantity was higher than usual, they used $610,867 worth. Now Mr. Pottinger said in his evidence that he thought they had run too closely, and he determined to have 50,000 tons in stock. He thought he ought to have that margin, as they had run too low in the previous year. What did the minister do ? In 1899 he had bought $548,184 worth ; in 1900, which was the high year, he bought $1,385,125 worth. The average cost of coal used was under $500,000 ; the highest cost of the coal used was $610,000. And yet in this election year, with prices high, he spent $1,385,120. Could it be otherwise than that coal should go up ? Let us see what the quantities were. He had in store at the beginning of the year, 15,507 tons. He bought in 1900, 412,446 tons as against 258,425 in the previous year. He bought so much that instead of increasing his stock on hand by 50,000 tons, he had in store at the end of the fiscal year 128,935 tons, or 78,935 tons more than the manager said was necessary.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was not the greater part of that coal purchased some time after the election, during the winter season ?

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking now of what he purchased during the year, the fiscal year.

Mr. EMMERSON. You spoke of the election year, and I ask if the chief part of the coal was not purchased after the 1st of January, 1901 ?

Mr. BARKER. I have no doubt a good deal of it was, especially the 60,000 tons that were purchased in the States.

Mr. EMMERSON. For the reasons stated.

Mr. BARKER. Now, Mr. Pottinger tried to excuse this enormous purchase by saying that they were threatened with a strike : they were afraid of a strike in the coal mines in Nova Scotia, and he produced a bundle of papers to the committee to show that a strike was imminent. Well, he read letter after letter until he came to one from the manager of a coal mine down there who conveyed the information to him, and as he went on reading it turned out that the manager of that mine was telling Mr. Pottinger that they expected some trouble with their men, and there might be an interruption in the delivery of coal for a day or two. Mr. Pottinger having read that far read no further. I think that is about the extent of the threatened strike. But after all, what possible excuse was there for buying this 128,935 tons more than the manager wanted ? Was it because it was convenient to rush off to St. John and give a contract of $46,000 to Thompson & Co. for freight of coal from the United States ? That was a nice little contract by itself. They bought 60,000 tons from the States at high prices. It seems that in the excitement of buying the hon. gentleman in that year wanted to purchase everything that he could lay his hands on, cars, locomotives, an enormous quantity of supplies, enormous quantities of bolsters from Chicago, $67,000 worth, bolsters from Moncton, or neighbourhood—everything on a most gigantic scale, until he ran his purchases up to $3,000,000 odd in that year, double what he had ever purchased before. Yet the hon. gentleman comes here to-night and speaks as if the fact that he bought so much and paid so much for the materials was an excuse for his high expenses. No doubt it had a great deal to do with it, but I do not think it is much of an excuse for the hon. gentleman. An ordinary business man, when he found prices for ties were high, would have curtailed the quantity in every possible way. When he found the price of coal was high he would have done the same

thing. But the hon. gentleman does the opposite, he seems to think the way to bring the price of ties and coal down is to order all you can. I do not know whether there is any other explanation of it. But I would like to show how the hon. minister is getting on, as he grows older as Railway Minister. His stocks carried in store at the end of the year 1897-98 were $468,462. That is a pretty good quantity. The next year, 1898-99, the stocks remaining in store amounted to 553,177; in 1900 the stocks carried were $971,054, that is the surplus at the end of the year. This last year, this wonderful purchasing year, the stocks carried were $1,824,977, four times what they were in 1898. That is good administration, that is successful administration. It is very successful for the dealer, the people who want to sell ties and all that sort of thing, and probably for the coal dealers and other merchants down there. But I think that even the people of New Brunswick, notwithstanding the enormous purchases that are made along the line, would prefer to see this railway economically managed and to see its business done in a proper manner. The people down east have just as much interest in the economical management of the road as we, in this part of the country, who have to share in paying the cost. I do not think that there is one man in New Brunswick but would stamp out this thing to-day if he could, and the sooner they stamp out these things, such as the letter to McManus, and these extravagant purchases the better it will be for New Brunswick and this Dominion.

Now, I have only a very few words more. I have a little regard for hon. gentlemen opposite and I am sorry that I have taken so much time. If any hon. gentleman wants to understand and appreciate the extent of purchases let him take the Auditor General's report and give half an hour to wading through that and he will see the most marvellous state of things that has ever existed upon any railway. Just one word as to what has led to this. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals a few years ago made up his mind that he would enter into competition and have a fight with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He was determined to be the railway king. He was going to show all these railway magnates at Montreal a thing or two about the working of railways. He was determined to centre business in St. John. He built an elevator there, enormous expenditures were made for heavy rails, heavy locomotives and a large quantity of cars. Millions upon millions have been spent upon that project and the hon. gentleman was going to fight the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, Sir, he has practically abandoned the fight. It is very like the King of France who, with 30,000 men, marched up the hill and then marched down again. The hon. gentleman has spent his millions and we are no farther advanced from a railway point of view than we were before. In fact, we are worse off. There is an enormous expenditure of capital which we cannot get back and the expenditure of that money might as well have been distributed over five or ten years instead of taking place in one or two years. What was the hon. gentleman intending to do? He was proposing, while working the Intercolonial Railway at 110 per cent, to enter into a fight with a company that work at 60¾ per cent. He attempted to compete with a company whose line to St. John was 481 miles while his line was 50 per cent longer, or 740 miles, so that the hon. gentleman was going to carry the traffic 259 miles for nothing and fight the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was the contest he entered into. I think it is very fortunate that it is nearly stopped. It is a good thing for the country. I ask again was there anything in all this to justify the congratulations of the hon. Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman must have known all this. He must have been familiar with all this expenditure every ten days throughout the year, because he gets the returns of the Railway Department and publishes them in his ten day statement; yet, in the face of the knowledge of these enormous expenditures, the hon. gentleman congratulates the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals on what he termed the success of the Intercolonial Railway. I do not know whether it is necessary to say anything more upon that. What can the hon. Minister of Finance possibly condemn if he congratulates anyone upon results of this kind? I am sorry that I have had to occupy so much time. There is a great deal more which I could have said but I have taken so much time to-night that I will not further presume upon the indulgence of the committee. I can only say that I have been very careful in extracting these figures from the various documents and I doubt whether the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals can find one error in them. If there is an error it is a very small one and I shall be the first to acknowledge it if he points it out.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. BARKER. Is that the first item?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is the vote for the general working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is the only item we want to pass to-night.

Mr. INGRAM. I expected to hear the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emerson) defend himself in regard to this letter when he was so brave a short time ago in saying that he was going to defend himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will hear from him likely later on.

Mr. INGRAM. Now is the time. The hon gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) has been accused of stealing the letter and he has not defended himself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will allow me, unless he particularly desires to go on, I would ask the committee to allow the chairman to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12 a.m. (Friday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 25, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 118) for the relief of James Brown—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 125) to amend the Act of the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company—Mr. Champagne.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to call attention to returns which I ordered some time ago. One is a return, ordered on the 9th April, showing the timber berths in the Yukon. I would like to have that down Monday or Tuesday, if possible. The other is a return giving the names of parties convicted of arson.

POLICE MAGISTRATES IN THE YUKON.

Resolution respecting the salaries of the police magistrates at Dawson and White Horse read the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 137) to amend chapter 41 of the statute of 1901, respecting the administration of justice in the Yukon territory.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Resolution respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts and the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory, read the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 138) to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REGISTRAR OF THE EXCHEQUER COURT.

Resolution respecting the registrar of the Exchequer Court, read the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 139) to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR THE YUKON TERRITORY.

House went into committee on the following resolution.

That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of an assistant commissioner of the North-west mounted police for the Yukon territory, at $1,600 per annum.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the object of the Bill of which this resolution is a preliminary is simply to authorize the government to appoint a second assistant commissioner of the Mounted Police. At present there is a comptroller of the Mounted Police stationed at Ottawa and a commissioner stationed at Regina. The object is to appoint an assistant commissioner stationed at the Yukon. The force in the Yukon is now under Superintendent Wood, a most competent officer. But some difficulty has arisen from the fact that, instead of being able to deal directly with matters concerning the Yukon he has to report to the commissioner at Regina, who has again to report to Ottawa. It would avoid many difficulties and promote the efficiency of the force if Mr. Wood were made an assistant commissioner and clothed with the powers of a commissioner, as is the assistant commissioner at Regina in the absence of the commissioner, and so be able to deal with all matters in the Yukon and report directly to Ottawa. The only increase of expenditure involved would be $200. At present Mr. Wood receives $1,400 a year with, of course, the allowance which is made to the officers in the Yukon. As assistant commissioner he will receive the same as the assistant commissioner at Regina, $1,600.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the strength of the force in the Yukon now ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Three hundred.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not intended to make any additional appointment, but merely to clothe Mr. Wood with the powers of a commissioner ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Of assistant commissioner—that is all.

Resolution reported.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT.

Bill (No. 105) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick read the second time ; considered in committee ; reported, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO EXCHEQUER COURT ACT.

Bill (No. 114) to amend the Exchequer Court Act (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to understand the purport of this. These two sections are not prepared in a way which, I think, is approved by most workers on the subject, that is to say, to re-enact a section with an amendment instead of inserting the necessary words. Without the previous statute before us, we cannot understand it, and would the hon. gentleman say what is the effect of it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Under the Exchequer Court Act, as we have it now, the government has authority to appoint a registrar to the Exchequer Court. He must be a barrister of five years standing, and he shall receive, according to the statute which authorizes his appointment, a salary of $2,000 a year. As I pointed out when I introduced the resolution, the registrar has been in the habit of receiving, under an agreement as he represents, an annual increase of about $50 a year, the original intention being to increase his salary to $2,400. At the present time, as a result of the actual increases given to him, his salary amounts to $2,375. In order to get rid of this obligation to take an annual vote for the sum of $50, we suggest the propriety of fixing the salary at $2,400, which he says was the amount at which it was fixed originally. I agree the drafting might have been a little better.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister tell us what the effect of this section is ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. As my hon. friend is aware at the present time there is no appeal from a judgment in the Exchequer Court unless that judgment is a final judgment. Now, you may demur, and if the demurrer is dismissed, there is no appeal, but if the demurrer is maintained there would be an appeal. But there may be cases in which it may be advisable to have the whole matter disposed of on a question of law, and this is to enable us to have an appeal in a case where the demurrer has been dismissed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I recollect now the minister made that explanation.

On section 3, subsection 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no need I suppose of any limitation as to the cases in which service may be made abroad?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Difficulties have arisen in the Justice Department, and we found it necessary in some cases to serve a process on persons living in the United States, and we had no provision to enable us to do it. It was in order to meet that difficulty that this amendment is suggested.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think in the English Judicature Act and in the Acts of the several provinces following it, the right to serve a defendant in a foreign country is somewhat restricted. Does this apply to a foreigner as well as a British subject ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not provide, I see, for the service of a writ, but simply the notice. The rules of international courtesy, I think, forbid the service of a writ upon a foreigner residing in a foreign country, only a notice can be served. The Bill seems to have provided for that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I noticed an important decision in one of the papers as to the jurisdiction of this government even to legislate in the direction of making a service over a subject in a foreign country. It is following the line of the navigation laws that we have no jurisdiction over a British subject beyond the marine league. The effect of that would be, I think—I saw it argued in that direction anyway—that even in processes in a foreign country we would not have jurisdiction to legislate in that direction.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This I think would be a matter affecting the procedure of our own courts. We authorize the court to make the service, at least we authorize the service or the process out of the court. But as to whether it would be binding upon a foreigner abroad is another question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be that a foreign court, in dealing with the rights of a citizen of a foreign country, if a case was brought in that foreign court upon a judgment here, would not recognize it.

Different laws prevail in different countries with regard to that subject. But I assume that this particular section has been drawn with care; I have not had time to consider it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It has been drawn by the deputy minister, after consultation with the judge of the Exchequer Court. I think that is a fairly safe guarantee.

Bill reported.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 115) further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893 (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Mr. Chairman, it is intended to limit the number of expert witnesses. The number is limited to five, but if the judge presiding at the trial desires to add to the number, of course, it is optional with him to give permission to counsel to have any number in excess of five that the court may fix. I think it is quite proper that there should be some limitation to the number of expert witnesses that are produced in certain cases in our courts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What would be the operation of the Bill? Is it confined to the Exchequer Court or to criminal courts?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This would apply to all cases to which the Canada Evidence Act would apply. That would be the Exchequer Court and also the criminal courts. In case of murder by poisoning, for instance, there is often an unlimited number of expert witnesses uselessly brought forward, and in this way the public expenditure is increased. The Chancellor of Ontario and the Chief Justice of Ontario have both agreed in recommending that this Bill should be passed.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—ATLANTIC SHIPPING COMBINE.

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

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I beg to call the attention of the House to the following cable despatch which I see published in the 'Citizen' of to-day:

London, April 25.—The 'Daily Mail' affirms this morning that the agreement of the Atlantic shipping combine contains secret clauses to the effect that the American promoters of the concern intend to ask congress to pass a new shipping bill permitting foreign built vessels to be brought under the American flag. The adhesion of the 'Cunard' line is practically certain, continues the 'Mail,' and the corporation will be formed mainly with American capital. It will take over entirely the British shipping companies. Those companies refusing to join the combine will be compelled to fight for their existence. For the three or four years that the present admiralty contracts still have to run, the paper adds, the vessels will remain under the British flag, at the expiration of this time the whole will pass under the American flag and be owned and run by the above mentioned corporation, which will eventually endeavour to carry its competition to every portion of the globe.

The 'Daily Express' declares that the shipping combine is trying to coerce Canada into accepting its terms and conditions as to emigration rates and traffic and that, if resistance is made, the combine will buy up the Canadian railways and declare a commercial war. It is the intention of the combine, says the 'Daily Express' to demand that the Canadian emigration department in London should cease to give facilities to Elder, Dempster and Company.

This, seems to me, to be striking a vital blow at the shipping interests of Canada, as it strikes a blow at British shipping, it as a matter of course, includes Canadian shipping as well. It strikes a vital blow at those interested in commerce and manufactures and all interested in trade generally. It goes on further and says that they will also include traffic by railways and that if a resistance is made they will buy up the Canadian railways and declare commercial war. This seems to me to be very bold reference or statement and if carried out would interfere very materially not only with the maritime provinces bordering on the Atlantic, but with Canada as a whole. It is declared that the trade of Canada is to be diverted from our Canadian roads across the American boundary to American ports, and in this way our seaports on the Atlantic will be seriously affected. It would not only interfere with our commercial interests but it would interfere with our ship-building interests, and very materially affect the county which I have the honour to represent, having no less than forty new vessels building in the county of Lunenburg this year, and last year we had about a similar number constructed. This referred-to project would place us in the position of having not only the ship-building industry, now a success, hampered, but our general trade greatly crippled. I would ask the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider this matter very carefully, to view the situation as it might ultimately exist and place such safeguards around the interests of Canada as to prevent our being interfered with in this way. I only saw this matter mentioned in the referred-to paper a few minutes before the House met this afternoon, and thought it my duty, in the interest of all concerned, more particularly for those interested in commerce and trade, that the matter should be brought to the attention of the House. I

would like to have some information in this connection as to the right hon. gentleman's views and the position the right hon. gentleman would take.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) that I do not think there is much danger at the present time. If, as is stated in the paper, congress is to introduce legislation, I am afraid we are powerless to prevent it, and if congress intends to take hold of our railways, I think I can satisfy my hon. friend that there will be no such occurrence as this. We will keep our own railways for ourselves.

Mr. KAULBACH. If any railways in Canada have subsidies from this government, then, the government should exercise careful supervision over these railways, and prevent traffic being diverted across the border into American channels. It would be very easy to deprive us of traffic, were our interests not vigilantly watched. We want to keep Canada for the Canadians, our trade for Canadians, and we want the shipping ports of Canada for our exports and for the trade of Canada generally, and to be maintained and upheld in the interests of Canada as one great and abiding country.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, I will take it into consideration then.

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

Government railways—Rental, Grand Trunk Railway, $140,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us any information as to how the Drummond County portion of the road is paying? We were assured most positively that once the traffic got well under way this would be a good paying concern.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think I can give any details, but I can state generally that there is no part of the Intercolonial Railway which has conduced to an increase in the receipts of the road to the same extent as has the recent extension from Lévis to Montreal. I attribute in a very large measure the immense increase in the traffic to our having brought the line to Montreal, and of course, having done so we have to pay this rental.

Mr. SPROULE. Can you give an approximate estimate as to the tonnage of freight carried, and the earnings of that portion of the road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am afraid not. We do not keep our accounts on such a basis that I could give that information, and the hon. gentleman will see that it would be manifestly unfair to give an approximate estimate. I could get the hon. gentleman information as to what amount of business originates upon the Drummond County Railway, or I could get the information as to what freight was carried on that part of the line for its destination, but even then we would be far from being able to form even an approximate idea of the value of that piece of line.

Mr. SPROULE. What I wanted to know was the proportionate earnings of that part of the road.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not got that.

Mr. BENNETT. When this road was acquired we were told that a large trade was expected to the maritime provinces particularly in grain. How much grain was handled last year through the elevators at St. John and Halifax, and did it come principally from American or from Canadian ports on the upper lakes ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that information was asked for and is published in 'Hansard.' I cannot remember what the details of that statement were, but I will be glad to make a note of it and look it up in 'Hansard.'

Mr. BENNETT. Surely there must have been some such quantity as would create an impression upon the mind of the minister with regard to the grain trade from St. John and Halifax. From what I have heard from time to time there has been practically nothing of account. Yesterday a government supporter tried to throw discredit on the late administration because they built an elevator at Halifax. If that were a fault how much greater was the fault of this government, who when the old elevator was destroyed, erected another one in its place. Cannot the minister give even a approximate estimate of the grain trade at St. John and Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not even venture to give an approximate statement from memory. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is in error when he understood that any gentleman on this side of the House condemned the policy of the late government for building an elevator at Halifax. I think what occurred was, that when the present government were condemned for building an elevator in Halifax, it was pointed out that they were simply rebuilding the elevator which had been erected by the previous government, and that if it was a grievious wrong for this government to rebuild, it must have been at least a slight offence for our predecessors to have built in the first place.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised that the minister cannot tell us even approximately the quantity of grain handled in his own city of St. John, by an elevator which has

been operated by this government. Of course the minister does not live in St. John, and that being so, may be his colleague can give the information. The minister cannot tell the House whether or not a bushel of grain went through that elevator last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can set my hon. friend's mind at rest upon that question. I can say unhesitatingly that more than a bushel of grain went through.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has now raised the limit, and let me ask him if 1,000 bushels of grain went through this elevator? The minister should not treat this matter in such a flippant way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have said that I will get the information and give it to my hon. friend.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, perhaps it might be as well to let the item stand until we get the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If you think it is really worth while.

Mr. CLARKE. Might I ask the hon. minister if he will bring down a statement of the quantities of grain that passed through the government elevators at St. John and Halifax, and the quantities that passed through the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators at the same time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If I can get the information for my hon. friend, I will do it.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). It was not my intention to offer any observations on the subject now before this committee, nor indeed to take part in any of the proceedings of the House during the present session, in obedience to the command of my physician, who had enjoined upon me the necessity of abstaining as much as possible from any work which would involve any mental strain or excitement. The extraordinary character of the speeches which were delivered here last evening, and the way in which my name was used, constrain me to make a few remarks with respect to the Intercolonial Railway. Representing, as I do, a constituency which is very largely interested in that road, which is, indeed, the head centre of the government railway system, it might perhaps be expected of me that I would make some remarks when such a subject was under discussion.

Before referring to the remarks personal to myself which were made by the hon. gentlemen who have already spoken, I would like to invite the attention of this committee and of the country to the circumstances under which the Intercolonial Railway was constructed. I think that a reference to the 145th section of the British North America Act will convince all hon. members of the committee that the construction and maintenance of that road was one of the essential features of the coming into this confederation of the provinces by the sea. Indeed, that 145th section was the stepping stone upon which the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick entered the threshold of this great Dominion, and therefore the people of those provinces are naturally very much interested not only in the maintenance of that road and its proper management, but they are particularly interested in the road being kept in such a condition that there shall not be any prejudice created in the minds of the people of any other section of Canada against it, or against its maintenance as a government road.

Now, while it is true that in going over the history of the Intercolonial Railway and looking at its balance sheets year by year we do not find any large surpluses on the right side of the account, yet I am prepared to say that the Intercolonial Railway has been one of the most splendid assets that the government of Canada has ever possessed. I do not feel that I can show it in dollars and cents, but I think I can show this committee and the country that the dividends which it has earned have been of incalculable value. I need only refer to the first ten years of the history of this Dominion, before we had an Intercolonial Railway. Take the conditions which then prevailed. Even when the provinces by the sea sent to this parliament representatives of the people, how did they come to the city of Ottawa to attend to their duties? Only through American territory. Many were obliged to go to Portland by steamer and thence to Montreal by the Grand Trunk. Those conditions prevailed not only with respect to the assembling of the parliament of Canada, but in many other ways. When I started out as a young man to obtain a technical education, did I look to the province of Ontario or to the province of Quebec? Were my eyes turned to the great University of McGill or to the University of Toronto? No; and mine is only one of many cases. Where did we receive our technical education? Passing from our higher schools, we were compelled to go to the neighbouring republic, across the waters of the Bay of Fundy, to Massachusetts or to universities in other parts of the American republic. The relationships between the provinces were such that we hardly knew each other. We were rather led to believe that the great province of Quebec was an impassable barrier between us and the province of Ontario. We did not know each other. Those who studied our geographies knew that there was a city of Montreal, it is true, but we were chiefly impressed with the fact that it was near Caughnawaga, that euphonious name

rather attracting the attention of the school student of that day. There was not much commercial intercourse or social intercourse between us. We were a separated people. What is true with respect to the educational features, is true with respect to all the conditions of life; and the construction of the Intercolonial Railway changed those conditions. If I may be pardoned for referring to myself, I was compelled to go to an American university; but I can refer with pride to the fact that my son is attending McGill University; and what has brought about these changed conditions ? I think there is no element which has contributed more than the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. We now know each other as we did not know each other previous to that time. With respect to the province of Quebec, there was created in our minds as young students a prejudice against it; but the intercourse, social and otherwise, the interchange of trade, and the communications which have been provided by means of the Intercolonial Railway have removed that prejudice. I remember the time in the maritime provinces when there was a prejudice against the great province of Ontario, when to call a man a Canadian was regarded as applying to him a term of opprobrium. We knew of Toronto, it is true : but studying our geographies, we knew of it as a city that was somewhere near the great Falls of Niagara.

When we took up our history we read of it as a city which in the war of 1812, had a number of its buildings, including the parliament buildings, destroyed. We knew of these things, but there was a separation between the people of the west and the people of the east. These conditions were however changed by the opening up of the Intercolonial Railway. Then began the inrush into the maritime provinces of the commercial travellers from our western cities. Before that road was built, if any young man wanted a suit of clothes and could not get what he desired at home, he would never think of going to Montreal or Toronto, but would run over to Boston. But all that has been changed and the people of eastern Canada have acquired knowledge with respect to the people of Ontario and Quebec which they did not formerly possess. We are to-day one people. We can go to the province of Quebec and give the hand of welcome to our brethren there ; we can go into the great province of Ontario and there meet our fellow-citizens as Canadians all. All these prejudices, which formerly existed, have disappeared, and in their place a national spirit has been engendered, to which I am sure the construction and maintenance of the Intercolonial Railway has contributed more than any other event in our history. It seems to me that we should discuss this question from a national standpoint. The expenditures on that road should be discussed in no carping spirit, and I was surprised to hear hon. members from the west on the opposite side speak in the way they did. I had supposed that they were the only true apostles of imperialism. That they were at least the great federationists of the Dominion. They lay that flattering unction to their souls sometimes in their speeches, but in discussing this great national highway of Canada they did not show the broad national spirit which the subject demands. They did not approach it in a Canadian spirit but rather with a regard for sectionalism. When the ex-minister of railways (Mr. Haggart) and the hon. gentleman who followed him (Mr. Barker) referred to the expenditure, I wondered how the views which they expressed were accepted by their colleagues from the maritime provinces who sit on the other side. If the hon. gentlemen wanted to discredit and depreciate the Intercolonial Railway before the people of Canada, in the interests of some great corporations, if it was their intention to discredit that road and place it in such a position before the minds of the people of Canada that they would be ready to transfer its ownership to some great corporation, they took the very methods that would best tend to the accomplishment of that object. And I am sure that their utterances cannot in any way receive the approval of hon. gentlemen opposite, who represent constituencies in the maritime provinces. I was very much impressed with the speech of the hon. the ex-minister of railways. He travelled all the way from Manhattan Beach to St. Peters' village in Cape Breton. But he in no sense discussed the Intercolonial Railway as a national highway, which should be dear to the hearts of every Canadian,—not merely those who reside in the maritime provinces, but those who reside in the great business centres of Toronto and Montreal and other sections of western Canada. His remarks rather confirmed the rumour that although he had been at one time Minister of Railways, he had never acquired much knowledge about the Intercolonial Railway. There is a rumour, unfounded perhaps, that when he once did travel over the Intercolonial Railway in his official car, he went to Halifax and returned to Moncton, and there took a breathing spell of about an hour, but did not deign to leave his car to visit the works connected with that railway, although he was Minister of Railways at the time. That rumour may or may not be well founded, but I am sure that in so far as the speech of the hon. gentleman is concerned, it rather confirms the rumour that he did not have much knowledge of the conditions which prevail along the line of that road. You would think when he referred to the winter port of New Brunswick, that he was speaking of Newfoundland. He spoke of it as the city of St. John's. He does not even know that it is St. John and not St. John's. His knowledge of that road seems to be very imperfect, and

to have placed him before this committee in the position of one who was rather more interested in some prospectuses in New York than in the proper maintenance and advancement of our great national highway. I have said that the Intercolonial Railway is one of the most splendid assets of Canada, and I shall not attempt to elaborate the point. While I could not show that there has been any accumulation of profits in the treasury of the Dominion, yet I think that the building of that road has created a national spirit and a national life which, but for it, we would not have acquired, and which finds vent, not merely on the floor of parliament, but in the press of the country and on public platforms throughout the land. That national spirit is due to the cementing together of the various sections of Canada by this railway intercommunication. It may be that as this is an asset which cannot be estimated in dollars and cents, some people may regard it as of little value, but I do not view it in that light. And while this road has not given us an accumulation of dollars and cents so far, it seems to me that even in that respect it has a bright future. It seems to me that when the fathers of confederation framed the 145th section of the British North America Act, by which they recognized the fact that it was essential for the consolidation of these provinces that there should be an iron band connecting together the three provinces that then constituted Canada, the idea must have been dominant in their minds that in the future, as our Dominion came into its vast western territory, it was quite as essential that that road should travel beyond the lines of the St. Lawrence and go west, and unite whatever then might be the provinces of the Dominion of Canada.

I am sure those great statesmen, the builders of this confederation, had in mind at that time that it was in the interests of the then three provinces to have them united by such a bond, and would be still more in the interests of the Dominion as it became enlarged, as it extended and became the vast domain which it is to-day. And yet hon. members will complain with respect to the expenditure of the $65,000,000, as it is alleged, that went out of the coffers of this country to construct the Intercolonial Railway. We hear nothing from these hon. gentlemen with respect to the canals of the country. We do not hear it in the maritime provinces as a matter of complaint that there have been such large expenditures upon the canals. When a vote is proposed in this House with respect to our canals, you do not find hon. members from the maritime provinces rising in their places to complain. We recognize that the business interests of the Dominion demand that there shall be such means of transportation, we recognize that it is in the interests of not only western Canada but of all Canada that these canals should be maintained. We have invested, as a Dominion, $65,000,000 in the Canadian Pacific Railway, not one rail of which do we owe, not a mile of which do we control—indeed, it controls us rather. I am not complaining with regard to these matters; but when complaints are made with respect to an investment in our great national highway, and when these complaints are repeated year after year, surely I am justified in making reference to these other expenditures concerning which no complaint has been made. We have a Canadian Pacific, which is not a through line on our Canadian land, but which runs in part through a state of the American Union. We have a Canadian Pacific which, while a credit to Canada, is not in all its parts Canadian. When the British government requires to send its marines or its soldiers across the continent, it is obliged to utilize a portion of the Intercolonial Railway, because it is not permissible for it to send them through American territory over the short line of the Canadian Pacific. So I say that, in all fairness, when we discuss the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway we should remember the part it has played as a great public work in Canada, we should view it from a higher standpoint than that which has been assumed, I regret to say, by some hon. gentlemen on the other side. I do not see my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Bell) rising in his place to discuss the Intercolonial Railway from this point of view. He lives on the line of the Intercolonial Railway and knows something about it. I assume that my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who takes such a deep interest in it, has never been over the line of the Intercolonial Railway. I assume that he has never been in the city of Moncton, of which he has heard so much within the last month or so.

Some hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON. If I am wrong in that I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will correct me. I think that Mr. P. S. Archibald came to him rather. Certainly from the speech the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) has made and the indications he has given before the Public Accounts Committee of his knowledge of the Intercolonial Railway, one would assume that he had never been over the line of Intercolonial Railway, and knew nothing about it. While he is the critic, and while the ex-Minister of Railways assists him in his carpings against the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, do we hear anything from hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from Pictou, or my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler), or my hon. friend from Sunbury and Queen's (Mr. Wilmot), or my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong)? They must know a great deal more about the Intercolonial Railway, about its circumstances and its workings than do these other hon. gentlemen. But they have not made these complaints. I assume that they are not in sympathy with these

complaints, because they recognize the value of the Intercolonial Railway. They know what it is doing, not merely for the people of the maritime provinces but for the people of all Canada. They recognize that trade and the very heart of trade is centered in that great national highway under government control; and I am sure they would not wish to raise their voices in any attempt to depreciate the Intercolonial Railway as a government road, or tend to cause the people of western Canada to become prejudiced against it or to unite in any way against the maintenance of it as a government road.

Now, I have said that there was a future for the Intercolonial Railway. While the balances have not always been on the right side, yet I take this stand with respect to the matter—that that road was not constructed as a dividend earning work for this Dominion. I hold that no Minister of Railways is called upon to stand up in this parliament and apologise even if the Intercolonial Railway is not a paying concern in dollars and cents. Its earnings are of a different character, its benefits to the people of the Dominion are not to be measured by mere dollars and cents. It was not built as a commercial road, and I hold, before this committee and before the people of Canada, that there should not be any complaint, even though that road may not show a surplus in earnings. In considering the Intercolonial Railway this committee and the people of Canada must reckon on the future of the maritime provinces.

I am not going to speak at any length with respect to the future of those provinces. In the great province of Nova Scotia there are magnificent industries in the island of Cape Breton, which are speaking in thunder tones to the Dominion of Canada, to the continent of America and to the world, of its great natural resources and its illimitable wealth. More than that. I think the province of New Brunswick has features which will make it a great factor in the support of the Intercolonial Railway and the upbuilding of the Dominion. It must not be supposed that because we have not increased in population we are in any sense going behind. You must bear in mind that while our population has decreased there are many reasons for it. You are spending thousands of dollars yearly of the money of this Dominion in your immigration policy. For the last thirty years, thousands upon thousands have been invested across the water in order to induce people to come to this Dominion. Are their eyes ever directed towards the maritime provinces ? Do the immigration agents, do the transportation companies, ever direct those intending immigrants to these maritime provinces, or instruct them concerning their wealth and resources ? Have we ever had on that immigration staff a man from the maritime provinces to direct the people of the old country to those provinces of this Dominion ? We find that while you have spent thousands and thousands of dollars on immigration, the object has been to direct the people who are seeking a home in the western continent, not to the maritime provinces, not to Quebec or Ontario, but to the wheat fields of the great west. I am not complaining of the efforts which have been put forth to build up our western country, which is worthy of all that can be said in its favour. But we should not forget that we have lands in the maritime provinces which will compare with the prairie lands of the west. I do not wish our immigration agents to forget that in our magnificent marshes of the lower provinces, in the counties of Annapolis, of Colchester, of Hants, of Cumberland, of Westmoreland, of Albert, and of numerous other counties in those vast regions of marsh lands, there is land equal if not superior to the very best prairie lands of the west, land that is inexhaustible in its richness, and land which, if it ever did become exhausted, can easily be renewed through inundations caused by cutting the dykes and allowing the muddy waters of the Bay of Fundy to enrich the soil over which they would flow.

I do not wish to assume the role of a prophet, but I venture to say that the Intercolonial Railway will yet prove to be one of the richest dividend bearing concerns in this great Dominion, that it will one day prove the wisdom of its founders, that it will one day justify the Minister of Railways and Canals in his efforts to make this railway worthy of this great Dominion. He found it a tramway and he has left it a railway. He has equipped it in a manner which I need not describe. But there is one thing which has not been mentioned. In mentioning it, I am not speaking upon my own authority, or from any knowledge I possess with respect to it, although I have some such knowledge; but I know the feelings of the business men of Toronto and of Montreal with respect to the establishment of a fast freight service between Montreal and Halifax and Sydney. That is one of the creations of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I was told not many months ago in the city of Toronto, that it was proving of incalculable benefit to the business interests of the west, and that it was contributing to an increase in the business between the west and the east. This is but one evidence of the value of the efforts which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has been putting forth to make a railway out of what seemed to have been the intention, or the result of an intention, to side-track at least a portion of the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, let me say to the members of this committee who are not familiar with the circumstances of the Intercolonial Railway, that there is a great section of it, that portion between St. John and the Sydneys and Halifax, which I suppose is one of the best paying sections of any road in eastern Can-

ada. I believe that there are corporations which are turning greedy eyes upon that section of the Intercolonial Railway. It is true that perhaps they might not be so desirous of having what is known as the northern division. It has been alleged that the hon. gentleman who held the position of Minister of Railways and Canals in a former government, was to make of that a branch line, and that the line between St. John and the Sydneys and Halifax, should be handed over to some one or other of the corporations, with the view of letting them take advantage of the large expenditure which Canada has made on the Intercolonial Railway. I venture to say that if it is not known in this section of Canada, it is at least believed in the eastern section, that the intention in 1896 was that the Intercolonial Railway should cease to be a government road, at least that portion of it which is so desirable between Halifax and the Sydneys and St. John; the intention was that that portion should cease to be a part of the great government system, and that only that section between Moncton and Lévis should be under the control of the Dominion. It is true that that portion of the road, the northern division, goes through a great stretch of country, but not an unimportant section; it taps a splendid country, splendid in its lumber resources, splendid in its wealth of fisheries; but yet as it travels around the shores of the St. Lawrence it deviates so far from the straight line that its maintenance is rather expensive. But that it is an essential feature for that section of the country, that it is an essential feature for the Dominion, I am prepared to maintain before this committee and the people of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is believed to have been the intention of those who were charged with the responsibility of governing this country at that time; and I am led to believe by the tone of the speech of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that there still remains in his mind a lingering intention of attaining that object by contributing in some manner towards prejudicing the Intercolonial Railway in the minds of the people, in order that, if ever an opportunity should occur, the idea at which I have hinted might be carried out. I do not think that, in justice to the Dominion as a whole, without regard to any sectionalism, without regard to the people of my own province nor of any other province—I do not think it would be in the interest of any section of Canada that any such arrangements should take place. It would be unfair, unjust, and it would be a breach of the terms of confederation. If the terms of confederation are to be carried out in their entirety, that the Intercolonial Railway shall be extended, it shall crawl further west year after year until possibly it shall extend to the graneries of the west and our seaports shall be the ports whence sail the rich products of the great western country. We hear much from hon. members who represent the western constituencies complaining of the exorbitant freight charges of the railway companies in the west. Complaint after complaint has been made, not merely in this House, but before the committees of this House. If there is to be a remedy applied, one that will be apt and effective, that remedy will be found in the extension of the government system of railways into that western country, so that the government may control freight rates in the west in the same way as it now controls freight rates in the eastern section of Canada.

The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has spoken of the expenditure made in the city of St. John, and he has termed it a sink hole. I think these were elegant words of the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) referred to the purchase of some marsh land within the city limits of St. John at the rate of $475 per acre. I want to know how far my hon. friends from the province of New Brunswick, having a knowledge of the completion of the terminal facilities at St. John, are prepared to say 'hear, hear' to the remarks of the hon. member for South Lanark? I take the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Fowler), who is in my eye at the present moment, and I am sure that he would not say 'hear, hear' to any expression of the kind in respect to the expenditure made at the city of St. John. I think the complaint was that there was an expenditure of $225,000 in connection with the wharf and freight shed. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) that a portion of the money was expended in renewing the building and perfecting the foundations of the station, in the city of St. John built by the hon. gentleman himself when he was in office, and which foundations were so imperfect that if they had not been repaired, and if this money had not been expended, the station-house would have tumbled to the ground. Let me tell him that if he and the hon. member for Hamilton complain of the payment of $475 per acre for marsh lands within the city limits of St. John, near the round house of the railway, if they feel badly, if their feelings are harrowed in respect to that, the only solace I can offer is to refer them to the public accounts of a few years ago when they bought the Harris property in the city of St. John at $1 per foot, and paid $200,000 for 200,000 feet. Then, they did not use it. My hon. friend has complained of the fact that there has been charged to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway a sufficient sum of money for the extension of the yards within the city limits of St. John, near the round house of the terminal facilities there. He has complained that the material, although charged against capital account and although set aside and assigned for this purpose, is not on the ground. Let me remind my hon. friend

of one fact that was disclosed before the committee, which he has apparently forgotten, that this has been the system which has prevailed along the line of the Intercolonial Railway since it has been the Intercolonial Railway. Let me remind him of the fact that Mr. Pottinger, in giving his evidence before the Public Accounts Committee, stated that that was the very course followed when the St. Charles branch was built in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman did not complain then. He did not tell this committee that that was a custom which had prevailed in the bookkeeping of the Intercolonial Railway as far back as the time of the construction of the St. Charles branch and that it has been continued from that time down to the present, not merely under this government, or under the regime of the Minister of Railway and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair), but under the regime of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart). Yet, he made much ado in respect to the fact. The expenditure, he said, was charged to capital account in the city of St. John, and he complained that it had been done in 1900, and that the material was still unused. I want to remind my hon. friend, if he wants something to weep over, that although the Harris property was purchased years ago for the sum which I have named, it remained idle year after year and year after year, and it was never utilized, except by the boys for playing base ball and cricket and as an athletic ground, for any purpose in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, until the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals attempted to make the port of St. John what it is, and not until he attempted to complete the terminal facilities there was this property utilized.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was altogether unproductive during all these years.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was absolutely unproductive during all that period of years. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) is made to say in his speech before the committee last evening that not a mile of the sidings in the city of St. John had been constructed, and yet he remembers the evidence of Mr. Pottinger wherein he stated that there was a mile and over of the sidings constructed and that several sidings, amounting to about thirteen miles in all, were under construction and were being attended to at this moment. I want also to remind my hon. friend (Mr. Barker), who made a complaint in respect to the purchase of this marsh land at $475 per acre, that the property was owned by the Gilbert family and if he knows anything about the politics of that country he will know that these gentlemen were Conservatives.

Mr. BARKER. Does that make any difference ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) thinks it does make a difference sometimes.

Mr. BARKER. I think it does not.

Mr. EMMERSON. It sometimes acts as a boomerang, as my hon. friend has found out before the Public Accounts Committee on occasions. Had the hon. gentleman taken the pains to learn the fact, he would have known that when it was sought to purchase that property by the Athletic Association of St. John, they could not purchase it for less than $1,250 per acre ? Yet, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was enabled to purchase it at $475 per acre.

And now, Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable reference made to the production of a letter before the Public Accounts Committee. I believe that last evening when I happened to be out of the chamber for a moment, a very courteous remark was made by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) with respect to myself, and at that moment, if I am informed correctly, some hon. member from one of the Ontario constituencies interjected the remark : That is a specimen of New Brunswick politics. I want to tell my hon. friends the Tory members from the province of Ontario, that if I wish for and need to take lessons in political morals or political ethics I will not go to them. I did produce a letter, and I have recited to the committee and it is part of the records of this House, the circumstances under which I secured that letter. I did not go to any spittoon and pick out the pieces and have them pasted together as was done by the Tory party some years ago in the province of Ontario in connection with a letter of the Hon. Edward Blake. I am quite sure that if any reflections are to be indulged in in connection with the production of the letter, the reflections should be upon the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker). I have told that when I went to Moncton I learned with respect to this letter ; I secured the letter in the way which I have detailed, and I produced the letter before the committee, and that is what troubles the hon. member from Hamilton. That is the difficulty with him. I think, Sir, that the scene in the Public Accounts Committee when my hon. friend was examining the witness in respect to the letter—at which time my courtesy forbade me from interfering in his examination—I think, Sir, that that scene should have been the subject of the photographers art. The picture of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) would have been a study, and as for my hon., my restless friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) why, if I could describe him as he appeared to be at that moment this committee would revel in the description. I might perhaps indulge in a simile and say, that he looked very much like a hen that had been disturbed off her nest. Here was a witness who had stated that he had received a letter from the Minister of Railways and Canals, and he thought that the words of that letter were to tell him to

accept certain railway ties, and the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was pressing the witness with the question: Yes, the letter told you to take or accept these ties. The witness not having in mind clearly the exact terms of the letter did not know exactly, but he thought that was it. My hon. friends opposite in their anticipation, expecting to go before the country with a grievance, knowing that they had utterly failed in their exploring expedition before the Public Accounts Committee, knowing that they had utterly failed in respect to finding anything that would in any way besmirch the Minister of Railways and Canals, thought to themselves: Oh, here is something we can appeal to the country upon; the Minister of Railways and Canals has written this letter and it is not forthcoming. But unfortunately for them I had taken the precaution to secure that letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, unfortunately for them that letter was produced, and that is what bothers them, and, Sir, the country will thank me for having that letter and for having placed it before the committee.

My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) has been kind enough to make a personal reference to myself in connection with the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair). He said—I do not quote his exact words—that it was rumoured that the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) and the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) were not on the best of terms. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) that I have been a close and intimate friend of the Minister of Railways and Canals for a quarter of a century, and let me tell him that from the beginning of our acquaintanceship down to the present moment, our personal relations have not in any sense been strained in the slightest. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) that we have been in close communion—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do my hon. friends opposite think that is strange. I do not belong to any nest of traitors. I have never been associated in any system of brigandage, political or otherwise. I have never gone into a constituency and had an ex-colleague of mine, a gentleman who was my premier come into the county and canvass against me and refer to me in terms that were certainly anything but complimentary. I have never been placed in any such position. I can say that as regards the Minister of Railways and Canals and myself, in so far as our personal relations are concerned they have always been of the most amicable and friendly character, even during this session from the very commencement of it down to the present day. But let me say this: I have not always agreed with the Minister of Railways and Canals with respect to the management of the Intercolonial Railway. I have not hesitated to tell the hon. minister in private, and I am not ashamed to say it before this committee and before the country, that in respect to the management of the Intercolonial Railway I have not been in accord with him. These gentlemen opposite call it a political road, and well may they call it that; but, it is not a political road in the interests of the Liberal party. The complaint that has been made—and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals knows it—is, that the management of the Intercolonial Railway during the past six years in so far as its details and its officials are concerned, has been identical with that which prevailed prior to 1896. And while the Minister of Railways and Canals has stated before this House that he has given the utmost freedom to the employees of that road in respect to their voting. I want to tell him that his officers, and that his bosses, and that his foremen have not been so generous. I want to tell the minister that in many instances there have been good Liberal votes sacrificed, not in the interest of that fairness of which he has been an apostle, but of which his officials and his foremen have not always been apostles by any means. I have not seen eye to eye with the minister. I have felt on occasions that there had been men placed in the employ of the Intercolonial Railway who should not be there, and I have so told the minister. I have felt that these men were there to the exclusion of many competent men in our ranks, and of our own country, but, Sir, that has in no sense interfered with the relationship between the minister and myself. I hold these views, and I am an apostle of the idea that the minister should be surrounded by men who are in sympathy, by men who are not seeking to make the Liberal party dissatisfied with the management of the Intercolonial Railway, by men who are not seeking to create dissensions in the ranks of the Liberal party. I have been an apostle of the idea that the minister should be surrounded by men who are in sympathy not only with him but with the government which he represents. I tell the hon. minister that while it may be true—and it is preached on the other side of the House to-day, though it was not preached a few years ago—that there should be a generous treatment of the employees of the road, while they should be given the greatest latitude possible, while their manhood should not be stunted or suppressed in any way, yet I feel that they should not take advantage of that generosity. While they are not called upon to refrain from casting their votes in favour of the Conservative party, if they so wish, they should not be placed in a position where they can

coerce a Liberal voter in the exercise of his franchise.

With regard to the personal reference made to myself in that connection by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), I want to tell him that that is the sum total of my complaint. The insinuation which my hon. friend threw out in his speech last night must have been, I am sure, from my observation of the hon. gentleman, unintentional; but if he harboured any suspicion that I could in any way be identified with those who belonged to the nest of traitors, or could in any way strike below the belt, I want him to disabuse his mind of any such idea. I produced the letter, because it came honourably into my hands, it came honourably into the hands of the gentleman who gave it to me, and I gave it honourably into the hands of the committee. The country has the benefit of it—that is what my hon. friend complains of—and the country having the benefit of it, the whole evidence is there, and the hon. Minister of Railways is exonerated freely and fully in respect to the matter.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ? Did he get that letter for the purpose of producing it to the committee

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say to my hon. friend that that was my intention.

Mr. BARKER. I am sure the Minister of Railways will be grateful.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will tell the hon. gentleman that that was my intention in the event of the inquiry being pursued, and in the event of the matter arising. The inquiry was pursued, the question did arise, and I carried out my intention and produced the letter. I had heard rumours that possibly the letter might not be wanted. There were a great many rumours. A friend of mine, who was a political opponent at the last election, it is true, and who held a seat in this House in the last parliament, made two or three visits to the city of Ottawa, and I understood that he took my hon. friend from Hamilton under his tutelage, and attempted to pump into my hon. friend—I hope the term will not be considered inelegant—his ideas with respect to the Intercolonial Railway ; and I daresay that my hon. friend had intimated to him by that gentleman the fact that there was a rumour with respect to this very letter.

Mr. BARKER. No.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, if my hon. friend had not, I can only say it was public humour in the city of Moncton. I heard it as a rumour in the city of Moncton that there was such a letter, and hence I sought to get it; but I understood that after his visits, the gentleman to whom I have referred went away in a very much disgusted state with respect to the inquiry. I do not know who expressed the most disgust, my hon. friend from Hamilton or the gentleman to whom I refer. It is rumoured—if we want to indulge in rumours—that before they bade each other good-bye, they exchanged compliments of a not very complimentary character. But whatever may have transpired, I shall not place upon 'Hansard' the rumours I heard, though I have no doubt they would be quite as interesting as the prospectus which was placed on 'Hansard' as a matter of record last evening. While an attempt is being made to draw a herring across the trail with respect to this letter, I wonder if my attitude with respect to it was any less dignified than was the attitude of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways with respect to Mr. P. S. Archibald. Mr. Archibald, it will be remembered, is the hero of the shingle story, which I think is a part of the record of this House; certainly it was placed on the Table of the House. The story is that once there was a very interesting episode in the history of the Intercolonial Railway; that it was on the eve of the general election of 1896; that railway passes, which were made up in book form, were sent out by emissaries to various stations along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, from Lévis to the Sydneys, and distributed free gratis, so that all who ran might read, and they could travel by the Intercolonial Railway without charge; that the telegrams kept coming in, 'Send me twenty-five thousand more shingles,' and so on; that although the supply had been very generous in the first instance, it had run out, and more and more came the cry of the horse-leech for these passes. Mr. Archibald was dismissed from the Intercolonial Railway, and I have no doubt that that gentleman is not very amiably disposed towards the hon. Minister of Railways. I did not think he would be a witness before the Public Accounts Committee of this House, because I remember an occasion in the legislature of New Brunswick, when there was a committee investigating a matter which had originated in the brain of Mr. P. S. Archibald, after his dismissal from the Intercolonial Railway, and when that gentleman, at the expense of the country, was brought to Fredericton, and was kept there week after week on the expectation that he would give his evidence as the originator of the story; but just before it was necessary to call him, he disappeared into thin air, and the people of Fredericton have not laid eyes on him to this day. It occurred to me, therefore, that possibly that gentleman might have found his way to Ottawa thinking there would not be any inquiry into thet subject of ties or any necessity for producing that letter. Therefore I did not rush to the committee at once and announce the letter. I produced it in all good time, unfortunately for the member for Hamilton. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has made reference to a gentleman holding a very responsible position, a gentle-

man well and favorably known throughout the province of New Brunswick, one of the ablest lawyers, as I believe, in this Dominion, a gentleman who holds the position of Attorney General of the province of New Brunswick, the Hon. William Pugsley. The member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) made reference on a former occasion to the Hon. Mr. Pugsley in terms that were at least intended to be slighting, and for which he was afterwards called upon to make amends and I believe did apologize. On this occasion he could not pass by a discussion of the Intercolonial Railway and its administration by the Minister of Railways without indulging in a reflection upon the Hon. Mr. Pugsley. He told us that Mr. Pugsley had been recently in New York in company with the Minister of Railways.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not say that he was in New York with the Minister of Railways, but I said he was in New York negotiating the sale of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will read what Mr. Pugsley stated himself, in reply to the statement of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), last evening. I have here a telegram from Mr. Pugsley, dated St. John, N.B., April 25, and addressed to the Hon. A. G. Blair, Minister of Railways :

I see by parliamentary report in this morning's paper that Hon. Mr. Haggart stated that Mr. Meyer, of New York, had informed him I had been in New York negotiating for sale of Intercolonial Railway. The story is a fabrication from beginning to end. I never either wrote or spoke to Mr. Meyer or any one else on the subject of the sale of the Intercolonial Railway or authorized any one else to do so, I have not been in New York for many months and have no acquaintances whatever with Mr. Meyer.

WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

I read that telegram in connection with what the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) said on the floor of this House last evening. This is what the hon. gentleman said :

I want to show the whole connection. I want to show that the hon. gentleman was down in New York in reference to it, and that he had his agents in New York negotiating for the sale of the Intercolonial Railway—Mr. Pugsley and others ; it is so reported down there. I would not have brought the matter up were it not alleged that these parties had purchased the Canada Atlantic Railway, which they say is part and parcel of their scheme. Mr. Webb has published the statement in the papers that he has bought the Adirondack Railway, and that its stock has advanced from 40 to 106 or 107, and that the stock of this Dominion Securities Company, which has not an asset in the world except the contracts or agreements which they professed to have made with the Dominion government, and the possibility of arranging this grand scheme with the province of Nova Scotia, has been selling up to 5 or 7 per cent premium. Will the hon. gentleman be quiet until I finish reading this circular ?

The telegram which I have here is certainly a complete refutation of either any statement contained in the extract I have read, on any insinuation thrown out against Mr. Pugsley or any other gentleman connected with the transaction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was not any transaction.

Mr. EMMERSON. I assume that my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) will be prepared now, as he was on a former occasion, to withdraw his statement and apologize not only to the committee, but to Mr. Pugsley.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. member for South Lanark will be able to read his authority upon which he makes his statement afterwards.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will he kindly do it afterwards?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I will.

Mr. EMMERSON. I must apologize for taking up so much of the time of the committee, but I am sure that I am entitled to the indulgence of hon. members, because I have not trespassed, either this session or last, at any great length upon the time of parliament, either in the House or in committee.

But I want to invite the attention of the committee for a moment to the evident desire and attempt of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), to show that all these tie transactions and coal purchases were made during the election of 1900. Of course he could not bring any evidence to show that there was any wrong-doing or to show even suspicious circumstances, but he evidently desired to have it go to the country that these purchases were made in contemplation of and in connection with the Dominion elections. Innuendos and insinuations were the weapons which my hon. friend used. Having no evidence of any fact, he had to resort to these miserable tactics. He made a reference to Mr. Curran, but, as was shown before the committee, Mr. Curran is the foreman of the Sumner Company, which is presided over by one of the leading lights of the Conservative party in New Brunswick, and which carries on a very large business, not only at Moncton, but at Bathurst, and Mr. Curran is the general manager of that concern at the town of Bathurst, in the county of Gloucester. My hon. friend threw out the suggestion that Mr. Curran was in some way connected with the government, as the treasurer of the Liberal organization in that section of the province, but I am sure that my hon. friend has no facts upon which to base even a suspicion of that kind. I am sure that he has not been well advised, that he has not been well coached, and there seems to have been a failure of connection with respect to that information in the same way that there was with respect to a great

deal of the information that came from Sackville to my hon. friend from Hamilton. If my hon. friend will refer to the evidence before the committee, he will find that the contract with Mr. Curran was not entered into until some months after the elections took place. He will find that there was no business transaction between Mr. Curran and the Intercolonial Railway until about January, 1901, and then that it was based upon a tender which Mr. Curran had put in for the supply of ties. And yet my hon. friend will have the country believe that this was an election transaction, and that there must be something wrong connected with it because it took place during the election year. My hon. friend has no evidence other than his suspicions, and I do not think, however, much he might wish to mislead the committee that this kind of evidence would enable him to do so. But I am sure he would not desire to mislead the committee——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He would like us not to buy anything for a year before an election.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, let the railway stop for a year whenever an election is to come on. What I have just said was true also with regard to the coal transaction. I am sure the evidence with respect to the purchase of coal was clear, convincing. The purchase was made at a time when a strike was believed to be imminent in the collieries in Nova Scotia. I know that it was a matter of common knowledge at that time that such a strike was feared to be pending. It was referred to in the press day after day. Notice was given by the men to the managers; there were disputes, there were threatenings. As Mr. Pottinger stated, there was, at that time, a great lessening of the supply of coal below what it was usual for the Intercolonial Railway to carry. Had there been such a strike, had it been impossible to acquire from the collieries of Nova Scotia the necessary coal, and had the railway been obliged to stop its traffic for want of coal, what a cry would have been raised from one end of the country to the other, as to the incompetency and incapacity of the Minister of Railways. I do think my hon. friend has strained the point, that he has endeavoured to mislead when he says this coal was purchased during an election year. Why, the coal was not even purchased during an election year, but during the year succeeding the general election of 1900.

Now, I do think the discussion with respect to the Intercolonial Railway should be based upon the value of the Intercolonial Railway to the country, its condition in relation to the work it is doing, and keeping in mind the work it has done for this Dominion. I trust this spirit will prevail. I trust there will be no attempt on the part of those in the west to create a prejudice against the maritime provinces or to seek to give the impression that this road is simply in the interest of those provinces. My hon. friend from Hamilton is a business man, he knows that it is not——

An hon. MEMBER. He is a lawyer.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then I hope that as a lawyer, he will appreciate all the more what I am saying, for some lawyers are very good business men. I think the hon. gentleman must appreciate, as he certainly should appreciate, the fact that the Intercolonial Railway is an essential feature of this confederation, as it was stated to be by the British North America Act, and that it is to-day more than ever an essential feature; that, as such, it should be treated in a broad, magnanimous spirit, and that the Minister of Railways, when he asks the support of the House and the country for that road, should be met in a spirit that means the upbuilding of Canada, a spirit that is not merely carping and captious, that does not savour of the littleness that should characterize only parish politics. I have endeavoured to view the Intercolonial Railway from that standpoint, and I leave it to the committee further to discuss the question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turgeon) will allow me I would like to say a word in reference to Mr. Pugsley, and to give the authority for the statement I made with reference to him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. May I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart), before he goes into that, has he the same authority for coupling my name with the question of negotiations for the sale of the Intercolonial Railway ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The same authority—the same authority which said, as I stated last night, that when the hon. minister went to New York and heard about the matter, he said there was no probability of being able to carry out the deal. My authority is information given by an officer of the Dominion Securities Company. It says :

From the information which I obtained from an officer of the concern it appears that the Dominion Securities Company, was originally formed as a blind pool by Messrs. Seward Webb, Callaway and Van Etten. At that time Mr Callaway was president of the New York Central, while Mr. Van Etten occupied a somewhat similar position on the Boston and Albany. In the early part of last year the company was organized under the laws of New Jersey. Mr. Webb was attracted to Nova Scotia by the development going on at Sydney, C.B., and, having become acquainted with certain friends of the Minister of Railways at Ottawa, was assured by them that there was nothing to hinder him from getting possession of the Intercolonial Railway. Negotiations were carried on between Mr. Webb and his friends on the one hand and Hon. William Pugsley on the other. In the end, however, the Minister of Railways himself visited New York and made it plain to Mr. Webb and his friends that it was clean out of the

question for them to acquire the Intercolonial at any rate, under existing conditions.

I mentioned to the credit of the minister last night that that was my information on the subject.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not happen to be in at the moment when the hon. gentleman read that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The letter goes on—it is a long letter, treating of the correspondence with Mr. Murray and negotiations with reference to building the road and trying to get over the Mackenzie & Mann contract—but this is entirely pertinent to this question:

As said above they have no intention of building to St. John. They are out to acquire, if possible, the South Shore contract promised to Mr. William Mackenzie, which, together with their contract in Cape Breton, would afford them, they imagine, the means of getting the control of the Intercolonial Railway.

This, of course, is hearsay.

My impression is they have been seriously mislead by Mr. Pugsley and are buoyed up by expectations not likely to be realized, so far, at least, as the acquisition of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the name of the writer?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is an interview with an officer of the Dominion Securities Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have the promise of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) that he would give the name of his informant.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No such promise was given. I stated that the information from which I spoke was an interview with an officer of the Dominion Securities Company, and that that was the information given by the Dominion Securities Company. If there is any denial of the facts I will accept it as such, and assume that there was no such communication.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So far as I am concerned, I have already denied it, and, if necessary, I would again give emphasis to that denial. There is not a single solitary word of truth in the whole story. I do not say that no such thing as a suggestion of the control by private parties of the Intercolonial Railway has never been made. During the time I have been in the department, I have had people ask me, I have even had people write to me, to know why the government would not transfer or lease the Intercolonial Railway. But, as for having had any specific proposition, or as to having ever negotiated or been cognizant of any negotiation looking towards any such result, either from or by Mr. Pugsley or any other living person, nothing of the kind has ever occurred. The idea seems so absurd and preposterous that it scarcely calls for contradiction. Now the hon. gentleman has a letter there on the strength of which he has sought to impeach the character, or to reflect upon the character, of persons who have been named. The hon. gentleman, when asked if he would state his authority, says: I will be able to state my authority after the member for Westmoreland sits down. I asked him: Well, will my hon. friend do so? And he did not say he would not. Later on he got up and said that he wished for an opportunity, if the hon. member was through, of stating the authority upon which he made these statements in the House. I ask the hon. gentleman now to say whether he can withhold the name of this correspondent after he has given such an assurance?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend has given his authority in the plainest possible way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not hear it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Dominion Securities Company itself.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, his statement is taken from an interview with an officer of the Dominion Securities Company itself, with regard to the business of that company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Who made the statement to him?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not at all necessary for my hon. friend to give the name of the particular officer. As long as it was an officer entitled to speak for that company, he has discharged his duty to the House in every way by stating that the information came to him from the Dominion Securities Company itself. I do not see the relevancy of asking the name of the particular officer. Reference has been made to the company. If the company sees fit to deny that any properly authorized officer has made a statement of that kind, that is another thing. My hon. friend has referred the Minister of Railways and Canals to the very company which has been named in the discussion carried on now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The hon. gentleman may be under the impression that it was not necessary that this name should be given; but he cannot say it is not necessary in view of what has occurred. I again ask him whether he will supplement the assurance he has already given that he would furnish to us, who are interested in this

matter, and to the committee, the authority upon which he made this statement. It is not sufficient to say that somebody was informed by an officer of the Dominion Securities Company. That proves nothing, that affords no chance for pursuing the inquiry. He ought to state who his informant is if he wishes to supplement the promise he has given.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I gave the statement for what it is worth, from information I received upon the subject. I stated that I heard from New York that Mr. Pugsley had been negotiating——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But who did the hon. gentleman hear it from ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is not necessary to say. The statement may be entirely untrue, there may not be a word of truth in it whatever. I give it for what it is worth. If Mr. Pugsley denies it, I accept his statement at once. It has been current rumour on the streets of New York; it was mentioned in Mr. Doull's remarks that there were negotiations for the purpose of building a railroad from the Georgian Bay, or from the great lakes, down to the Atlantic. There was talk of that in New York. I had information on that subject again and again. I heard that Mr. Pugsley had been negotiating. There may be no truth whatever in it.

The PRIME MINISTER. Why did you mention it then ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I obtained my information from a gentleman in whom I have perfect reliance.

The PRIME MINISTER. Name, name.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I believe his word thoroughly. I will write to the gentleman and find out whether he will give me authority to make use of his name. It was information that I obtained privately. But the fact is one which can be very easily verified. Was Mr. Webb negotiating with Mr. Pugsley in reference to the acquisition of running rights on the Intercolonial Railway, or the acquisition of the Intercolonial Railway ? It is denied by Mr. Pugsley, who says that he has not been in New York for a couple of months. It is with reference to a transaction which took place more than a couple of months ago, it is with reference to transactions when the circular of the Dominion Securities Company was issued. Surely they would not make a statement of that kind in New York——

The PRIME MINISTER. Who ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Dominion Securities Company.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is no authority. The hon. gentleman knows very well that corporations have no souls to damn or to save. Therefore it is no use to give the name of the corporation. Who is the man belonging to the corporation who made that statement ? There is no use telling us that the corporation has done this or done that, but if an officer of the corporation has done it, let us have his name.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In reference to whom ? Does the hon. gentleman say in reference to Mr. Pugsley ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly, Mr. Pugsley or anybody else. Mr. Pugsley denies the statement, and he has a right to the name of the author of the statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. I ask the hon. gentleman if his informant is Mr. Powell, the late member for Westmoreland ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I never had a conversation with Mr. Powell on the subject. My information came from New York from parties entirely indifferent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only other available source of information to the hon. gentleman is Mr. Archibald. Will he say whether it was Mr. Archibald ? Now, I would say this in all fairness : The hon. gentleman thought enough of the statement which he received to credit it. If he did not credit it, if he did not think the statement was worthy of credit, he ought not to have taken the responsibility of putting it before this whole country, of making a matter of record of the imputation which it contains. He ought to have ascertained upon what basis these things were being done. While I cannot say, and do not pretend to answer for the thousands of people that are in Canada as to what they may think or do, I do not think the hon. gentleman ought to couple my name as a minister in any transaction of that kind, and seek to create the impression that I was a party to or cognizant of any such transaction as he has described, without he is very sure there is a foundation upon which the statement has been built. I say it is due from the hon. gentleman to this House and to the presons who are concerned, since he has given publicity to these reports, that he should state the authority upon which he has given them. If he refuses to do it, he will not be doing what is just and fair by the members of this House, or by the persons involved.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In speaking upon the subject I mentioned no letter, no information that I had received further than this, that it was rumoured in New York city that negotiations were going on for the purpose of selling the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. minister in his speech today said I had no authority to say so, and Mr. Pugsley, after reading my remarks in the 'Hansard,' gave an explicit denial to the rumour. For the purpose of justifying the statement that I made yesterday, I said I made it pro tanto, for as much as it was worth, and I read an extract from

a letter I had received. The hon. gentleman says it is no justification at all unless I give the man's name. All I have to say is that, on the authority of statements that were made to me, I firmly believed, when I made the statement, that such negotiations were going on. I was attacked by the hon. member for Westmoreland on the strength of the statement that Mr. Pugsley entirely denied it. Then, the justification for the statement I made was a private letter to myself, which I have not the authority to use, but I shall ask the party's permission. There are other matters contained in the letter which I would not like to make public, but I shall ask the party's permission to make use of this particular portion of the letter, and if I get authority I will read it to the House. If I do not get authority I will say so candidly and withdraw the statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax. The right hon. leader of the House is very much more sensitive over matters of this kind than I have seen him on previous occasions. I recall the occasion in this House, not many years ago, when the right hon. gentleman brought a telegram down from across the Atlantic denying that Mr. Hamilton-Smythe was an authorized agent of the Rothschilds. But, before that telegram was read to the House, it was rumoured the right hon. gentleman sent his secretary around to the Liberal press of this country for the purpose of making it public. I was present when the right hon. gentleman said, in answer to a question by Sir Charles Tupper who was then leading the opposition, that he would bring down to this House the telegram to which that was an answer, and I was also present on the following day when the right hon. gentleman came down to this House and said he would not bring it down because it was a private telegram. He produced in the House and distributed through the press a telegram for the purpose of discrediting Mr. Hamilton Smythe who had come forward with a better contract in respect to the Yukon railway than that which the government were attempting to put through the House. That was a public telegram, it was read to the House, it was sent to the press of the country, but the telegram which the right hon. gentleman sent across the Atlantic and which had produced that one, was, according to the right hon. gentleman, a private telegram. The Prime Minister, I think is not perfectly logical or perfectly consistent. He is very much more sensitive now than he was then. An hon. gentleman made certain statements in this debate. He said that there were rumours in New York which should be brought to the attention of the government. He was challenged for his authority and he said that he would give his authority. He read a statement which he says had been communicated to him in an interview with an officer of the Dominion Securities Company. The right hon. leader of the House says that corporations cannot act except by agents. I never understood that it was absolutely necessary in order to bind a corporation that you should have the name of the agent. Has the right hon. gentleman always been provided with the names of agents when he has been dealing with corporations in this House ? I do not think so. It is perfectly patent that although Mr. Pugsley denies that he ever had any negotiations with any officer of the Dominion Securities Company, that he can make all the denial in this case that he could make if the name were given to him and if Mr. Pugsley wishes to make a denial, then, it is a question of veracity between the informant of my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) and Mr. Pugsley.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. How are we to judge of that veracity if we have not his name ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) say that if we had the name we could judge ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We could inquire.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How shall we come to a definite conclusion ? By moving a resolution in this House stating which of these gentlemen is telling the truth ? The matter could not be definitely settled even if the name were given. The matter could not be definitely settled without a judicial inquiry of some kind I suppose. I am not aware that this House has any machinery at its disposal at the present time, as a House, for the purpose of making that inquiry. I submit therefore that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has in this case discharged every duty which he owes to the House and to the hon. member for Westmoreland who has read a telegram from Mr. Pugsley.

Mr. FRASER. I think this is a matter of more importance than one of merely passing moment. Any one of us may some day be in the same position. I do not think that any hon. member should make statements about another hon. member in the House, upon mere New York street rumour or upon a rumour that is obtained upon the curbstone, or in any offices of the brokers in New York, or in any office in New York. I think that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) made a mistake, and I think there is no hon. gentleman in the House who feels it more than he does. The case mentioned by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was a different case altogether. The position there was of a telegram sent. Nobody has asked the hon. member for South Lanark to produce the letter he wrote to this man asking him for this information. All that this committee has anything to do with is with the

letter that he received and upon which letter he made the statement. Nobody cares about any other statements that may be contained in the letter which he received. Evidently the hon. gentleman wrote about a great many things. We have nothing to do with that letter and we have nothing to do with anything except the direct statement that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) and Mr. Pugsley were concerned in discussing this matter in some way. Mr. Pugsley could not speak except with the authority of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. Mr. Pugsley had no power to go to Mr. Meyer and discuss this matter with him. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was mentioned as going to New York in regard to this matter, and he was quoted as saying that he did not see his way clear to make this arrangement. That is a statement of the most damaging kind. It is a damaging statement to say that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals would ever think of discussing the question of the transferrence of the Intercolonial Railway. Does the hon. member for South Lanark, or does the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) think it fair, upon a New York rumour, upon a letter from a man whose name will not be given, to say that the Minister of Railways and Canals and Mr. Pugsley are talking about handing over this heritage of Canada to a lot of Yankee speculators ? This is not a trifling matter. It is not a trifling matter to say : We think the Minister of Railways and Canals should be looked after, that he is quietly going to work to hand over the Intercolonial Railway. The people in the maritime provinces believe that the Intercolonial Railway will not only become an admirable asset but a valuable road, and we must still have our own road in our own interest as well as in the interests of the people of Canada. I think the name should be given for these two reasons : The name should be given, in the first place, so that we may know the man who made this lying statement, and in the second place, the name should be given so that no member of this House may lightly charge a member on the other side and when challenged attempt to back it up by saying that it was rumoured in New York. Surely that is anything but fair. I think the hon. gentleman should rise in his place now and manfully say : Well, I heard it from so and so. The minister says it is not so, Mr. Pugsley says it is not so, I take it back and the man who signed this paper was wrong. He might have heard this, but I apologize to the House for making such a statement as I did upon evidence of such a character.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I desire to dispute the position which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) occupies. Where is the charge against any member of the government, or any member of this House ? I made the statement that Mr. Pugsley was negotiating on authority which I thought to be correct, in reference to the Intercolonial Railway. I made no charge against any member of this House or in connection with it, and the statement completely exonerated the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the extent that I said that when he heard it he put his foot upon the whole transaction I am told. What does the member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) mean ? What right has he to propose to teach lessons in honour and propriety ? Where is the lesson he can teach in reference to these things. What have I been guilty of ? I know my position in this House as well as any other man. Why is there all this absurd talk because at the most, I accused Mr. Pugsley of negotiating the sale of the Intercolonial Railway. I made no connection between Mr. Pugsley and any member of this House or any minister. Why am I taunted and questioned and taught lessons of propriety ; especially lessons from the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Guysborough.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg pardon of the hon. gentleman from Annapolis (Mr. Wade), I mean the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). Look at the absurd position you want to put a member of the House in. You are asking a member of this House when he makes a statement with reference to a person outside of this House, to give proof and to furnish authority. The member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has brought Mr. Pugsley's denial here. I accept his denial. I furnished the information to this House in reference to Mr. Pugsley, and I gave the statement on which I furnished that information. I will accept his denial fully, and I will ask the House to accept it fully, if I do not get authority to read these portions of the letter in justification of my course in reference to Mr. Pugsley. I am the judge of my own honour in reference to that gentleman. I know what is right and what ought to be done in the matter, and I will not receive lessons from the Minister of Railways or from any one else.

Mr. FRASER. I did not try to teach the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart), although he has shown now that he needs teaching. I thought before he did not. I thought he had honour enough, that he should do what was expected from him under the circumstances. I am satisfied now to leave it to the judgment of the House that no teaching and no training would improve him.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been trying to divert the attention of this committee from the main point, and substantially the only point under discussion. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) assured this House that he would give authority for his statement. What did that language of

his mean ? Did it mean that he would ask the person who gave him this information, and whose letter he has in his hand, whether that person will consent ? Is that carrying out the promise which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) made to this House ? Why, Sir, if this question were free from political bias and if we were elsewhere than in this House of Commons, there would be no hesitation on the part of anybody in declaring that if the hon. gentleman were as good as his promise he should give the name and his authority.

Mr. EDWARDS. Let him give his authority now.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) says he made no charges. Well, there is a very convenient way, which the hon. gentleman often avails himself of, of doing what for his purpose is very much safer than making charges, and which at the same time accomplishes the end he would have in view by making charges. He has availed himself of that method which is a frequent and common method with the hon. gentleman, and some others on that side of the House—not all I am happy to say, but some few. I think I can show the committee that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has adopted that expedient in this instance. He tells us that he makes no charge, but is not an insinuation just about as nasty a thing as a charge, and is it not harder to refute ? If I were to use the expression which would properly characterize the conduct of the hon gentleman (Mr. Haggart), he would consider it offensive, and I do not wish to use an offensive expression. I tell the hon. gentleman, that if he did not make a charge he did this : Referring to me he says : The Minister of Railways is going to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the Georgian Bay; the Minister of Railways hopes at some future date to reach the North-west; I wonder is it the syndicate of the friends of the Minister of Railways who are trying to negotiate the sale of the Intercolonial Railway at the present moment—not three months ago, not two months ago, not four months ago as the member for Lanark discovers now; but at the present moment. The hon. member for Lanark did this. He said : That the Minister of Railways and his friends were trying to negotiate the sale of the Intercolonial Railway at the present time in New York; and he exclaimed : Is it under the auspices of the Dominion Securities Company that this extension of the Intercolonial Railway is going to be made to the west ? Does my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) think that was a commendable and worthy insinuation for him to make against a minister of the Crown ; that that minister was connected with a syndicate that had his friendship and with which he was allied—if not actually allied, yet in a sense allied ? Did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) intend to convey that impression, or if not, why did he use the language ? If he did intend to convey the impression, why did he not take the responsibility upon himself as a member which he ought to take ? If he is not obliged to assume the responsibility, then, Sir, there is no responsibility attaching to the language which a member of this House may use at any time in this House as respects any other member. The hon. gentleman may, and can refuse to accept responsibility. But he is not the custodian of his own honour to such an extent as that he can fly against the judgment of the members of this House if they choose to sit in judgment on his conduct. If an appeal is made to the judgment, and arbitrament of this House, the hon. gentleman has got to submit himself, and in the last resort the members of this House are entitled to judge what the honour of the House will require at his hands. Let the leader of the opposition keep patient—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman refer to me ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought the hon. gentleman wanted to rise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not aware that I was interrupting the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was not interrupting me a bit, but he seemed uneasy, and I thought possibly he might interrupt.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend is entirely mistaken.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) tells us that he makes no charge. He tells us that he does not make anything which resembles or is intended to be a charge, or an insinuation, or a reflection on anybody, but the hon. gentleman's words do not bear out that statement. He was reading these prospectuses and he went on to speak about what is taking place between this syndicate and others, and I rose in my place and I said :

Where is the relevancy of all this.

I could not for the life of me see why a member of this House who knew as much as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) ought to know, and who is as responsible as he is actually, and as he ought to hold himself before the House—I could not see why he should incumber 'Hansard' with reading over all this absurd and ridiculous prospectus—fraudulent if you like to call it so, and you would be justified in so describing it—I could not see why he should drag this in; I could not see why he should drag in the government; drag in the Minister of Railways; drag in Mr. Pugsley and endeavour to create the impression that there was something that had not been probed, and

which if it were probed, would reflect upon the minister. So I asked the hon. gentleman :

Where is the relevancy of all this.

And what did the hon. gentleman reply ? He said :

I want to show the whole connection—

The House will remember what the hon. gentleman said a few moments ago, and here is the record which corresponds exactly with my recollection of what the hon. gentleman did say. He replied :

I want to show that the hon. gentleman (that is the Minister of Railways) has been down in New York in reference to this negotiation, and that he had his agents in New York.

Mark the words :

That he had his agents in New York negotiating for the sale of the Intercolonial Railway —Mr. Pugsley and others it is so reported were down there.

Now, what is all that intended to convey to any mind of ordinary intelligence which can understand the meaning of plain words ? What it is intended to convey ? Is it not, that I was engaged in what I would consider a most reprehensible, a most unworthy and a most improper act holding the position which I do—to be privately associated with a syndicate, and having agents employed with a view to effecting a sale of the Intercolonial Railway. The thing has only one redeeming feature, that is, that it is so utterly and ridiculously silly that I should scarcely feel justified in referring to it, only that in coming to that conclusion I should undoubtedly have to assign to my hon. friend a range of intellect which I have not any desire or thought of doing. What does my hon. friend mean by it ? The meaning is too clear to need any explanation or interpretation, it speaks for itself—it means to cast a reproach on me as the minister of the department. My hon. friend having undertaken to do that in these explicit terms, I say that, if he acts in a manner becoming to a member of this parliament, in addition to the fact that he has promised to give his authority, it is his bounden duty to give that authority here and now, or to withdraw the statements which he has made and apologize for the imputations which he has cast.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman's tender heart is touched almost to sadness—the cries of the baby in the gallery show that he has already produced results.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 109) incorporating the Molson's Bank Pension Fund.—Mr. Osler.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Rental to Grand Trunk Railway, $140,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When the House adjourned at six o'clock, I was about to say a few words but the remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals had produced such a marked effect on his audience that I was unable to proceed. The hon. gentleman had been so extremely plaintive in the language he used, expressive of his desire to have the name of the particular person associated with this company, that the results absolutely prevented me saying a word at the time. As the hon. gentleman seems to be sensitive on this subject, I would like to point out one or two facts which it would be well for him to bear in memory. I dare say he recollects the statement of his leader in this House on one occasion that no man would be dismissed for political partisanship without being afforded an opportunity to make out his case by an investigation. The hon. gentleman does not seem to be disturbed in his mind that that promise has not been carried out. Would it not be well for that sensitive spirit of his to consider that feature of the case which has been going on for the last four or five years ? Let him explain to the House why that particular circumstance does not trouble his mind to the same extent as the failure of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) to give the name of a certain officer of this company. I think the hon. gentleman has been in this House when charges of the grossest possible fraud have been made during the present session against people who did work for this country in 1891, without any opportunity whatever having been afforded to those men to meet these charges, without their being even acquainted with those charges when made in the House first by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and afterwards by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher). Is my hon. friend troubled with that feature of the case ? He no doubt appreciates the conduct of his colleagues in that respect, and regards it as perfectly fair and perfectly praiseworthy.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know to what the hon. gentleman alludes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a matter as to which apparently the hon. gentleman has not been taken into the confidence of his colleagues.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That may be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I think it would have been as well for the hon. gentleman, before taking the course he has

done to-day, to have ascertained something of what has taken place in connection with these matters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a very red herring the hon. gentleman is drawing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is the one who has been drawing the red herring across the trail. Would it not be well for him, instead of talking about the name of an official of this company, to explain to this House how it is that this railway, which was going to produce such magnificent results under his management, has been costing 110 per cent of the receipts in railway expenses, whereas every other railway in Canada and the United States has been paying a handsome dividend during the last two or three years in a period of great prosperity. I would like to know how it is that the hon. gentleman has so much to say about this particular feature and nothing about that. I would also point out to my hon. friend that we have had officials dismissed over and over again, on charges of political partisanship, and when we have asked in this House for the grounds of their dismissal we have been told that the charges have been substantiated in such a way that the particular department concerned was perfectly satisfied, and took the whole responsibility, while the men who were so dismissed did not, in some instances at least, even know the names of the persons who made the charges against them, and, notwithstanding the promise of the leader of the House, were not given the slightest opportunity for any investigation. My hon. friend himself has not always been so careful of these matters as he would have us believe. And I recollect, on one occasion some three or four years ago, when the hon. minister's own estimates were under discussion, we had to sit in this House a very long time indeed because he was not willing to fulfill the promise he had made to give certain information. The hon. gentleman could have saved this House a great deal of trouble on that occasion if he had been as scrupulous and sensitive on this subject as he seems to be to-night.

I do not wish to detain the House at any length with regard to this matter. My hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has told the House the source of his information. True, he has not given the name of the particular officer, but only the name of the company from which that information was received. But it is just as competent for Mr. Pugsley, the only gentleman who is concerned, to make, as I understand he has, a denial without the name of the particular officer being given, as if the name of every official of that company were given as the source of this information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not mind saying, whether, in his opinion as a member of this House, the hon. member for South Lanark has fulfilled the promise he made, that he would give the authority upon which he made the statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend from South Lanark, in my opinion, has fulfilled every promise he has made to the House. I do not understand that he gave exactly a promise in the way the hon. gentleman puts it. But whether that be so or not, it is a matter for the hon. member for South Lanark to decide, and in any opinion he has done everything necessary.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for South Lanark may with reason ask to be saved from his friends. Of all that has been said on this subject, that which is most condemnatory of his course in what has fallen from the hon. the leader of the opposition. While undertaking to defend the hon. member for South Lanark, he has hardly devoted one minute to the subject of discussion, but spent his time talking about his friend, Mr. Hamilton Smith, and the dismissals of officials and things of that sort, which have no connection whatever with the question under discussion. When so able and astute an advocate has to take that course, it is evident that he sees no case in favour of his hon. friend from South Lanark. He would not have spent his time on these irrelevant matters if he had any defence to make of the conduct of his hon. friend. The statement is made that this concerns only Mr. Pugsley, but my hon. colleague the Minister of Railways read the statement made by the hon. member for South Lanark, in which that hon. gentleman distinctly stated that the Minister of Railways had been in New York and that he had his agent in New York for the purpose of negotiating the transaction referred to. That is the point of the whole matter, and if that statement went further than the hon. member for Lanark intended it should—which might happen to any member when addressing the House—if he found that he made a direct statement affecting the Minister of Railways and not merely Mr. Pugsley, he should have admitted that he had gone too far and had made a mistake.

Mr. BENNETT. The point seems to be narrowed down to this, whether the Minister of Railways should apologize to Mr. Pugsley or not. As I understand the discussion, the statement was made absolutely by my hon. friend from South Lanark that he was not conversant with the fact as to whether Mr. Pugsley was down there or not, as the accredited statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals. The Minister of Railways and Canals may well say save me from my friends—at least from one of them, who is Mr. Pugsley. It is well known that Mr. Pugsley's services are

sought as an intermediary when any person has a claim—I would not say shady—but a claim that cannot be passed by the minister. That is a notorious fact. It is a notorious fact that if there is a claim to be pressed against the Department of Railways, not only in New Brunswick, but in the other provinces as well, the parties who are disappointed in pressing their claims seek recourse from Mr. Pugsley. Is it not an odd thing that when a man has a claim, which is honest and straightforward, he cannot go to the department with a counsel from his own province or city, but is advised that if there is any one who can steer his claim through the department it is Mr. Pugsley. Will the Minister of Railways deny that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly, in the most unqualified way.

Mr. BENNETT. I will prove it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is hanging a wholesale statement upon the flimsiest possible material. As far as my recollection serves me, I know of but one instance in which Mr. Pugsley was ever engaged in connection with a claim with which I or my department had any concern, and that was two years ago—only one single solitary claim. And when he makes the statement he does in this broadcast way, I would ask him to state the facts upon which he bases such a charge against Mr. Pugsley, and such an insinuation against the department.

Mr. BENNETT. The statement I have to make is this : that some three or four years ago there were some lands to be expropriated in Point Lévis, opposite the city of Quebec——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is the only instance I know of.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the only one made public at present. There was a claim before the department. A tried official of the hon. gentleman's department went to Quebec to bring about the purchase of a very considerable portion of land. He asked for prices and got them. He came then to the present Minister of Justice, and that gentleman assured him that the price of 90 cents per foot was ample for the property. He reported to the minister that this was a fair price, and the minister consequently initialled the document and agreed to allow that. But in the month of November, 1898, the parties concerned got information that they had better not accept that price and the matter dragged on. Year followed year, and finally, three years after, the parties concerned—or one of them at least—not being satisfied with the price offered by the minister, and which was said by the Minister of Justice and the late Mr. Dobell, who was then a member of the cabinet, to be a fair one, was advised—I do not suppose he came to that decision by intuition—to go to New Brunswick and hunt up a solicitor. He had had a solicitor employed, a member of this House, whose name I need not mention now because it is not pertinent to the issue. But there was a member of this House who laid down the principle last year that he had a perfect right to take advantage of his position, as member, to go into the department and press claims on behalf of clients. There never was a time in the history of the country when that practice obtained to the extent it does to-day. It is notorious, particularly in Ontario, that such is the practice to-day.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is notorious ?

Mr. BENNETT. The practice of members of parliament presenting claims in the departments for a fee, and that practice was defended in this House last year by an hon. gentleman sitting on that side, and he was not at all rebuked by the ministry. Now, what happened ? These landowners in the city of Point Lévis, unable to get the price they wanted, had evidently been advised by somebody that they could get it, if, after they had availed themselves of the services of a member of this House, they would go further down to New Brunswick. They did so, and secured the services of Mr. Pugsley. Here is the proof of what I say :

Fredericton, N.B., March 1, 1901.

Hon. A. G. Blair,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

(Re Couture property, Lévis.)

My Dear Blair,—Mr. Charles Archer, of Montreal, has sent me copies of solemn declaration of L. M. Carriére, M.P., &c.

After carefully reading the declaration, it seems to me that a very strong case is made for a valuation of at least $2.50 a foot. If the matter could be settled immediately, I can, I feel sure, induce Mr. Archer to get his clients to accept $2.25. I will esteem it a great favour if you will kindly take the matter up, and settle upon this basis.

Yours sincerly,
WM. PUGSLEY.

Now, I think I can well use the words of the Minister of Finance, and apply them to the Minister of Railways, for that hon. gentleman must surely desire to be saved from his friends. It must be notorious—it certainly had become known to these parties in Quebec—that if they wished to get their full claim, if they wished to collect this amount—nearly three times as much as the minister had offered them—they must not rely even upon a member of this House, but the proper step was to secure the services of Mr. Pugsley. I do not know whether Mr. Pugsley was in New York or not, but I do know that the hon. member for South Lanark

made the statement that he had been informed that Mr. Pugsley was in New York endeavouring to carry on these negotiations. That hon. gentleman has made this statement and has said that he must ask the consent of the gentleman who gave him the information before he divulges his name. He has read from a document, and the House is bound in honour to assume that it is a document received by him, and not a fictitious one. And, having read from that document, I say the hon. gentleman has done what he promised the House he would do. It will remain to be seen whether he gets authority to give the name of the writer of that letter. But, unfortunately for the Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Pugsley's relations with him were so notorious in the province of Quebec, at least with some people, that in pressing their claims they dispensed even with the mediation of a member of this House, they dropped even their own counsel and went away to St. John to secure the services of Mr. Pugsley.

Mr. EMMERSON. It seems to me we are entirely begging the question, putting up these men of straw only——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) would allow me, I would like to make a statement, before he goes on with his remarks, in answer to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). It is notable that the hon. gentleman, with all his astuteness was unable to discover anything that he could say in justification of the course taken by the hon. member for South Lanark, and his attitude before the committee, so he has been obliged to go back to the record of 'Hansard' of four years ago to discover something that might possibly help to divert the attention of members on this side from the main question. But no effort on his part, or on that of any other hon. gentleman will succeed in that. We will come back—it may be with some loss of time, but we cannot help that—to the question before us, and will stick to it until we get it set right. Before I resume my seat, let me say to my hon. friend that he knows that Mr. Pugsley does not represent me in any particular. Mr. Pugsley is a gentleman of the legal profession of very high standing in the country. He had business relations in the city of Montreal, I know, and was there at stated periods in connection with the company with which he was associated. I do not know, but I presume that Mr. Archer, who is a resident of Montreal, and not of Quebec, as the hon. gentleman stated, would be very likely to come into contact with so prominent a lawyer as Mr. Pugsley.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will allow me, I will tell him that Mr. Archer is the law partner of the member of the House who had the claim in hand before it was handed over to Mr. Pugsley.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not care about that. I am telling the hon. gentleman that Mr. Archer is not a resident of Quebec but of Montreal, and he would naturally make Mr. Pugsley's acquaintance, and would learn of his ability as a lawyer just as he would that of any other gentleman whose services he might desire to avail himself of. My hon. friend has not seen fit to follow up the subject, to state, as the record has shown, that, while Mr. Pugsley and other gentleman who were associated with him pressed the matter in that way upon the attention of the department, the pressure and the argument advanced were of no avail—the claim put forward was not entertained, and the amount he demanded was not paid, nor was there any larger amount offered claimants than was fully justified by the valuations made of the property. I ask my hon. friend, therefore, to endeavour, if he wishes to continue this diversion, to find something with bottom to it; something that has not been answered and disposed of already.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister should start by at least getting his facts right. This was not in 'Hansard' of four years ago, but last year. And I am not, nor is any hon. gentleman who has not the departmental records in his hand, in the position to know what disposition was made of this case. Perhaps when the estimates come down we shall learn what disposition was made of it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not recall whether it was last year or an earlier session. My own impression was that it was two years ago. But the hon. gentleman spoke of four years ago, and I supposed that was the time of the 'Hansard' from which he was reading. I can only say that I entirely refused to entertain the demands made. I told the gentleman that unless he chose to accept the valuation we were prepared to offer, which our valuators sustained, he might take it to the Exchequer Court. And I believe it is in the Exchequer Court, unless there has been a recent decision in the matter.

Mr. BENNETT. I am pleased to know that the minister resisted the pressure put upon him in that case. He will remember that he was pressed very hard, not only by Mr. Pugsley, but by the Prime Minister himself, to pay the claim. He will see on reference to 'Hansard' that the Minister of Justice wrote a letter asking for the payment of the claim at the advanced rate, and based that on the ground that the Prime Minister thought it was fair.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was remarking that I did not see the object of putting up these men of straw to have them knocked down. And I think the hon. member for East Simcoe will see the point of that remark, as he

has been called upon to take back the statement he made as inaccurate. The point I wished to draw attention to is this—this afternoon I read a telegram from Mr. Pugsley repudiating in their entirety the statements made by the hon. member for South Lanark last night, and I suggested to the hon. member for South Lanark that it was desirable that he should at least withdraw his remarks in connection therewith. And the hon. gentleman stated that, as soon as I was through speaking he would give his authority for the statement he had made. I think this committee is entitled to that statement to the fulfilment of the pledge that the hon. member for South Lanark gave to the committee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he will state what the authority was upon which he relied? Do I understand him to confirm what has been said by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), that his authority is one of the officials of the Dominion Securities Company? Does that correctly define the person whom he puts forward as authority for these statements?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The leader of the opposition was referring to the letter which I read. This was an interview with an officer of the Dominion Securities Company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not a communication to you made by that officer?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No. The communication to me was that a party who communicated with the Dominion Securities Company got this information from an officer. I thought I had ended the controversy. This question between Mr. Pugsley and myself——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a question between the hon. member and myself.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not at all—the hon. member will stick to that. If the hon. member will read the 'Hansard' he will find that last night I withdrew any charge against the minister, and why does he repeat it again and again?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not understand you so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Read my remarks which are in the 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Then do you do so now?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do now, and I did then. I stated that the information I had got enabled me to withdraw any imputation upon the minister—because he went down to New York and stated it would be impossible to carry on such a transaction. I read that from the document, I stated it last night. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) says he has a telegram in which Mr. Pugsley denies it altogether. I have to accept the denial at present. My information on the subject is what I read to the House. I stated to the House that I was going to ask authority to give the name of the party, and to read the whole letter, which contains a good deal more, and to put it on the Table of the House.

Intercolonial Railway, $5,500,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I listened with considerable pleasure to the burst of oratorical fireworks we heard this afternoon from the hon. member from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson). I regretted at the time that the members of this committee did not seem to appreciate that class of oratory the way they should, because shortly after he begun, the benches began to empty. That was rather regrettable.

Mr. EMMERSON. That doesn't hurt me.

Mr. FOWLER. I quite understand why it does not make the hon. gentleman feel badly because he is used to it; that is the usual result when he begins to fire off his big oratorical guns. The hon. gentleman drew a picture, a scene which he said would be worthy of the highest art of the photographer. He referred to the expression upon the countenance of the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) when this famous letter was produced by the member for Westmoreland. Sir, I have in my mind a scene which I think would be still more worthy the art of the photographer. Some months ago, and up to the beginning of this session of parliament, we heard in New Brunswick very strong rumours of the belligerent attitude which the hon. member for Westmoreland had assumed towards the Minister of Railways and Canals. The member for Westmoreland is a gentleman of a somewhat impulsive nature, and when he feels that he has a grievance he does not make any bones, as we say, in giving utterance to his feelings; and he gave very strong utterance to his feelings in his native county and throughout the province. It was a matter notorious and patent to everybody that very strained relations existed between the member for Westmoreland and the Minister of Railways and Canals. The member for Westmoreland came to this parliament with the same feeling of rancour, the same feeling of resentment in his heart towards the Minister of Railways and Canals concerning his management of the Intercolonial Railway. But, Sir, after he arrived here a change came over the spirit of his dreams, and he became disarmed; and the scene I would like to see properly portrayed was the scene when the two met and a reconciliation took place.

An hon. MEMBER. Who says there was one?

Mr. FOWLER. Those who have heard the hon. member speak in this House can imagine the pathos in his tones as, with

tears streaming from his eyes, he embraced the Minister of Railways and Canals and said to him: 'I have been deceived, I have been tricked, I have been cajoled by you, I have been induced to give up the position of premier of the province of New Brunswick by means of a glittering promise you made to me if I would take part in federal politics, and when I gave up the position I held in my native province, and came into the federal arena, I found you did not, or could not, deliver the goods, and naturally I was cross and angry with you. But I have in my mind the memory of those twenty-five years of close intimacy and companionship—which the hon. gentleman told us about this afternoon—and for the sake of the memory of those years of friendship I am prepared to forgive you. And the minister, not to be outdone in generosity by the member for Westmoreland, said: 'Henry, I am willing to be forgiven.'

Now, Sir, the member for Westmoreland, in his peroration, grew very eloquent on the subject of broad statesmanship and he said to hon. members on this side of the House: 'You must give up this petty parish politics, you must be broad in your statesmanship, you must view this Intercolonial Railway in a broad and statesmanlike manner. Very good advice, excellent precepts, and I would that the example of the member for Westmoreland accorded better with his precepts. What he said to this House and country—and judging from the loud tones in which he spoke, if the windows had been open it would not have been necessary for the members of the press to have recorded his speech, because the country would have heard it—he said he was prepared to tell this House and the country that he was not altogether in accord with the policy of the minister in the management of his department. Sir, we expected him to give the reasons why he was not in accord, we expected to hear a discussion of the railway policy of the minister; we expected to be told on what particular he disagreed with him. What did we hear? Was it something on broad lines of statesmanship in which he disagreed with the minister? No, Sir, it was solely and entirely because, as he said, the minister had not introduced enough politics into the management of the Intercolonial Railway. And this is the sort of statesmanship we get from the hon. member for Westmoreland, the man who occupied the proud position of premier of the province of New Brunswick. We should expect something wider, something broader from the hon. gentleman than that sort of doctrine. I failed to understand what fault he could find with the minister on that ground. I thought that in no department of the public service had so many men been displaced for political reasons as on the Intercolonial Railway, I won't except even the Post Office Department, and that was bad enough, in all conscience. The hon. gentleman had denounced what he termed the hydra-headed mismanagement of the Intercolonial Railway—those were the very words he is said to have used in characterizing the management of the Intercolonial Railway by the Minister of Railways and Canals. And the only fault that he now tells the House he has to find, is because the minister has not dismissed enough officials, that they are allowed to vote as they please And the minister, as I understand, though I was not in the House at the time, stood up in his place and said that there was no coercion used towards the employees of the Intercolonial Railway. Sir, along the line of the Intercolonial Railway people will laugh at that statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals when they read it. The Intercolonial Railway runs through the county which I have the honour to represent in this House, for a distance of sixty miles, and upon nearly every official of that road coercion was brought in the last election; not satisfied with that, they even resort to it in connection with municipal and local politics, and in the very last election run in the county of King's a few weeks ago, that same coercion was brought to bear upon employees of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By whom?

Mr. FOWLER. By those in authority who are over them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps if some of you knew your own names it would be better. Some of you can scarcely tell your own names. Names—an hon. gentleman says. I give the name and what would happen?

Mr. HYMAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) a question. He has said that pressure was brought and I submit that he should state on which side the pressure was brought.

Mr. FOWLER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) is so dense, so obtuse, so ignorant, as not to understand on which side the pressure was brought I will tell him. It was on the side of the party which he supports.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. FOWLER. I give the name and what would happen? The man coerced would lose his position that very moment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. FOWLER. And a place might be made for some hungry Grit heeler so that the hon. member for Westmoreland could fill it with some hungry heeler in his constituency. That is why the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Heyd) is so anxious for the name.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) permit me to ask him a question ? If the hon. gentleman is seriously of the opinion that the employees, or officers, of the Intercolonial Railway were warranted, or authorized or permitted, so far as the minister in the department is concerned, to exercise any undue, or improper pressure, or any coercion upon the employees of the road in the matter of the exercise of their franchise, I ask my hon. friend why it is he thinks that they are in any danger of being dismissed for doing what they were allowed to do.

Mr. FOWLER. I would just say this to the hon. minister ; I have known him a long time and I know him to be too astute a man to place himself in such a position. The hon. minister will take very good care that his hands were very clean, but a wink is sometimes as good as a nod and those under his authority would understand that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let me ask my hon. friend another question. Does he not know that there was no wink or nod about it ? Does he not know that a general order went out under my own hand throughout the whole Intercolonial Railway to the effect that no officer employed on the road was warranted in exercising any pressure in any shape or form, that every man must be left entirely free to vote as he pleased—given an opportunity to vote and be afforded facilities for going to the polls on both sides of politics and if there was any violation or infringement of the order they were called upon to notify the department of it.

Mr. FOWLER. It is all very easy to issue these general orders, but there is not a man in this House, certainly there is not a man on the other side of the House, so absolutely simple as cannot understand how these orders can be evaded. I do not give hon. gentlemen opposite credit for any great astuteness. To get away from this matter—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes, yes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, we will discuss it just as long as you like. The longer we discuss it the worse it is for yourselves. I do not consider that this sort of thing is very high statesmanship, and that is why I was so much surprised——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it would be well, as far as possible, to confine the discussion to the question under consideration. The question under consideration is the propriety of granting $140,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway as rent for the use of their railway, and I would like the committee to confine itself to that question.

Mr. FOWLER. I was referring to some remarks made by the hon. member for Westmoreland. I have not deviated nearly as far from the question as did the hon. member for Westmoreland. He gave us a history of his early life and of his early struggles. He told us how it was necessary for him to look to Boston for his education rather than McGill and all that sort of thing. He was allowed to make this very great deviation without question on the part of the Chair, and yet I am to be strictly held to order when I simply refer to some matters in connection with the railway and not in connection with the different universities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) will allow me to make one remark. I will appeal to the Chairman whether it would not be fair to all members of the House to allow the discussion to continue in the same general way in which it has been carried on up to the present time. I think there should perhaps be some limitation, but I think, since the discussion of a general character has been commenced and has continued down to the present time, if you, Mr. Chairman, would so rule, it would meet the wishes of the committee as a whole that the hon. gentleman be allowed to continue the general discussion.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The subject that was under the consideration of the committee up to this afternoon was the Intercolonial Railway itself, a much wider question than the subject under consideration now. Would it not be better for the committee——

Mr. FOWLER. On what item ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Item 268. Would it not be better to allow item 269 to pass and then the next item would be the Intercolonial Railway ?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has to bring down certain information which he has not brought down yet.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Well, if it is the desire of the committee the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) may proceed.

Mr. FOWLER. I rose before the item which was under discussion by the hon. member for Westmoreland was carried. I rose several times to speak while that little side discussion was going on, but I was so unfortunate as not to be able to get the Chairman's eye. It seems to me that the hon. member for Westmoreland, in his desire to show to the committee and the country that there had been brought about, between himself and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, a reconciliation, should have made some defence of the railway policy of the hon. minister when that item was under discussion. It seems to me that he should have endeavoured to have made some reply

to the most convincing speech that was made by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) in connection with the mismanagement of the Intercolonial Railway, a speech the most argumentative, the most logical, of any speech that I ever remember listening to since I have been a member of this House, a speech which was most convincing in its arguments and a speech which showed that there had been the grossest mismanagement on the part of the hon. minister in connection with his department. Yet, the hon. member for Westmoreland, who comes from the railway centre of New Brunswick, was unable—we must presume he was unable, because he did not avail himself of the opportunity—to reply to a single one of the charges that were made against the management of the Intercolonial Railway. There was the question of the tie scandal; he might have shown, if he could, the necessity of purchasing 1,300,000 ties when the department required only 300,000 or 400,000, he might have shown why it was that they purchased ties whose life is only three or four years when they might have had the other kind. He knew that it was impossible to defend such a scandalous thing as that. But, the hon. gentleman had to make a defence in his own behalf in connection with the tie scandal. He had to defend his conduct, or to attempt to defend it, in obtaining possession of this celebrated letter which was written in pencil by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the tie inspector. He found it necessary to make some defence as to that. The hon. gentleman is a lawyer, but I do not think, were he defending a man who was charged with being the receiver of stolen goods, and he made such a lame defence as he did in this case, that he could expect any common sense, intelligent jury to acquit the man. He admits the whole thing. What a spectacle have we in this House of Commons? An hon. gentleman who is the representative of one of the largest constituencies in the Dominion of Canada and one of the most intelligent constituencies gets up in his place in the House of Commons, in the parliament of Canada, and admits that he is a receiver of stolen goods—admits more, admits that he is an accessory before the fact of the theft of these goods that this man McManus was acting under his direction, and acting at his request when he went to his brother's desk and abstracted this letter. What defence can there be for that? Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may say—oh, he was his brother and therefore it is no harm. Does it make it any less a theft because one brother takes from the property of the other? Has the hon. gentleman never heard of one brother murdering another brother; of a son murdering a father? Why, to-day there is in one of the jails of this province a man charged with the murder of his father. It is a crime just as much as though it was the murder of a stranger; aye, the relationship makes the offence the greater. And here is the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), who admits that by his direction this man stole this letter, and that he took the letter from this man knowing it to have been stolen. That is the whole case in a nutshell. And how does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) defend himself? He says: I did not find the letter in a spittoon and piece it together. That is the only defence he can offer to the House and to the country for his conduct. Why, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of law, and he is lawyer enough to know it, whatever the moral offence may be, he could not be tried and convicted for finding the letter in a spittoon and piecing it together, but he could for the other offence.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) made an attempt to justify the purchase of these ties by saying they were not all purchased before the elections. What a defence that is. If they were not purchased before the election, how easy a matter it is to make a promise previous to the election and to carry it out after the election, and that is just what was done in this case.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. gentleman any evidence to adduce to show that a promise was made before the elections and carried out afterwards?

Mr. FOWLER. I did not make the statement. I simply said that it was a very easy matter to make a bargain before the election and carry it out afterwards. Some of the back benchers on the other side are making so much noise that the minister does not hear correctly what I say. I notice that when things are getting a little too hot for them over there, they always take that way of trying to drown the voice of the speaker; particularly some of these gentlemen from the woolly west.

Now, Sir, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) appealed to me to know whether I favoured expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. In answer to that appeal I say, that I do favour proper expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway. And let me say, that so far as this question of the sale of the Intercolonial Railway is concerned, I would at once acquit the Minister of Railways from having the remotest idea of ever making such a sale, or of even bargaining for such a sale, or having anything to do with negotiations in connection with it. I acquit him because the Minister of Railways is a New Brunswicker, and he knows very well the feeling of the people of New Brunswick on that matter. He knows that the building of the Intercolonial Railway was a part of the confederation compact and that the people of New Brunswick would never consent to the Intercolonial Railway being handed over to any private corporation. We are in fa-

vour of any proper and reasonable expenditure upon that road, and I want to say in justice to the Minister of Railways, that along some lines he has made a very proper expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway, and he has improved that railway to a considerable extent. But I do not go the length of the hon. member for Westmoreland, who said that the minister found it a tramway and made it a great railway; nor do I go the length of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who told us they found the terminus of the Intercolonial Railway in a ploughed field. I should think that the hon. gentleman who represents Lévis would not thank the Minister of Trade and Commerce for having spoken in such a way of the town of Lévis.

Mr. BENNETT. It was the Prime Minister who said that.

Mr. FOWLER. The Prime Minister, was it! I say that the Intercolonial Railway has always been kept up to a high degree of efficiency, and that the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) is deserving of the credit that he has not allowed it to run down, and that he has in many ways kept pace with the improvements of the times, because, as we know all railways have improved in their rolling stock and every thing else. But I do say, Mr. Chairman, that many of the expenditures made by the minister on that railway have been wasteful and extravagant, and that the people have not got from that expenditure the good which they ought to have got. Take for instance this large purchase of twenty or more acres of marsh land some two miles out of the city of St. John, at $475 an acre.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not two miles.

Mr. FOWLER. It is more than a mile.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not a mile from the station.

Mr. FOWLER. Oh, yes, further than that. The roundhouse is well on to a mile out, and this is a long way from the roundhouse.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. FOWLER. If the hon. gentleman ever walked it he would know it is a great deal longer than he thinks. But suppose it is a mile outside.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not a mile.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is within the city limits.

Mr. FOWLER. That may be true, but the city limits extend a long way out; they extend beyond the hotel known as the 'One Mile House,' and this land is beyond that. I had occasion to walk this, and I know what the distance is. However that may be, this land was part of a property some of which was expropriated by the Horticultural Society.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When?

Mr. FOWLER. Some years ago, but land has not increased in value to an appreciable extent since that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was worth a dollar a foot then.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOWLER. Let them go on, they do not worry me at all. A part of the property lying nearer to the city than this was expropriated by the Horticultural Society, and a very much less price was paid for it than the government paid for this land. Instead of $475 an acre being paid, something over $200 an acre was paid, and some of the land, not the marsh land, I think, was sold for $55 an acre. At all events, the price paid by the government is at least double what it should be. Of course, there is some middleman who does not appear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no middleman.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister should not get so restless. He is so stirred up by this matter that he feels that everything that is said is a direct reflection on him whether there is an attempt to connect it with him or not. I do not say that the minister knew anything about the middleman, but I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that there was a middleman who had a considerable rake off.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) that there was not any middleman.

Mr. FOWLER. I put it to the hon. minister—why could there not be a middleman without the minister knowing it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no margin for any middleman business in it.

Mr. FOWLER. This land was only farming land, and would not be built upon in the next fifty years, even if the city of St. John should have the growth we all expect. The best marsh lands in the county of Westmoreland can be bought for $100 an acre—better land than that. There is a man, another Gilbert, who has a farm of 200 acres, in the neighbourhood of this land, which yields about 200 tons of hay, and which he rents for $1,000 a year. How much interest would $1,000 a year be on 200 acres at $475 an acre? It would not be 1 per cent.

Mr. EMMERSON. Would my hon. friend pardon me? I wish to correct him, and to

say that there are marsh lands in the county of Westmoreland, remote from any town or city, which are selling at from $160 to $200 an acre, and large bodies of them too.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend knows that it is very rare that marsh lands run up to $150 an acre. The general price for the best marsh lands is $100, and they are not remote either. I am surprised at my hon. friend making such a statement. Some little individual piece of marsh land may sell at $150, but the English marsh land will not average more than $100 an acre. I say that expenditure is extravagant, and there are lots of expenditure along the same line. Wherever the hon. minister has improved the conditions of the road, and done it at a reasonable cost, I would be the first to give him his due meed of credit; but we have a right to condemn this wasteful and extravagant expenditure. We are anxious that the road should be maintained in a proper state of efficiency. I am glad that the minister extended the Intercolonial Railway to the city of Montreal, and I trust that he will go on and extend it further. I am in favour of making the Intercolonial Railway a great trunk line. In saying this I am stating my individual view; I do not know to what extent it may accord with the views of gentlemen on this side of the House, but I say I am in favour of a proper and due extension of the Intercolonial Railway. Now, Sir, I do not propose to take up any more time of this committee at present. If there were anything more in the speech of my hon. friend from Westmoreland which required a reply, I should impose on the committee at further length, but I think I have amply replied to the few matters he brought forward.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of care and attention to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) as well to those of the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). I did on two or three occasions interrupt the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, and I cannot complain of the courtesy he extended to me in replying to any questions which I may have asked him. But, Sir, after hearing the discussion of these three gentlemen in regard to the Intercolonial Railway, I heard a very serious charge made against the hon. memeber for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), that hon. gentleman being in the House at the time, and I took the liberty of rising before the House closed last night and asking why the hon. member for Westmoreland did not rise in his place and defend himself against the serious charge of stealing a letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, I am using the language which was used by an hon. member who addressed this House yesterday. For charging that serious crime the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who made the remark, and I was taunted to-day by the hon. member for Westmoreland to the effect that he did not have to go to the province of Ontario to learn either morals or anything else in connection with politics, and he did not see any reason why the hon. member for East Simcoe or the hon. member for West Elgin, as he termed me, should have anything to say about the matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. I beg pardon, I mean East Elgin.

Mr. INGRAM. Unfortunately for the hon. gentleman, he referred to an incident which must bring a blush to the face of every Liberal in the Dominion of Canada——

Mr. BENNETT. They have no blushes.

Mr. INGRAM. An incident which occurred in the province of Ontario some years ago; an incident that brought about one of the most disgraceful acts that were ever committed by the Liberal party in the province of Ontario.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was not the letter which was issued to the people of Haldimand, I believe, during a certain election?

Mr. BENNETT. Come again.

Mr. INGRAM. I will see you before I get through, and go you one better. My hon. friend referred to the incident known as the 'speak now' and 'spittoon' incident, which led to the defeat of one of the most honourable men who ever conducted public affairs in the Dominion of Canada. I refer to the late Hon. John Sanfield Macdonald, who was sent to his grave by the false charges preferred against him by the Liberals of the province of Ontario. I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to place their fingers on one corrupt or dishonourable act committed by John Sanfield Macdonald or his government; but it was by such disgraceful tactics that he was driven from power, and it is a lamentable thing for the people of the province of Ontario. With regard to the hon. gentleman's reference to myself, I have conducted five elections in the county of Elgin. I have had the honour of representing both ends of that county, and during those five elections but one protest was filed against me; and after four days of fishing by my opponents, they succeeded in finding three paltry cases which caused me to be unseated. I want to compare that record with an incident that occurred in the county of Elgin, one of the most disgraceful that any Liberal candidate has ever been guilty of. I have the proof here over the signature of the Liberal candidate in West Elgin, and for the information of my hon. friend, who has not been very long in this House, and perhaps

is not very well posted in the history of his party in the province of Ontario, I will read the document, which contains one of the most damnable catalogues of infamy in the history of Canada. This document is signed by Donald McNish, having been prepared by his own solicitor, and is addressed to Messrs. Crothers & Price, barristers, of St. Thomas, who were acting for his opponent, and on this his election was voided, and it took only a few minutes for the court to void it. What does he say ? He says :

St. Thomas, June 26, 1899.

Messrs. Crothers & Price, Barristers, &c.,
St. Thomas, Ontario.

Dear Sirs,—We beg to advise you that Mr. Macnish has discussed at length with his solicitors the charges contained in the petition which has been filed against his return as member of the legislative assembly of Ontario for West Elgin, and that they have to a considerable extent investigated the charges contained therein and other matters which have come to their knowledge in connection with the election. And the subscribers hereto make the following statements and admissions respecting the same :

1. That a large number of persons were specially sent into the constituency by men working on behalf of the Liberal party for the express purpose of taking part on Mr. Macnish's behalf in the election held January 12, 1899, and we believe that fraudulent and corrupt means were used by some of such persons to secure his election.

2. That several of the said persons illegally and without authority acted as deputy returning officers at the said election, and in at least three cases so acted in the names of reputable local men, having, under assumed names, been introduced to the returning officer by local agents of Mr. Macnish.

3. That in many of the polling subdivisions of the riding there were grave irregularities connected with the return of the ballot boxes and their contents, the voting, and the counting of the ballots thereat.

4. That there were large numbers of persons brought into the riding for the express purpose of personating legitimate voters, and assisted by some of Mr. Macnish's local supporters such persons did personate qualified votes in voting for Mr. Macnish.

5. That the declared number of votes for Mr. Macnish largely exceeded the number of bona fide votes cast for him.

6. That a large number of votes cast for Mr. Macdiarmid were in some nefarious and corrupt manner manipulated, whereby the result of the election was rendered doubtful and that in this connction the voting at Shedden and Middlemarch and in several divisions in St. Thomas, where said strangers so acted as deputy returning officers, merits special mention.

7. That there are good reasons to believe that there are many specific and well authenticated cases where agents of Mr. Macnish concealed at their homes some of those strangers, who there paid large sums of money to electors to induce them to vote for him.

8. That Mr. Macnish will forthwith deliver to the Speaker of the legislative assembly his resignation as a member thereof for the said electoral district.

(Sgd.) DONALD MACNISH.

Witness :
(Sgd.) A. B. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. INGRAM.

This is signed by Donald Macnish. I just point this out to show my hon. friend that when he casts reflections on the Conservative party in Ontario, he had better study up the history of his own party in that province, and then I am sure that he will refrain from making any more charges of the kind.

With respect to the letter itself, my hon. friend made a statement before the committee that during the Easter recess, he went to Moncton and that he did not want to meet Mr. Charles McManus because he did not wish to have any conversation with him respecting the fraudulent inspection of ties.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that I did not want to have any conversation with Mr. McManus with respect to any evidence he might be called on to make before the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman did not wish to meet Mr. McManus.

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to any evidence he might be called on to give before the committee. He had already been summoned, and I knew that fact as a member of the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. And the hon. gentleman said:

I would like to make an explanation. I had been attending the meetings of this committee previous to the Easter holidays, when I was much interested in this question. When I returned to Moncton, I did not want to talk to Mr. McManus, the inspector,—

Why did the hon. gentleman not want to talk to him? Was there anything disgraceful in talking to a man who, as he told the committee, belonged to a respectable and honourable family ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Surely my hon. friend will accept the statement that I made. What I said was that I did not wish to have any conversation with Mr. McManus with respect to any evidence he might be called on to make before the committee, knowing as I did, that he had been summoned before that committee.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell me when he procured the letter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated before the committee that I procured the letter during my sojourn at home, during the Easter holidays, and brought it to Ottawa when I returned to my parliamentary duties.

Mr. INGRAM. And that is strictly correct, I presume. That is the statement which the hon. gentleman made. Here is some of the evidence to which I wish to refer. On the 30th March last the hon. gentleman said:

I would like to ask——

He broke in on the question asked. He did not pause, he did not hesitate to break in when he thought he could make a point.

—I would like to ask if Mr. McManus is a man of good repute in that section of the country ? —A. I have never heard anything against him at all.

Q. You know the family with which he is connected ?—A. I do.

Q. One of the oldest Westmoreland families, of the highest respectability and highest character as a family ?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it fair to ask you this, I think, or do you not know that Mr. McManus absolutely and entirely repudiates the passing of anything like poplar ties or anything of that kind or fir ties? —A. That was what I was told by Mr. Russell, of Moncton, who has questioned him.

Will the hon. gentleman tell this House how he knew that Mr. McManus had repudiated the idea of inspecting fir or poplar ties?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will tell my hon. friend. That incident occurred on the 13th March, before Mr. McManus had been summoned as a witness. It was a matter of general repute that he had repudiated the passing of these ties. That was reported generally as the statement which he had made to the engineer of maintenance.

Mr. INGRAM. And the hon. gentleman was present. That was the statement the hon. gentleman made on the 30th March. He was particularly eager to break in with a question to show that McManus belonged to a highly respectable family. What occurred later on? The hon. gentleman was present with this letter in his pocket, which exonerated McManus. Did he rush up and interrupt the gentleman who was trying to find out whether McManus did have this letter in his possession ? He did not. That hon. gentleman had been questioning over half an hour, and the hon. gentleman sat in his place with the letter in his pocket, and did not get up and try to defend McManus by producing the letter.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was very cruel on my part.

Mr. INGRAM. What did he do ? He took the Minister of Railways aside and consulted him about the letter. Then he waited half an hour or so until Mr. Barker proved that McManus had been given this letter by the Minister of Railways. Why was it necessary to give this letter to McManus, in compliance with which McManus passed a large number of ties which he should not have passed. When McManus was desirous of doing his duty and refused to accept white spruce, when black spruce was named in the tender, what did this gentleman, who was trying to sell ties to the government say? Let me read what occurred :

Q. How many ties had you rejected of Mr. Ultican ?—A. I hadn't inspected any of them before that.

Q. You had not inspected them at all ?—A. Which.

Q. Mr. Culligan's ties.—A. He took me out to show me the ties, do you see, and I saw that they were white spruce ties, the big run of them, and I said to Mr. Culligan : Your ties are white spruce, and he says: 'Yes, what of it,' and I pulled out this memorandum and showed it to him, that I was to take black spruce, he wanted to see the words, and he came and looked over my shoulder and looked at it and said: 'How the hell did that come there, I never agreed to give black spruce, there is none grows here.' I says. 'I don't know,' and he says: 'Its all right, I'll see Pottinger about it.' That's all the conversation we had.

Q. You were not going to take the ties on account of their being white spruce?—A. I was going to refuse them.

Q. He managed to get them taken afterwards? —A. Yes.

I want to show that when McManus was desirous of doing his duty by not accepting the white spruce, he afterwards got a letter direct from the minister, telling him to accept these ties.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, then, I will have to read it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Read the language in the letter.

Mr. INGRAM. Here is the famous letter, and what does it say ?

Mr. McManus will please inspect Mr. Culligan's ties the same as Mr. Ultican's.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Oh, oh.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) who does not appear to know much about the matter interrupts as usual. What did the tender call for in Ultican's contract ? It called for spruce ties, not for black spruce, and this letter was an instruction to this man to accept white spruce ties. Now, the government railways of this country have managers; they have chief engineers, and this Mr. McManus was acting under the engineer. If the minister had acted in the proper way, he would have instructed the engineer of the railway to tell Mr. McManus that he might inspect these ties the same as the others. No, he comes down from his lofty position as Minister of Railways and tells this gentleman receiving $2 a day, how he should do his work. This whole letter business from beginning to end is a fraud on the face of it. It is disgraceful, and dishonourable to say the least of it. And I will go further and say that my hon. friend from Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) must surely have some other object than that which he stated in the House for procuring the letter in the way he did and presenting it to the Committee on Public Accounts as he did.

Mr. EMMERSON. I regret that the hon. gentleman does not feel that he can accept my statements.

Mr. INGRAM. I am simply going by the evidence, and I prefer doing that in this case. I represent, it is true, a constituency in the province of Ontario. But

I wish to point out in my eastern province friends that if they wish the government railways of this country to be a success, if they wish them to be popular throughout the Dominion, they should do what they can to have those railways conducted in an economical and efficient way. Coming from the province of Ontario as I do—the province that pays the greatest proportion of the taxes of this Dominion—is it not my right and duty as a public man to see that the government railways are conducted in as economical a manner as possible? I challenge any hon gentleman to put his finger on a single syllable used by any gentleman on the Conservative side against the Intercolonial Railway. No hon. gentleman on this side condemns the Intercolonial Railway because it is a government road. What we do, and what we have a right to do, is to condemn unwise and extravagant expenditures on that railway. Do we want more proof than the statement made by the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) yesterday? Since I first had a seat in this House, I have never heard a better statement in connection with the railway than the one made by that hon. gentleman last night. Let it be not forgotten that it is the statement of a gentleman who at one time was general manager of a railway in this country. No more capable man to discuss the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway could be brought forward in this House than the hon. member for Hamilton. And I am sure no hon. gentleman can say that my hon friend from Hamilton used language that could possibly have been offensive to hon. gentlemen opposite or to any other. We simply desire to discuss this matter fairly, to give our views frankly, hoping that by so doing we shall assist in making the road a success. And I will go further and say that if justification were needed for the complaints made by hon. members on this side concerning the management of the Intercolonial Railway, it is be found in the statement of the Minister of Railways yesterday. What do we find in that document which the hon. gentleman himself read in this House? This is a document dated at Moncton, May 1st, 1899, addressed to the Minister of Railways and Canals and signed by D. Pottinger, general manager. And on the last page of this document, I find the following:

> It is difficult to speak with certainty of what ought to be done to meet the demands of the passenger traffic. Both with regard to the locomotives and cars, it is more a question of competition, appearances, speed, comfort and safety, than one of reducing expenses per train mile. I feel that you are quite familiar with the facts, and requirements in regard to this and that I need not say very much about it beyond pointing out that our passenger engines are small and that the condition of our tracks is anything but a good advertisement for our road. A stranger visiting the provinces for the first time would conclude from their appearance that the road was very much embarrassed financially, so poor that it could not afford to make a decent appearance, unable even to spend enough to keep them clean, and when we know that they belong to the Canadian government and therefore in some degree represent it before the world, we cannot help feeling ashamed for their appearance. Our cars are built long before comfort was considered a necessity in railway travelling and we have not been renewing our cars at such a rate as to be able to say that we have a respectable and modern equipment.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will the hon. gentleman give the date of that letter?

Mr. INGRAM. May, 1899. Now, I wish to be perfectly clear—I am not trying to make a point against the government with respect to this, but making a statement as a member of this House who, I hope, seeks to offer something that will assist in making that road what it ought to be. And I say that if that road at any time, whether under a Conservative government or under this government, was in the condition here described, it is a disgrace to the Dominion. And, so far as I am concerned, if it is necessary to vote money for the purpose of making that road what it ought to be, and fit to compete with any line of railway in this country, I am prepared to vote what I believe is a sufficient sum to put it in that condition. At the same time, I wish to say as strongly as I can that I entirely disapprove of the methods followed in the management of that railway.

My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) referred to the case of coal purchases as an instance. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) did not complain of any of the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway. But I challenge him or any hon. gentleman in this House who knows anything about railroading to stand up in this House and discuss these expenditures. One who would not find fault in such a case as this is no true friend of the Intercolonial Railway. It has been admitted in this House that, on the 30th of June, 1900, there were fifteen thousands tons of coal in possession of the road. It has been proven in evidence that there was a feeling of unrest among the coal mines of Nova Scotia even from January or February. These being the circumstances, I charge the management of that railway with being negligent in their duty in not preparing themselves for that threatened strike. In the latter part of December, the railway management found themselves with only six days' supply of coal on hand, and this in the face of a threatened strike of the miners. Is there any railway in this country properly managed who would allow themselves to get so low in coal in the face of this danger of a cessation of supplies? No, not one railway company in this country would do anything of the kind. What do we find further? We find an agreement drawn up by the different coal companies in the province along the line of this railway, and we find the coal companies shrewd and sharp enough to have inserted in their

agreement with the government a clause that in case of a strike they should not be bound to furnish the required amount of coal under the contract. Now that is a fact. Do we find the government protecting themselves? Not at all. What ought the government to have done in a case of that kind? In preparing their contracts with the coal companies, when the coal companies demanded a clause of this kind, the government should have said: Here you are demanding a certain thing to protect yourselves; now, we ask that certain protection should be given to us. And what would that be? That a clause should be inserted that in case of a strike by the miners, and in case they could not furnish the required amount of coal to the railway, in case of the government being compelled to buy their coal elsewhere and get a large supply on hand—in that case the government would not be bound to buy the supply agreed upon between the parties. That would have been a proper course to take, that would have been a protection to the government. The government had on hand over $500,000 worth of coal on the 30th of June, 1901. Why were they compelled to have so much on hand? Because, in addition to having a large supply of American coal on hand, they were compelled by their agreement with the coal companies to take the amount which the agreement mentioned. So I say they were remiss in their management of the coal contract with the companies. Every man knows that if you have a large supply of coal on a railway, that coal naturally becomes slack when it is exposed to the weather; when it is exposed to the rain and the sunshine it does not have the same heating properties as it would have when taken fresh from the mine. So I say in this instance the government lost a large amount of money in buying coal when the price was something like 50 per cent more than it had been the previous year. The coal they were required to buy during the time of this strike, rose in price, some of it as high as $5.12 a ton, an enormous price to pay for coal, a much larger price than is paid by any railway in this country.

Then we find the same bad management with respect to ties. The manager, under his sworn statement before that committee, says he was the gentleman who prepared the estimates, and he knew that it would only be necessary to have 300,000 or 400,000 ties supplied during that year. What do we find him doing? We find him taking no less than 1,300,000 ties. The question was asked: Do these ties lose in life by lying long unused?—No, he did not think so. Why, Sir, he was so inexperienced in regard to ties that he could not form an estimate of the probable lifetime of ties of any diameter. That man could not say whether or not ties lose in value when lying around year after year without being used. Every man knows well, who has any railway experience at all, that the sooner you place ties in the railway, the longer they will last. Now I think that is ample with respect to coal and ties.

Now, with respect to engines. I undertook yesterday to interrupt the Minister of Railways and Canals when speaking of engines. I am one of those who believe in Canadian industries. I have had some experience on railways in this country and in the United States; I have been employed on something like seven or eight railways in Canada and the United States, and I know something both of handling engines and of their construction; and I want to criticise Mr. Russell for his course in respect to those engines. Notwithstanding the statement made by the Minister of Railways and Canals that Mr. Russell had been a Canadian, and had been employed on the Intercolonial Railway years ago, I want to point out that he wrote a circular which could be taken advantage of by every manufacturer of engines in the United States—to the effect that these Kingston engines were not up to the mark, and that the Cooke engine was not up to the mark. To allow that to be sent around to the different superintendents and to be reproduced in the public press of this country, I say was a very improper step on the part of Mr. Russell. Why do I say so? Especially in view of this fact, that Mr. Muhlfeld is a practical man, and Mr. Muhlfeld told him in conversation that the construction of these engines was not to blame, that if he had an opportunity of readjusting them he would be able to ascertain whether it was the fault of the engineers who were running the engines, whether it was the fault of the coal, or whether it was the fault of the construction of the engines. Why was not Mr. Russell content with that? Why did he not instruct this gentleman to take these engines in and perform that readjustment, and try to give them a proper test? He did nothing of the kind, but he issued this circular, and that is what I condemn him for. I know that these Kingston engines have performed their duties as well and better than a great many engines used on the railways in this country. I have no interest whatever in the manufacture of these engines at Kingston, I know that that industry has been used for the purpose of promoting the interest of the Liberal party in this country; therefore I cannot be charged as a Conservative with any desire to show undue favour to that industry. Therefore I am the more free to say that I consider these Kingston engines are good engines, and I trust that more of them may be employed on that railway.

Now with respect to the rolling stock. Why, Sir, we have it in evidence that hundreds and hundreds of cars on that railway are lying idle; we have it in evidence by this mechanical superintendent that he does not know the condition of a great deal of the rolling stock. Yet the government is expending large sums of money in purchasing new rolling stock to be used on that rail-

way. Now, would it not be in the interest of economy for the officers of that railway to inspect the rolling stock thoroughly, and when they found some requiring repairs, to make the repairs so that it might be put in service again, thus saving a large sum of money. I can quite understand the indifference of the general manager on that point. What did Mr. Pottinger care about charging up new material to capital account? If the government and parliament were satisfied, what had he to do with it? Why, Sir, if the general manager could get all the money he wants, is he going to exercise economy? Certainly not. So I say that, instead of buying any more stock, a large amount of that on hand could have been saved by economy and proper management.

Now a good deal has been said about capital account, as respects earnings, and charging up to maintenance, and so forth. I have always understood that in conducting a railway in this country, or any other country, it was the duty of the management first, to conduct their railway as economically as possible; secondly, to keep their expenditure well within their earnings; and thirdly, at the end of the year, to take their expenditure and subtract it from their earnings and show, if possible, a surplus to the stockholders of the company.

I always understood that was the proper method of conducting a railway in this country, but since I have been in this House I have found that a different method is pursued. A method is pursued whereby they can buy stock for the railway, and when it gets worn out they can simply throw it to one side, get fresh stock, charge it to capital account and never charge it to maintenance at all. Now, hon. gentlemen have given the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals a certificate of character inasmuch as that hon. gentleman had conducted this railway in a non-partisan spirit. This is a question in regard to which I can fairly take credit to myself, because, when my own friends were in office, I did then, as I do now—I opposed the political influence that was being used on that railway in one way or the other, and from the information which I have from a very reliable source, I believe this same political influence is still in existence in the management of that railway. I want to say that we have in the general manager a gentleman, who, though, to my mind, may have very poor judgment in some cases, has very good judgment in others, but, I do say in that gentleman's behalf, that if he were not interfered with, if he were allowed to manage that railway without any interference from political parties, I believe he would be in a position to show a better record in the administration of the railway. But, as I said before, it is owing to political interference from time to time which is the curse of the management of that railway, and the chief reason why the people have to pay large sums of money that it is now actually termed the sink hole of the government in this country.

Now, there is another question with the respect to the extension of sidings. Mr. Pottinger gave evidence under oath in regard to the Copper Crown Company's siding. I want to draw the attention of the hon. member for Westmoreland to the fact that he had better carefully re-read the evidence in connection with the Copper Crown question, and if there are any hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who will read that evidence very carefully, they will come to the conclusion that there was something materially wrong in connection with this transaction. It is all very well to say that it is a small case, that as it involves an expenditure of only $20,000, it is not worth bothering about, but it is the little things on a railway, when added together at the end of the year, which amount to large sums, and before the hon. minister undertakes to expend sums of money from $20,000 and upwards, the general manager should so guide these expenditures that no advantage will be taken, that a hundred cents' worth of material and labour will be furnished for every hundred cents of expenditure. What do we find that the general manager says? Upon going to interview the Copper Crown Company for the purpose of finding out what the output of the company was, he found that the company had exaggerated the output of their mine. That he stated in his evidence. Now, I would like hon. gentlemen in this House to compare this statement with what I am going to say. Where any company or individual want a siding run into their works, the company or individual construct a siding, pay for it and afterwards, if the railway company have secured freight, and they have continued to secure freight they give the company, or the individual, a rebate on that freight to compensate for the expenditure made on this siding. That would have been a wise course to have taken in this case, but what do we find to be the fact? After the company had exaggerated the amount of material taken out of their mine, the general manager goes away, notwithstanding that fact, and authorizes an expenditure of $20,000 on this siding over which to-day there is not a pound of freight passing, over which only 4,000 tons of freight have passed, and for which something like $3,000 has been paid. And it is a question whether there will ever be a pound of freight passing over that line again. If he had taken the proper course he would have said to this company: Construct your siding, we will haul your freight, and when you have earned sufficient in rebate on your freight you will get your money back. That would have been a guarantee to the people of Canada that they would not lose anything by the transaction, but there is something like $17,000 to date of a loss on the transaction, and there is yet due to Mr. Macdonald $500 for legal

expenses in connection with the transaction. This is one instance of the way in which this railway is conducted.

Again, we have a principle in this House and one which not only applies to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, but to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and to every department of this government, and it is this: Who has the better right to pass these estimates? Whose duty is it, as representatives in this House, to pass these estimates? Is it not as much our duty to assist in passing these estimates and to criticise them as it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite? Is it not in the interest of the people that we should discuss these estimates? In an honest discussion of these estimates there should be a method pursued by this government and that method should be that where any public work is to be constructed, I care not whether it is a canal, a railway, a public building, or whatever it is upon which public money is to be expended in this country, the department that wishes to expend this money on such a project, should first have their engineer, or other officer, whose duty it is, give a proper estimate of the cost of the work. Then, once the government agree on a policy in connection with it, and once they agree to perform that work, it is their duty to come down to this House and, supposing a work is to cost $1,000,000 and that the government feel that they cannot expend $1,000,000 this year, let them come down with $200,000 in their estimates for this purpose. Let them say: This $200,000 is to be expended on a certain work; we expect, according to the estimate, that the work will cost $1,000,000, each year following we hope to expend $200,000 until the expiration of five years, when we will have spent $1,000,000 on this work, and this amount, we expect, will complete it. What is the system that is pursued to-day by the government? They first come down to the House, and for instance, taking the case of the Sydney Railway extension, they ask for $8,000 to finish this work. Does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals confine the expenditure to that? Not at all. What does he do? He first expends $649 in advertising a work which cost $8,000.

Then he goes on, irrespective of parliament, and he expends nearly $17,000 on a work for which he was only authorized to spend $8,000. Is that the proper duty of government? Is that the way in which the money of the people should be expended? Certainly not. But it is only one example of the conduct of the Minister of Railways, and of other ministers. We have had a unfortunate spectacle not long ago, of a minister taking some $13,000 out of an expenditure that had been voted in 1901, and applying it to a work that had been begun in 1891. Is not that a disgraceful way to conduct the affairs of the country? It is simply a farce for the representatives of the people to come to this parliament, and pretend to pass estimates when we have ministers of the Crown expending the money in whatever way they please and without any reference to what parliament decreed. No language is too strong to condemn such conduct. So long as I occupy a seat in this House, I shall to the best of my ability protest against such misappropriation of the money votes given by this House. My hon. friend beside me points out that it was sworn to that no less than $1,364.94 was paid for advertising in connection with three roundhouses, and when the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway was asked, why it was necessary to expend such a large sum for such a purpose, what was the answer of this brilliant manager of this government railway? He told us: People are so busy now and the contractors have so much other work that we cannot secure their services without incurring this large expenditure for advertising. That is something like what we were told the other night, that the government could not get people to accept positions in connection with the census. Well, I congratulate the government. It is the first government that ever had the pleasure of not being able to find people to fill positions. I could speak, Sir, about the Curran railway tie monopoly, and about several other matters, and if I should speak of them, I could speak by the book, because the sworn evidence is before me. I want to know, are the people of Canada going to stand this kind of thing from any government? I want to know if they will allow ministers to do these things. When Mr. McManus, inspector of ties, was changed from his position as tie inspector to be assistant inspector of lumber, a question was asked of Mr. Russell, the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, as to the reason of that change, and the Minister of Railways thought it his duty to get up and object. In no business concern in the world would a question of that kind be objected to by the man who conducted the business. It is the most absurd thing I ever heard of. Had such an objection come from the member for Westmoreland or from others on that side, it would not be so strange, because they believed it their duty so far as they can to burk any inquiry that may damage the government, but when the objection comes from the Minister of Railways, who is responsible for the Intercolonial Railway, it is all the stranger still. I hope at a later period, and before these estimates are passed, to discuss other questions about the expenditure of public money. I trust that I shall do so without offending my opponents, and that whatever I say may add something to help to make the government railway what it ought to be—a paying concern to the people of this country.

Mr. TURGEON. I rise not to commend the action of the Minister of Railways though I would be pleased to do that; but

to commend the action of the railway administration at Moncton, which is well known the Dominion over, never wittingly to have sinned for the love of the Liberal party. I speak with some reluctance, because it was not my intention to take part in the debate, but if I did not refute some of the statements made by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) it might have gone to the province of New Brunswick that the member for Gloucester, from whose district largely these ties were supplied, felt that something had been done that ought not to have been done. I believe I am in a better position than perhaps other hon. gentlemen in this House to give a statement in relation to this matter. In a previous debate I dealt somewhat extensively with the general administration of the Intercolonial Railway, and I shall content myself now by referring to some matters of more local import. I expected that the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) would have delivered an oration which would have gone to the province of New Brunswick as a great condemnation of the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, but the hon. gentleman's speech was short and ineffective. Far be it from me to impute a motive to any member on either side of this House, but sometimes I am amazed at the extraordinary memory of some gentlemen opposite, in its pliability to the requirements or the needs of whatever case they are trying to make out. When the inspector of ties was before the committee, he swore that he inspected ties for Mr. Curran and for Mr. Culligan, and for other parties during many years past. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who was the chief cross-examiner before the Public Accounts Committee, got up in his place and left it to be inferred by the House and by the country that the contract to Mr. Curran had been awarded before the election, and in order to serve the purposes of the election. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) made this statement in view of the sworn evidence of Mr. Pottinger, general manager, that the contract given to Frank Curran for ties was given in December, 1900, or in the early days of January, 1901, several months after the election, and therefore could not have been given for the purpose of influencing the electorate at that time. The general manager himself explained in his evidence, the first day he came before the Public Accounts Committee, that he had advertised for ties for the following year, just as he had done every year since the inception of the road. It is always in the fall of the year, in September, October, and sometimes in November, that ties are asked for by tenders for the next year. He stated that he required at least 600,000 ties for the following summer, and he made an appeal for tenders to the amount of 800,000, as the supplies of previous years had invariably run short of meeting the requirements of the road. And I am hear to say that in the years 1898 and 1899, Mr. Pottinger sometimes sent emissaries to me from Moncton, begging me to try to secure immediately in the district to which I belong ties of which the railway was short. On some occasions I was not able to do it, and they had to get the ties from the upper end of the province of Quebec in order to supply the foremen and the trackmen in the province of New Brunswick and the province of Nova Scotia what they required. Therefore, I say that when the general manager asked for 800,000 ties and in answer to that requisition obtained only 335,000, he was more than justified in taking the course he did. He was not influenced by any political or personal consideration, for I know that Mr. Pottinger has no personal interest in Mr. Curran, but he was bound to secure all the ties he would require for the following year ; and after having given that contract for 185,000 ties or thereabout, to Frank Curran, he was still short of the requirement. It has been stated in this evidence that he only gave that contract after having received in reply to his request tenders for only 350,000 ; and I ask every member of this House who has been in any way connected with railroads, if, after failing to get during the winter the supply of ties required for the following summer, he was not obliged to remain without them until the next winter. Therefore, the contract was given for no political consideration, but as a matter of necessity for the requirements of the road.

Then, again, comes the fact that after having given that contract to Frank Curran, the department had not yet contracted for the full quantities required for the next summer, and knowing by past experience that every summer he had been put to inconvience because of the scarcity of ties and knowing also that the best quality of lumber for ties is getting scarcer and scarcer every year in our district, he said to those contractors, 'bring me all you can.' Is it to be supposed that for political considerations the general manager bought a number of ties and left them over for another year ? The road is bound to run for another year, and what is bought in one year will not have to be bought the next year. No doubt the reason why the general manager succeeded in getting a larger quantity of ties than he expected was that many men on the north shore, in the counties of Restigouche and Gloucester, and I may say Northumberland as well, were induced to go into the tie business, which would enable them to stay at home during the winter instead of going into the lumber camps.

Then this stock of ties would be as valuable to the road the next year as it would have been this year. I even go further, and speak not from my own authority, but from the authority of men who have had

twenty or twenty-five years of experience on railroads in our district—not on the government railroad, but on railroads of private corporations. I speak especially from the authority of the trackmaster of the Caraquet Railway, which runs through the same district. He claims that if he had the means to do so, he would get all his ties a year in advance, because when a tie has been dried for a year it is more valuable and will last longer in the ground than a tie which is cut fresh from the wood.

Again the statement is made that the ties were no good. I know that complaints were made against the inspector. I know nothing personally of the action of the inspector. Although belonging to that district, I never had the pleasure of meeting the inspector from the time the contract was signed until I returned home last summer after my parliamentary duties had ended in June. It was while parliament was in session that I heard the complaint made against the inspector of receiving ties which were not according to the specifications. I might also add that while in this House last spring I received letters from some of my friends complaining of the difficulty they had to get their ties accepted by Inspector McManus, claiming that he was too strict, and that he should not have rejected their ties.

My own personal investigation has shown me that these men had a certain quantity of ties which were certainly not acceptable, and which Mr. McManus refused to accept. Regarding the letter of the minister about which so much has been said, in our locality the inspector has stated that there are two or three kinds of spruce, but that the best kind, which is black spruce, does not grow there. We only see it once in a while, and the spruce which he called white spruce is the ordinary spruce of the country. It is a quality of wood which is certainly even better than cedar for ties. Men of experience know that the white spruce will hold nails for the first five years better than cedar, and therefore is as valuable as cedar itself, which is considered a first class quality of wood for the purpose. I may say also that the supply of cedar is becoming exhausted in that district, so that it is a matter of necessity for the management of the road to accept the spruce which grows in that country. If the black spruce grew there, it is certainly to some extent superior to the white, but it is only a portion of the black spruce, at the butt of the tree, which can be used for ties. Some times out of one tree you will only get one first class tie, because ten or twelve feet from the root the wood has no more value for this purpose than the white spruce. When, therefore, the hon. minister, at the request of the contractor, whose political feelings cannot be appealed to for he is a well reputed Conservative, who worked for the Conservative party even after he got this letter from the minister, accepted white spruce, he did what any business man would have done. No other spruce could be found in that locality, and it was in that locality the minister had to get his supply. That letter therefore, instead of reflecting on the conduct of the minister, shows that he had a practical knowledge of the locality and of the quality of wood required and which could be had there.

In answer to complaints a second inspection was ordered, and according to hon. gentlemen opposite that made a bad showing. Well, I claim that the ties which were supplied by these contractors and received by the inspector were fully equal in quality to those that were always received on the Intercolonial Railway during the administration of the late government. It has been shown also by the evidence of Mr. Pottinger and the inspector of ties that section foremen or trackmasters or roadmasters are often employed as inspectors themselves or as assisting the inspector, and it is well known that sectionmen, as a rule, are fully competent to judge the quality of ties which they are handling. In our district we have seven or eight section foremen. The county of Gloucester is an extensive county, and we have seven or eight sections running through it, and every one of the foremen employed—and who have been employed on the road fifteen or twenty years in most cases—declared over their own signature, and are ready to declare the same under oath if the opposition members want to call them as witnesses, that the ties received are just as good as those which had been received in previous years ever since they have been employed on the railway, and are even perhaps superior, if any discrimination is to be made. I now hold their signed statement in my hand. But these hon. gentlemen do not want to call these men. They only want the evidence of Mr. P. S. Archibald, and failing to get him they want none at all. We can conclude therefore that they must have a motive in refusing every other evidence except that of Mr. Archibald, who they called an engineer of the road. But Mr. Archibald has not been on the road during the last five years and as the reasons which brought about his dismissal have been referred to at length, I need not discuss them now. The inspector has declared himself that, according to his judgment, he was not accustomed to follow strictly the specifications but used his discretion in that respect, and he is a competent man who has been engaged in the lumber and tie business all his life. It is admitted by members on the other side, and it has been proved, as well, that Mr. Chas. McManus is an honest man and that his family is one of the most honoured and respectable and well known perhaps in Nova Scotia as well as in New Brunswick.

I do not think I need extend my remarks any further. All I intended was to sub-

stantiate the evidence of Mr. Pottinger and also the evidence of the inspector, as far as I could from my personal knowledge, and especially commend to this House the sound judgment of the present Minister of Railways when, travelling over the road and inspecting its work, in company with the officials, he took the action he did in the interests of the road and acting on the advice of most competent men.

Mr. TAYLOR. As the minister is not here, I think it would be well to let the item stand over. There has been no proper explanation given.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Which item is it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The item of $140,000 for rental of the Grand Trunk.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought it had been pretty well threshed out, but if hon. gentlemen opposite wish the item to stand, I will not object.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose, if there is anything we wish to say further about it, the hon. minister will have no objection to having it understood that we shall be free to say it on another item.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will agree, then, that the item is carried with the understanding that the subject may be referred to on another item.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—Prince Edward Island Railway, $275,000.

Mr. WILSON. What is the explanation of this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I thought we had gone over the whole railway service so thoroughly that it would not be deemed necessary to give any explanation of these items. If, however, any hon. gentleman desires it, we will suspend the vote on this department, in the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals, who has been obliged to leave, and take up the estimates of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think, perhaps, that would be better. Last night, we did not go on quite as long as we might have done. And my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) have been obliged to take the train.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All the railway experts have left us, so we will proceed with the estimates of the Minister of Justice.

Administration of Justice—Yukon territory—additional salary of judge, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This item appears here rather out of its order. If hon. gentlemen will look at page 26, they will see provision made for salary of judge in the Territorial Court, $4,000. This vote of $1,000 is intended to supplement the other, so as to pay a salary to the Yukon Territory judges of $5,000 each.

Mr. WILSON. What are the names of the judges ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Messrs. Craig and Dugas.

Salary of additional judge, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These two judges form a sort of additional court, now, do they not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. With the third judge it is proposed to appoint, they will. We are taking authority this session to appoint an additional judge. It is proposed that these three judges shall sit as a Court of Appeal from the judgment of a trial judge instead of carrying appeals to British Columbia. And, when the amount involved exceeds $2,000 there will be an appeal from the Territorial Court to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Yukon Territory—Living allowances of judges, $6,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is the same amount as was voted last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is really an additional salary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes. It is given in order to make the position of a judge in the Yukon the same as would be the position of a Superior Court judge in one of the older provinces. The theory is that they have to spend so much more for their maintenance, that a salary of $5,000 in that country would not put a judge there in the same position at all as a judge in any other part of Canada with that salary. I took the precaution to get figures to show what the cost of living out there is. I have been told, for instance, that a house of a very modest character cannot be had in that country for less than $150 a month, that a house servant cannot be engaged for less than $100 a month; that the amount of fuel required is at least 30 cords of wood a year at $16 a cord, $480——

Mr. TAYLOR. And the government gave all its wood away.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Anyhow, we do not expect the judges to be obliged to go out and chop their own wood. Water there costs $20 a month, $240 a year. And so on. In view of these figures the allowance is not at all exorbitant. The item of house rent and service takes up the whole allowance.

Mr. WILSON. Is this $6,000 for the three judges ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, for two only.

Mr. WILSON. But you are going to appoint a third, you are making no provision for him.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, in the supplementary estimates. I may add that we propose in the supplementary estimates to provide a living allowance of $5,000 for each judge. I take this opportunity to let that fact be known that I may not be said to have taken the House by surprise when the item comes down.

Mr. WILSON. And there are travelling expenses also.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The vote of $1,500 for travelling expenses is merely tentative. It covers only travelling within the territory. The item was voted last year, but we have not been called upon to spend any of the money. But it may be found necessary for the convenience of suitors to sit at White Horse or Tagish, and this is to provide for such cases should they arise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any particular object in dividing it up in this way, calling part salary and part living allowances ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have thought we should consider the propriety of giving the judges a round sum as a salary. But there is this objection, which I speak of not from personal experience, but from information I have received, that the country is not one in which a man can be expected to live for more than five or six years and be able to perform his duties. If we fixed the salary at $10,000 or $8,000, and then found it necessary to move a judge say, to the North-west and make an exchange, the question would arise whether, having appointed him at a fixed salary, we had any right to reduce it. It is suggested to me also by the Minister of Finance that the cost of living there may decrease, as we hope it will, and then we can decrease the living allowance, though we could hardly, in that case, decrease a salary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is also an advantage in respect to superannuation, from the country's standpoint.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, I had not thought of that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like, when the hon. gentleman does bring down his proposal with respect to $5,000 for living allowance, that he would furnish us with some data, because it seems to me a pretty large allowance in view of what the judges get in other parts of Canada. For instance, a great many items are comprised in this living allowance, and must necessarily be, in the salary which the judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia receives, $4,000 a year, or the judges of other provinces, with salaries somewhat higher in some cases. I do not know that what you would call a living allowance in this case, would amount to in the salary of a judge in the other provinces. But whatever it may be, it seems to me that the cost of living in the Yukon must be very excessive indeed if a sum of $5,000 is a fair allowance. I am not disposed to be too particular about it, because it is right that the judges there should be adequately paid, but it seems to me, taking all things into consideration, it is a large allowance for that purpose.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When it was suggested that the living allowance of the judges should be increased from $3,000 to $5,000, I asked the commissioner of the Yukon Territory, who is here, to give me some figures which would enable me to justify this increase to the House, and he gave me the figures I gave a moment ago. For instance, he says that a very modest house there will cost $1,800 a year, one servant, $1,200, and other figures that I mentioned a moment ago. In addition, he says, speaking generally, that the cost of living in the Yukon Territory is at least four times greater than in eastern Canada. For instance, meat costs 75 cents a pound, potatoes 18 to 25 cents a pound; during the month of August last, potatoes sold as high as 30 cents a pound; apples and perishable goods of all kinds, 25 to 50 cents a pound. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of his statement, and in view if it, $5,000 is really not an exorbitant amount for living allowance.

Salary of sheriff of Territorial Court, in addition to such fees of office as may be allowed by the Governor in Council, $3,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I would ask, when did Sheriff Eilbeck return to the Yukon, and if he had leave of absence last winter, and for how long ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think he had leave for three or four months, the first leave of absence, I understand, he had since being in that country.

Mr. TAYLOR. What salary does he get ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The present salary is $3,000, and he has been receiving at the same time one-half the fees coming to his office. I think myself that it is a mistake to give any share of the fees to a public officer. I think it is better to pay them a fitting salary, and oblige them to render an account of the fees they receive in connection with their office. The fees paid out there were sufficient to enable the sheriff this year to have a salary of $5,000 or $6,000. When the supplementary estimates are brought down there will be a provision fixing the salary of the sheriff at $4,000 a year, and hereafter he will have no share of the fees.

Mr. TAYLOR. I saw in the Auditor General's report that Sheriff Eilbeck received a commission of 3 per cent on $53,669, and 2

per cent on $57,065, making $2,751 for commissions he made in selling government lands out there, besides $4,800. Then he spent four months of his time electioneering for hon. gentlemen opposite in West Durham. The figures I have given are found in the Auditor General's report, page L—46.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was not in connection with his office as sheriff. I think the hon. gentleman is mistaken. Sheriff Eilbeck may have received that sum in some other capacity, but it was not in connection with his office as sheriff. But whatever his fees may have been in the past, I do not think he will be in receipt of any more. With respect to the statement that he was electioneering in West Durham, I made inquiry as to that—of course I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman—but my information is that he was not in West Durham, although I believe he lived somewhere in that locality. But I could get no information to the effect that he had been electioneering in that place.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can furnish the information. I was up there, and I know something about it. I think that probably these commissions he got in selling this land he distributed, or a portion of them, in West Durham.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think that is likely.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the information I got.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think the hon. gentleman's information must be wrong, because I do not think this gentleman would improperly use such money.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know the gentleman very well, and I think he must have been supplied from other sources.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that is quite right, because in the part of the riding that Sheriff Eilbeck was operating in, and he was canvassing closely, the election went very badly for the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think perhaps a very critical person might object to his salary going on while he was electioneering in West Durham, though I would not be inclined to say much about that. But does not the Minister of Justice think it is rather rubbing it in to ask us to pay for his living allowance while canvassing in West Durham ?

Mr. WILSON. When his salary is raised to $4,000, will he have to furnish his own living allowance ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He gets $1,800 in addition for living allowance.

Salary of clerk of Territorial Court in addition to such fees of office as may be allowed by the Governor in Council, $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. His salary also will be $4,000 a year, with a living allowance of $1,800. Under the present arrangement he makes considerably more than that, and we do not see why he should be in receipt of the emoluments of his office in addition to his salary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is far better to give him a fixed salary. What does the judiciary of the Yukon consist of ? There are three judges and two police magistrates.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are two judges in the High Court and two police magistrates, and the intention is to have three judges and confer upon these three judges the jurisdiction which these police magistrates have now, in the expectation that we will be able to dispense with one of the police magistrates.

Mr. FOWLER. Where are these police magistrates located ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. One is at White Horse and one at Dawson.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These police magistrates are barristers, are they not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, Mr. Taylor, from Ontario somewhere, is a barrister. He is at White Horse. The other police magistrate is Mr. Macaulay, formerly of Belleville. He is at Dawson.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they allowed to practice as barristers ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the one at White Horse, I fancy, is not very much occupied with business. There is not a great deal of business to be done there, but at Dawson the police magistrate has a very great deal to do.

Mr. FOWLER. Does the police magistrate at White Horse practice his profession?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, as far as I can gather from the return there does not appear to be very much to do either for the police magistrate or for the bar. However, it is necessary to have a man there.

To supplement the salary of the surgeon of the North-west Mounted Police at Dawson, on account of his attendance upon long term prisoners, confined at the police guard-room, $400.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that $400 in addition to his salary as surgeon of the police ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He receives as surgeon of the police a salary, and in addition to that he attends to the prisoners who are confined in the jail at Dawson. For the services he renders at the jail he receives $400.

Mr. WILSON. How much is his salary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think that the salary of a surgeon of police in the territories, speaking from memory,

varies from $800 to $1,000. And then there are certain allowances in addition, but I am not prepared to say whether, in the Yukon, there is any additional salary or not. That is the salary in the territories.

Maintenance of prisoners, $40,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the hon. minister any statement as to the number of prisoners there ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the expense of keeping them last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We spent last year $22,812, and the daily average of prisoners was 45. The arrangement is to pay $2 per day to the North-west Mounted Police. We account to them at the rate of $2 a day for each prisoner maintained by them, and of the amount of $22,812 there was $20,000 paid for the Dawson jail, and $1,900 at White Horse. Up to the present time this year the expenditure has been in the vicinity of $19,000.

Transport of prisoners, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does that mean ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have not received from the mounted police the account, but I inquired at the mounted police office here to-day, and I was told that there will be about $3,000 due up to the present time for the services which have been rendered in that connection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where do they transport them to and from ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. From wherever they may happen to be arrested, from different portions of the territory. Some are brought to Dawson, some to White Horse, and a few to Tagish. They are chiefly brought to Dawson.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where are those prisoners convicted and sentenced to penitentiary sent ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We keep them in Dawson as far as possible. There are two convicts in Dawson who are hardened criminals and we thought that perhaps it would be better, as they are life prisoners, that we should move them to the penitentiary in British Columbia, as it would not be safe to keep them in Dawson. My hon. friend must bear in mind that there is a very considerable inconvenience caused by the movement of prisoners by reason of the fact that it is necessary to pass through American territory, and whenever we want to move a prisoner to British Columbia we are obliged to go through the formality of applying to the home authorities, and of having them apply to the Secretary of State at Washington, for the purpose of obtaining permission to take the prisoners through American territory. There are two whom we intend to move, and we have permission to do that.

Witness and jury fees in criminal trials, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We spent $12,000 last year. It appears very large, but my hon. friend will remember that we pay $5 a day to a witness and $5 a day to a juryman. There were last year over eighty criminal trials in the territory, which resulted in this large expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. It appears that in almost every estimate you are asking considerably more than you spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, we are taking the same amount that we had last year, but we had more than we actually expended. I am speaking about what we have expended up to the present time.

Mr. WILSON. In some of these estimates you are asking nearly double the amount ?

Mr. BENNETT. How often are trials by jury held in the year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I really cannot answer that question. My information is that courts are sitting almost continuously.

Mr. FRASER. All the time ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. An Order in Council has been passed enabling the commissioner of the Yukon Territory to fix the sittings of the court. Up to the present time the sittings have been regulated largely by the judges themselves. I really cannot say how many sittings they have in a year, but I know they profess to be very busy, and, judging from the returns, they must have a good deal to do.

Law books, &c., and freight thereon for the use of the bench and bar, and stationery and freight thereon for Territorial Court, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is somewhat misleading. As a matter of fact, we have paid so far this year $1,817.04 in connection with that item—stationery, $1,318.06; freight on stationery, $345 and freight on some law books, $153.10, making in all, $1,817.04.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there a law library for the use of the court provided by the government ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, we have provided a law library for the use of the court, and that includes, also, barristers in that portion of the country.

Miscellaneous expenses, including fees and expenses of Crown prosecutor, salaries and living allowances of stenographers for territorial and police courts, and other officials or employees connected with the administration of justice, coroner's inquests, &c., &c., $30,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who is the Crown prosecutor and what is he paid ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Mr. Wade is the Crown prosecutor. He is now on

leave of absence and he has been replaced by Mr. Congdon, formerly a barrister of Nova Scotia. He is paid by fees which last year amounted to $7,768.91, but that included the services he rendered in connection with the celebrated O'Brien case which occupied thirty days in the trial.

Mr. FOWLER. Is he paid any living allowance.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. Of course he has a large practice in addition to this.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is doing well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there not a barrister who holds the position of legal adviser to the Yukon council or something like that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think there is one, but the Minister of the Interior has the appointment of that officer. I really do not know who he is, or if there is one at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I am considering is, why the legal adviser to the Yukon council should not attend to the duties of Crown prosecutor and save the country $7,000 a year. I do not know how much of his time would be occupied in advising the council of the Yukon, but I should not suppose there can be legal questions continually arising sufficient to take the time of a capable man. The minister might very well consider as to whether the legal adviser must not perform those other duties.

Mr. FOWLER. As the minister expressed the opinion that payment by fees is not a very good principle, it might be a good idea to pay the Crown prosecutor by salary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think that you can apply that rule to the Crown prosecutor. He ought to be one of the leaders of the Bar in any part of the country where he performs his duty, and if he is to be of any use at all he ought to be in active practice. In my own province the Crown prosecutor is paid by fees, except in the city of Montreal.

Mr. FOWLER. He could be allowed to practice outside, and receive a salary at the same time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When I speak of fees, I mean that he gets a per diem allowance. He is paid by the Crown and I presume he considers the Crown as an ordinary client. His services are permanently retained by the Crown in all criminal matters.

Mr. FOWLER. By whom are these fees taxed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They are taxed by the Department of Justice, here the same as the fees of any other counsel who have a claim against us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It occurred to me that a gentleman capable of filling the position of legal adviser to the council of the Yukon ought to be capable of conducting these prosecutions, and I would think he would have sufficient time at his disposal to do so. I know that the late Sir John Thompson when he was Attorney General of Nova Scotia performed the duties of legal adviser such as are incident to the filling of that position, and he conducted all criminal prosecutions at Halifax as well. Of course at the same time he was engaged in an extensive legal practice outside. If there is no objection on the ground of public policy—and none occurs to me at this moment—I would be inclined to think that the legal adviser might very well do this work which Mr. Wade is paid for doing. I think the minister should look into that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That seems to be a very reasonable suggestion, and if my hon. friend will renew the question when the supplementary estimates come down, I will in the meantime make inquiries as to whether there is a legal adviser at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think there is. If I remember aright Mr. Congdon went from the Bar of Nova Scotia to fill that office.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And he was replaced by Mr. Frank Newlands from the North-west Territories, formerly of Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, Mr. Newlands also came from Halifax many years ago. Mr. Congdon, I believe, resigned to enter into partnership with Mr. Wade, and I think Mr. Newlands took his place. I would suggest that Mr. Newlands might have sufficient time at his disposal to discharge the duties of Crown prosecutor along with his other duties.

Mr. BENNETT. What leave of absence did Mr. Wade get, and is he paid anything during his absence ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He has four months leave of absence which I understand is the first leave he got since he has been in the Yukon. Mr. Congdon, his business partner acts as Crown prosecutor in his absence.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the fees paid per day.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In connection with the O'Brien case which was a very serious case, Mr. Wade was allowed $100 a day.

Mr. LANCASTER. What are the duties of the legal adviser.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I really do not know what he does. He is under

the Department of the Interior, and we have no control over him.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do I understand the minister to say that he knows nothing about this legal adviser.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I know nothing about it. He is controlled by the Department of the Interior, but of course the Crown prosecutor comes under the Department of Justice. I believe the legal adviser is a semi-judicial officer who is a member of the council and acts as legal adviser, and I would suppose performs to some extent the duties of the Attorney General of a province.

Mr. FOWLER. How many stenographers are there, and what are their salaries ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Two ; and their salaries, under the new Order in Council, will be $2,000 a year, which will be in lieu of all fees and other emoluments. I may say that last year the stenographers fees amounted to $5,833.86 ; but that is going to stop.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the living allowance ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. $1,800 a year.

Mr. FOWLER. Do they do duty in the police court ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The two stenographers are supposed to be sufficient to perform all the duties in both the high court and the police court.

Penitentiaries—general, $6,290.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The increase is $2,730. It is made up by an additional inspector at $2,600, a statutory increase of $30 to the stenographer, and $100 increase to the office contingencies.

Kingston penitentiary, $187,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are they manufacturing binder twine at Kingston Penitentiary now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, not now. We got face to face with a difficulty which has to be dealt with. I am glad my attention has been called to that, because I wish to refer to it. Last year this House passed the following resolution :

That so long as the government continues to manufacture twine, the same shall be offered for sale directly to farmers up to July the 1st of each year at cost of material and manufacture, calculating wages on the basis of fair wages for free labour ; and that the twine unsold and on hand on July 1st of each year be sold by tender to the highest bidder, after advertisement.

We consider now that we are bound by this resolution of the House, and the result has been as follows. The annual output of the penitentiary was 500 tons. Acting on this resolution, the farmers were called on to come and purchase binder twine. As a result, up to the 1st of July we had applications from 850 farmers. Of these 220 were from Prince Edward Island, 17 from New Brunswick, 130 from Quebec, 85 from Manitoba, 24 from the North-west Territories, 1 from British Columbia, and 359 from Ontario. The average of these orders was 120 pounds, and the total amount purchased was 45 tons ; so that on the 1st of July we found ourselves in possession of something over 300 tons of binder twine out of the total production of 500 tons. We had to keep it until the 1st of July for the farmers, and then we sold it at public auction. We called for tenders, and there were three tenders put in, and the binder twine was awarded to a man named Henderson Black, of St. John's in the province of Quebec. Of course, we sold the twine at a sacrifice, because at that time the farmers had all made their purchases, and the people in the trade had obtained their stock. It is absolutely impossible for us to do business there if we are going to conform to this resolution, and the loss on the business of last year is in the vicinity of $10,000. We are in the hands of the House if the House maintains this resolution ; but while I am at the head of the department, I will not take the responsibility of carrying on business on any such conditions.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister explain what kind of twine they have been manufacturing there—the different qualities ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I understand that the quality was the very best. After the 1st of July we had 586,973 pounds of mixed grades, and 60,000 pounds of sisal. That was disposed of, as I said a moment ago, to Mr. Henderson Black.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the hon. minister to give to the committee a statement of the quantities of the different kinds that were manufactured there last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot give it off hand.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to read this letter to the House. It is somewhat startling, after the statement of the minister. It appears that they have been making a kind of binder twine which the farmers do not want and are therefore unable to sell it. I wrote a letter to the warden of the penitentiary and here is his reply dated 17th June last :

Your esteemed favour of 15th instant, came to hand this morning and I have sent Mr. Hare samples as requested. I also mail you to-day, under particular cover, half a dozen of the samples and some circulars. You will notice that our 'pure manilla' and 'standard' stocks are exhausted and consequently I am not sending you the samples of these brands.

Therefore on the 17th June every particle of pure manilla which was manufactured was exhausted, and every particle of the standard, so that it is hardly fair to say that the farmers did not take advantage of their opportunities. But if the penitentiary is going to manufacture a kind of twine which is not used, it must expect to have it left on hand.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend has the advantage of me in this, that he speaks as an expert. I would ask him to tell us what kind of twine we ought to manufacture in order to get a market, and comply with the terms of this resolution. In past years we had no difficulty whatever in selling our twine.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. gentleman said last year and there was nothing new in the resolution moved, because they had been operating that very system of selling twine in the past to the farmers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I would like the hon. gentleman to quote me the statement I made and I am prepared to repeat it now.

Mr. BLAIN. I will get it before the discussion is through. But I would repeat that if the minister expects a market for his twine, he must manufacture the kind that the farmers require. It is well known that the kind of twine more used than any other, particularly in the province of Ontario, is pure manilla twine. But the minister has not been giving attention to the demands of the farmers. He has been manufactuing a kind of twine which the farmers do not require. The kind of twine which the farmers do require was all sold on the 17th June under the new resolution. The minister asks if I will be good enough to state the kind of twine that the penitentiary ought to manufacture. That is an easy statement for any man to make.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If he is capable of doing it.

Mr. BLAIN. All I have to say is that if the minister is going to conduct the business he ought to know or find some man who does. He complains that there is a stagnation in the business, because the farmers do not take advantage of the terms offered in the resolution. But it is the duty of the government to find out the kind of twine the farmers want, and to make that kind of twine. What the farmers want is pure manilla twine and the second grade, which is a mixed manilla and sisal twine, and the total quantity of the two kinds mentioned which the hon. gentleman manufactured last year was sold out before the 17th June. I know that orders were in from my county that could not be filled, and therefore it is hardly fair to say that the farmers will not take advantage of the twine manufactured.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I believe in the old adage that a cobbler should stick to his last. I am not a manufacturer of binder twine, but there are men at the head of the penitentiary, not chosen by myself but appointed previous to 1896, to carry on the business, and they have carried it on up to the present, and I did not think I could do better than allow them to carry it on as they understand it. I made no statement as to what occurred as the result of that resolution other than to quote the statement of the inspector, Mr. Stewart, who inaugurated the business, which will be found on page 9 of the report of the penitentiary, and which is confirmed by the warden of the penitentiary, to be found on page 30 of the same report. I accept the responsibility of what these men do, as I do not believe I can do better than follow their advice.

Mr. BLAIN. Do they advise the hon. gentleman to make a poorer grade of twine than the farmers want to purchase.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I deny that statement, and I deny it on the authority of men, who are not there by my choice but by that of hon. gentlemen opposite. I take the responsibility for what they have done, and it is for the House to choose between the statement of my hon. friend and that of competent officials.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not wish to make a statement.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But you did make it.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not make it. I did not say that the twine manufactured is an inferior grade or that it is not properly made, or that the material used is not up to the standard claimed, but what I do say is that if the minister will continue to make a grade of twine which is not in demand in this country, he cannot expect the farmers to buy it, and I repeat that twine which he manufactured last year of pure manilla and the second grade twine was all purchased, under the resolution passed by this House the 17th June last.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The statement I made was this. The practice previous to the introduction of this resolution was to dispose of the twine to the farmers as they applied for it, but that did not prevent our disposal of the twine by tender previous to the 1st July. We disposed of it to the farmers as they came, and disposed of the balance to the traders.

Mr. BLAIN. So far as the clause in the resolution is concerned, providing that the twine should be sold after 1st July by public tender, I had no connection with the resolution which was proposed by an hon. member on that side.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I hope my hon. friend does not imagine that I hold

him responsible for everything said in connection with binder twine.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the minister inferred that the resolution of last year was moved by a member of the opposition.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, it was passed with one dissenting voice, and was suggested by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). All I said was that it was a resolution which had been passed by the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I took it as a resolution approved by the government and introduced by the hon. member for Alberta. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Stewart was the gentleman who had inaugurated the system. He had nothing to do with the inauguration of the system of manufacturing binder twine at Kingston. He was Sir John Thompson's secretary up to the time Sir John Thompson left the government, and was then appointed as inspector of the penitentiary, but the penitentiary had been manufacturing binder twine for a year or two before his appointment.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. For what Mr. Stewart has done in connection with binder twine I accept all responsibility and consider him a very competent man.

Mr. TAYLOR. He was not the man who inaugurated the manufacture.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think he was. It began in January, 1894.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Stewart was not inspector at that time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, the present warden, Mr. Platt, the gentleman who wrote that letter was not appointed by friends of hon. gentlemen on this side, but by the hon. minister himself? He is the head of the institution.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not mean to give the impression that anybody is responsible for what is done except myself. I did not wish to shirk the responsibility and put it upon an official. As long as an official is with me I am responsible for what he does.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the hon. gentleman says that the man who directs this industry was appointed by hon. gentlemen on this side. Now, Mr. Platt was appointed by himself.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. But Mr. Connor was not.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the gentleman who wrote that letter on June last was appointed by the hon. minister, and the manufacture of binder twine is carried on in an institution of which he is the head. Now, with reference to the price, the price obtained in July last was as good as any obtained for the last two or three years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am told not.

Mr. TAYLOR. In one or two years, perhaps it was sold at a less price than that named by my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman has told us that only three tenders were received. Who were they from and what were they? I never saw a notice of the twine on hand being sold by tender last July. Was it publicly advertised or were only a few friends of the government asked to put in bids?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It was advertised in the Toronto 'Globe,' the Hamilton 'Times,' the London 'Advertiser,' the Montreal 'Herald,' the Montreal 'La Patrie,' the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' the London 'Record,' the Brandon 'Sun,' and the Windsor 'Record.' In addition, the two dealers who had purchased the previous article and other dealers were asked to put in tenders.

Mr. BENNETT. What Toronto papers were there?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Toronto 'Globe' is the only one I see mentioned in this list. Tenders were received from Henderson Black, the Hobbs Hardware Company, the Ontario Binder Twine Company and S. S. Dickinson. The question is whether we should continue this industry, and I do not see any reason why we should not, particularly in view of the large amount of plant we have on hand. I do not see why we should not keep that plant running and why we should not change the product we put on the market so as to make it more attractive. With that in view, I am ready to take the advice of anybody who is competent to express an opinion on the matter. I have absolute confidence in the two men who have charge of the administration of this industry. At the same time the industry has not been as profitable as it ought to have been—I have to admit that. There is no reason why we should not change and make it profitable. I do not pretend to know anything about the manufacture of binder twine. Why should I? But I have two experts to advise me. Mr. Platt, I do not consider an expert on this subject. But Mr. Connor is an expert. He was put there to carry on this business, and gets a large salary for doing so. Mr. Stewart who has been in the service from the inception of this industry is also there to advise me. I will take their advice. But I will likewise take the advice of any others who are competent to speak upon the subject. My desire is to carry on this industry profitably for the benefit of the country, not for the benefit of the farmer only, but for the benefit of the country as a whole.

Mr. WILSON. Is the plant now running?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At the present time it would not be profitable to carry on the business, because the price of manilla has gone so high.

Mr. WILSON. But the hon. minister is paying help ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. None except Mr. Connor.

Mr. WILSON. He is keeping the expensive men ?

Mr. FRASER. I gave the minister advice last year, and I wish to repeat it now—and that is to sell out everything you have got in this line, if you cannot get better than scrap-iron prices for it, and get out of the business. This is not a business for the government to go into, I have said before, and I say now, it was started as a sort of bait to catch the farmers, to convince them that we were going to give them assistance. The farmers can look after themselves better than we can look after them, and the manufacturers of binder twine will attend to that business. Let us not be hedging and trying to make ourselves and others believe that we are generously trying to help the farmers. Sell out the whole thing and give Mr. Connor something else to do.

Mr. LANCASTER. In view of the great stress laid this afternoon on the fact that the Intercolonial Railway was such a good means of holding up the other railways, I should think that it would have occurred to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fraser) that this manufacture of binder twine would help us to keep down the prices charged by manufacturers, and I should have thought that that would appeal to so good a free trader as the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. There is this difference—there is no other line where the Intercolonial Railway is. Besides, this railway is the bond which unites the provinces, and the construction of it was the reason why we became part of the Dominion. But in the manufacture of binder twine there is competition. There is no duty. The business is open to those who care to engage in it.

Mr. BOYD. Has the hon. minister any suggestion from his officials in regard to the future manufacture and disposal of binder twine ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The suggestion is that we should continue. It is true that we produce but 500 tons of binder twine a year, while the quantity sold in Canada in 1901 was 5,837 tons. Therefore, the quantity we produce is——

Mr. TAYLOR. A drop in the bucket.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Just about a drop in the bucket. But we must look at it in this way also—by this industry we give employment to from forty to fifty-five inmates of the prison. If we can carry on this business so as not to lose anything and give this employment, and also, to some extent control the market —I cannot say that it affects the prices much, but has something to do with it—it is a good thing. If, with the plant we have and with the experience we have gained we can carry on this business, we ought to do it. We have forty odd thousand dollars invested there.

Mr. FRASER. And you lost ten thousand last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. For one reason or another the business has not been profitable from the beginning. But it seems to me we ought to be able to do something with it. If we cannot make binder twine we ought to be able to make rope. But, in the first place, we must get rid of this resolution and have a free hand to manage this business as we understand it, having of course, the responsibility of coming here and explaining what we are doing in that industry. But, so long as you tie us down by the terms of this resolution we cannot carry on that business profitably. I prefer to have a free hand, subject to the duty of coming here and rendering an account of my stewardship.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I know a little about binder twine and a good deal about cordage. The same rule applies to both. If you want a first-class binder twine, you must make it of pure manilla. The second-class is a mixture with sisal, and the third is almost altogether sisal. The farmers will buy the best quality of binder twine just as the fisherman will buy the best quality of rope. The mistake that has been made should be avoided in the future, and nothing but the best quality of twine should be made. That will be sold readily.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the minister tell us what the twine cost last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot tell what the cost of manufacturing it was. If my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) will look at the report of the Minister of Justice, page 32, he will find a statement prepared by the warden of the Kingston penitentiary—the binder twine account. I can give no further information than is contained in that account.

Mr. BLAIN. When the minister makes a statement that he sold twine and lost a great deal of money, he should be able to tell the committee the cost of the article he was selling.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I ask the hon. gentleman to take page 32, he will there find that the hemp purchased cost $34,830.81, that is the total amount of hemp purchased. The oil purchased cost $1,022. Advertising, bags, paper and things of that kind have got to be charged up against the twine. In addition, the labour has got to be charged up. If the hon. gentleman

will look at that page of the account he will find all the information I can possibly give him.

Mr. BLAIN. How does the resolution tie him down, and why does he ask for the resolution to be discontinued ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It ties us down in this respect, that the proper time to dispose of binder twine in the market to the traders and the farmers, is previous to the 1st of July, that is the time the trader puts in his stock. And as the farmer wants his binder twine from July onward, if you keep the twine in your possession until July, and then advertise for tenders. you would put it in the market at the time the traders are stocked.

Mr. HOLMES. There is another difficulty in connection with the sale of binder twine to the farmers that has not been mentioned. If I remember rightly, the resolution last year was a sort of a compromise, and if you sell twine to the farmers and thus prevent a combination among the manufacturers, I think you will find as a result that you will have to sell binder twine to the manufacturers, for this reason, that the farmer is required to pay cash to the government for twine, while he can buy it from all the dealers, or from their agents, and pay for it in the fall. Consequently he will not buy it, as a rule, from the government.

Mr. BLAIN. I think there is something in that. But the farmers in the main are paying cash for their binder twine at this moment in the province of Ontario. I made the statement that the minister made, saying that the resolution did not change very much the former practice of the government I now refer to. I wish to read his remarks on page 569 of the 'Hansard' of last year :

> I will now proceed to deal with the motion, and in speaking to that motion I will state immediately that we have no quarrel with that portion of it, and we cannot have a quarrel, because, since August, 1899, we have been doing what that motion says we ought to do.

I would like to ask the minister how the resolutions has affected him this year, when he made a statement last year that they were doing the very same thing and had been since 1899 ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I repeat the statement I made, that it hampers us in this respect, that we are obliged to keep twine on hand up to the 1st of July so as to dispose of it to the farmer. The twine remains in our possession until the 1st of July, and if we put it on the market then we have practically no purchasers for it, and that is what I meant to say last year.

Mr. BLAIN. According to this letter, pure manilla twine, and the second grade was all sold on the 17th day of June, and sold at the price set down by the minister himself, therefore there could be no loss upon that porton of the manufacture. Would the minister now state how much the twine cost that was sold after the 1st of July, and let us find out how much the government really did lose ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I can not tell what that portion of the twine, that is to say, the 300 tons sold out to the 1st of June—I cannot tell what that portion cost, it is absolutely impossible. All I can say is that according to the accounts furnished by those who were in charge of that branch of the industry, there was a loss of over $10,000 on that portion.

Mr. BLAIN. If the minister is selling this twine at a loss, it is the fault of his department—I do not wish to charge it to the minister personally. But this penitentiary having been manufacturing twine for so many years, it would be their duty to watch the market, and if they had manufactured the proper kind of twine last year, made of pure manilla, or second grade twine, they could have sold every dollar's worth of it, because many orders came in that the penitentiary was unable to fill. I have a statement here which, however, I will not read, and which perhaps I had better turn over to the hon. minister. I have no hesitation in saying that if the government manufacture the proper kind of twine and in the proper way, they would have no trouble whatever in finding an output for the small amount they manufacture. I have here the answer to my question this session, where I am told that Henderson and Black bought twine at $4.80 per hundred weight for sisal, and $1.10 per 100 weight for mixed twine. I wish to make the statement that if that is a correct answer to my question, it is utterly impossible for this government to lose any such an amount of money as the minister has stated.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course the hon. gentleman knows something about binder twine, and in that respect he has an advantage over myself. Would he be good enough to tell us, now or later on, the quality of the twine, or the character of the twine, that we ought to manufacture, so as to obtain a ready sale.

Mr. BLAIN. I read the letter saying that their pure manilla and standard stocks were exhausted on the 17th day of June. I was asking for samples of pure manilla to be sent to our own county. In response to my letter, I got a statement from one of your own officers that they were sold out of pure manilla and standard twine. That will answer the minister's question. I state again that pure manilla twine is the kind which ought to be manufactured in the Kingston penitentiary. If the department will manufacture that kind of twine, according to their own evidence in this letter, they would have no trouble in selling it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is, we ought to manufacture pure manilla and standard in order to have a market in this country ?

Mr. BLAIN. That is my opinion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister asked for a free discussion as to how to conduct this business. My suggestion would be to go back to first principles. This industry was started by the present Justice Ouimet, who was then Minister of Public Works. He purchased and put in the plant, and started that industry long before Mr. Stewart's time. The policy he adopted was the policy any other manufacturing concern would adopt. If this government want to go into manufacturing they must conduct their business the same as any other business man, they must put an agent on the road and sell it to the retail dealers. That is the way it was done before.

Mr. SCOTT. Did they lose money by it ?

Mr. TAYLOR. They did not lose money by it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have not been paid yet for the product of 1895.

Mr. TAYLOR. I discussed that a long time ago with the hon. gentleman, and he answered the question by saying that these accounts had all been secured. He has security from Mr. Connor which is good for a portion of it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It will be secured now.

Mr. DAVIS. What about Rogers in Manitoba ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Rogers paid for his. The only man who is behind is Connor and the government have had some dealings with Connor in twine since.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. TAYLOR. The government sold to merchants all over the country, but because the whole of the twine was not paid for on the first of July, when the Auditor General's report was brought down, these customers were shown as owing at that time. But, these accounts were all paid. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) as a manufacturer, has to sell his goods on credit, to the retail merchants of this country, and he gives thirty days, or four months as the case may be. That is what every manufacturer does, and if this government will start this industry and conduct it on business principles, manufacture the twine, put an agent on the road and sell to the trade generally they will control the market against the monopoly. Merchants will buy twine and sell at a small advance, and whether they want to sell for cash or credit, the farmers are in a position to buy from them. There are just two ways of doing it. The hon. gentleman for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) suggested to the government that they should smash up and sell for scrap iron $40,000 worth of machinery for the manufacture of binder twine and cordage. He says we do not require to have this industry in the country now because we get twine free from the United States. It is duty free but we cannot manufacture in Canada and send the twine to the United States free of duty.

Mr. FRASER. What is the duty ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The customs regulations of the United States are such that manilla brought into this country, manufactured and sent back there has to pay duty. Twine made of manilla or partly manilla in Canada cannot go back to the United States free.

Mr. DAVIS. How does that affect the consumers here ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Minister of Justice gave the figures of the consumption in Canada last year. How much of it was made in the country ? Why can we not manufacture binder twine in this country instead of bringing it from the United States ? The government can start that machinery running and make a success of it because the country requires manilla and standard twines. If you look at the Auditor General's report, page M-50, you will find that the sales were as follows :

Pure manilla (Maple Leaf) 66,088 pounds, average price, 11½ cents to 12 cents per pound.

Sisal, 13,051½ pounds, average price, 9 cents per pound.

Mixed manilla (Monarch), 4,360 pounds, average price, 8½ cents per pound.

Standard, 26,430 pounds, average price, 7½ cents per pound.

Beaver, 71,515½ pounds, average price, 9 cents per pound.

New Zealand (Red Tape), 60 pounds, average price 8 cents.

These are the prices the government asked the farmers to pay and they are high prices. If you will turn to the statement of raw material in the Auditor General's report you will find that they did not buy a pound of pure manilla. They bought New Zealand fibre, something that they ought not to have bought at all because it will only make third or fourth rate binder twine. They bought of New Zealand fibre 90,306 pounds, sisal 439,985 pounds, and manilla fibre 135,540 pounds. But, the great bulk of the raw material was New Zealand fibre which we purchased to make twine out of. So that, they made a very inferior article. Whether this was due to the fact of manilla being too dear or not I do not know, but, I maintain that the government can manufacture binder twine the same as any other manufacturing industry in the country would do. Or, if they do not wish to do that, let them rent the machinery to some person

who will carry on the industry and the convict labour with it. Let them rent this industry to somebody who will start the machinery humming and make money out of it. In this way the government will be able to control the American ring and Canadian combination. These people have kept the price of binder twine up ever since this government took control of the industry, This government cancelled the policy of the late government in regard to the binder twine industry. The late government had engaged a man to go out as a travelling agent and sell the output of the industry for five years. Since hon. gentlemen opposite have come into power they have cancelled the appointment of the travelling agent and they have sold to the Hobbs Hardware Company, and to some others of their friends without asking for tenders at all, simply sending a letter out to one of two of their friends. Moreover, they sold the twine at a loss. I do not think the government were justified in selling it at 4 or 5 cents a pound to this firm in St. John. If they could not get a satisfactory price they should have held it over until next season and got 10, 12 or 15 cents a pound for it as I presume the farmers would be willing to pay this in view of the fact that the American and Canadian combinations have joined hands for the purpose of squeezing them. If the hon. minister asks his hon. friend the member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) to introduce a resolution similar to that which he moved last year, I am satisfied that all hands will vote for it. Let the hon. minister either establish this industry on a business footing, or let him rent the machinery, together with the convict labour, to a private individual.

Mr. COCHRANE. I think it would be very unfortunate to have that industry closed up. It may not pay but I think there are two sides to this question. If it does not pay as a financial concern from a government point of view, perhaps it will pay from the point of view of the farmers interests. Perhaps I do not make myself quite clear. If by running it as a government institution we lose a little money perhaps this would be more than compensated for by the saving which it would enable the farmers to make in the purchase of their binder twine. It may be that the officials in control of this industry are in need of ideas and do not keep pace with the times, and perhaps, though the person in control may be a skilled artisan, his ideas are not up to date. I do not agree with the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser). I generally agree with him. But, we have now free coal oil and we have one of the biggest combinations that exists in Canada, I fancy.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) means free wire, not free coal oil.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well it is nearly free anyway, and we have combinations that are running that institution and controlling it in their own interest. I think we might talk about this matter as a business proposition that is going to benefit the great bulk of the farmers in Canada. I do not think that because we are from Ontario we should monopolize all the opinions in reference to binder twine. There is the great North-west, and the maritime provinces which require a large amount of binder twine and for that reason I feel concern for the interests of the farmers throughout the Dominion of Canada generally. If that institution has the effect of preventing a combination in binder twine, we will reap beneficial results from it just as we reap beneficial results from our canal system which keeps down the transportation rates. I agree that it would be well now to start that machinery to produce a certain amount of binder twine. Now that the transaction has passed, I would respectfully ask the Minister of Justice if he does not think that it would have been better to have kept that twine, and not to have sold it at all.

Mr. BOYD. We instructed him to do so.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, to that extent the resolution was a mistake. We could have held that twine just as well as anybody else, and if the public knew it was there, there would be no attempt to start a combination against the farmers this coming harvest. It appears to me that although the government may not run this industry as a paying concern, yet it is useful to the country in as much as it tends to regulate the price of binder twine to the farmers of the country.

Mr. DAVIS. I believe with the member for Guysborough, that it would be better for the country if the government went out of the business of binder twine making. I do not think that it is the function of government to enter into that business at all. However, if we are going to manufacture binder twine then the government should not be hedged around with such a resolution as that but should be allowed to have a free hand to dispose of the twine in the best interests of the people. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) no doubt knows a good deal about binder twine, but when he says that the government should manufacture only two kinds, I would ask him is he not aware of the fact that other manufacturers are making several kinds of twine and disposing of it successfully.

Mr. BOYD. Since the inauguration of this industry in the Kingston penitentiary I have been watching its career with some interest. I was in this House when it was established and I favoured it then. Sir John Thompson took a very deep interest in this question at the time. His expectation was that it would have the effect of

controlling the price of binder twine to some extent. I am free to confess that under the Conservative regime the disposal of the twine was not as successful as we had hoped, but there was the excuse for that that it was our first attempt in undertaking a new industry, and we had to do it in face of the most bitter opposition from the other manufacturers of binder twine. I do not hesitate to say that such opposition still exists. Let me point out that an increased charge for binder twine is a far greater tax on the farmers than the duty on agricultural implements, because a farmer will use every year from 500 to 1,000 pounds, and a difference of four or five cents a pound in the price—and they seem to charge whatever price for it that they can get from the farmers—means yearly a tax of $40 or $50 on each farmer which is rather a serious matter. The minister stated that something like 850 pounds had been bought in Manitoba previous to July. There was nearly a car load of this twine sold in Carberry last year, and I used 1,000 pounds myself. I think the grade was inferior to that mentioned by the hon. member for Peel, but nevertheless it gave satisfaction. This was the first year the penitentiary managed the business under the new system, and in many cases the farmers knew nothing about the sale of the twine until near the expiry of the time allowed. We may imagine that information given in this House spreads rapidly, but frequently it does not. From listening to the minister to-night I would judge that officials in the penitentiary are like other officials ; they do not like innovations. They do not like people from the outside to tell them how they should do their business and I expect that the officials in charge of the manufacture of this twine are like all others in that respect. They do not care to be dictated to, and they have no doubt very little confidence in the members of this House who might be considered by others as experts in the binder twine business. In all probability the minister may ascertain later on that something of that spirit of personal pride accounts for the failure of the twine industry at the penitentiary. If the minister of Justice, active and energetic as he is, had himself been in charge of the binder twine, there would be a different story to tell. Now, as to what the member for Guysborough said. It is all very well for a gentleman like him to treat this question lightly but if he represented a constituency as we from the west do, where this is a very important question, he would possibly be one of the loudest in support of this industry which he wishes to have wiped out. I would remind the hon. gentleman that there are certain government enterprises in the east which do not pay their way, but nevertheless we in the west have to grin and bear it. I think that possibly this item had better stand until the minister comes down at some future day with a proposal. He is young and energetic and if he will only take the interest in the matter that the late Sir John Thompson did, he will make a success of the business. There is no reason why the convicts should be idle. They might as well be employed at that work as anything else, and I have learned from some of the officials that the manufacture of the binder twine is a most desirable employment for them, and especially for the long term prisoners. At all events it would be very unfortunate if we should act on the hasty and ill considered suggestion of the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The fixed opinion of the officials is that we should continue to manufacture this binder twine. They believe that by making certain reductions in salaries and so forth, we will be able to carry it on without any great loss if not at a profit. We have always to bear in mind the very serious question of finding employment for the convicts, and it was in order to meet that difficulty that this business was inaugurated. If I take what has been said to-night and especially the opinion of the experts who have spoken, the conclusion I am driven to is that the officials more immediately in charge of the binder twine industry have not kept up to date, and are not equal to the position they occupy ; and I am going to say here now, that while I give my loyal assistance to any man so long as he is with me, no man is going to remain long with me who is not equal to the position he occupies. With respect to the system of disposing of the twine, my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) said a moment ago that there ought to be agents on the road. Let us deal with our experience. That system was inaugurated, and what was the result ? In 1895 over $30,000 worth of twine was sold by an agent and delivered. Previous to the month of November he was actually paid for the greater part of it. When the change of government took place in 1896 we had not received a dollar of the money that had been paid to the agent. Up to within a few days ago there was over $9,000 still due on the twine sold by that agent at that time. I am not making this statement for the purpose of recrimination at all. The product of the year 1895-6 had not been disposed of when the change of government took place in July, 1896, because of the difficulty in connection with the agent. There is our experience which I am stating simply to show the difficulties attendant on the management of this industry. After that I conceive that it was justifiable on the part of the government to endeavour to dispose of this twine by public auction. The result has not been satisfactory in the highest degree ; but at all events, we have been paid for our output ; we have

got our money in exchange for our twine, which has been disposed of at a fairly reasonable price. I do not think there is much to be said as to the disposal of the twine. Any complaint that I have heard has brought me to the conclusion that the reason we have not been able to dispose of this twine up to the present time is, in the first place, that we have not manufactured the particular quality which appeals to the farmer, and, secondly, that we have been hampered by this resolution of the House. What ought we to do? We ought to take account of what has been said to-night, make inquiries of those familiar with the situation, make the kind of twine that is suitable to the market, and then dispose of it in the right way. The question is, ought we to sell it through an agent or by public auction? Our experience with an agent has not been satisfactory.

Mr. TAYLOR. You did not do it right.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not stated that we did not, but that those who went before us did not. I have asked for advice on this question from men who are perfectly competent, and they advised me to put one or two agents on the road, and not deal with them as we did before, but authorize them to simply take orders and then execute these orders at the penitentiary. We may possibly in that way improve on the system that has existed hitherto and get a better price for our twine after we have improved the quality of the twine itself.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will admit that one year the late government sold through an agent, and allowed the agent to collect. But surely the government can carry on the business on the lines followed by every manufacturer in this country. He puts an agent on the road who takes an order from a retail man. That order is submitted; the manufacturer looks at the commercial agency report to see if the man has a good standing, and if he has, he will fill the order and send the twine to him, and the agent is paid either by per diem allowance or by commission. I find that my hon. friend has been dealing with Connor all along.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. For all cash.

Mr. TAYLOR. He purchased $3,592 worth from the government last year. Every business man in this country who manufactures goods either sells them by circular or puts men on the road to dispose of them. I do not fancy it will be necessary for the government to put a man on the road to sell. They have twine for sale and the merchants of the country will know their prices and order it, and either pay cash or buy it on four months time. Surely the government can do business on these lines. They can control the market and manufacture in Canada what the hon. member for Guysborough wants manufactured in the United States.

Mr. FRASER. I want it manufactured wherever it can be done the cheapest and best.

Mr. LENNOX. I hope the hon. member for Leeds is reasonably satisfied now. I think that when a member sits down in deference to the minister he should have the right to resume his remarks when the minister is done. I do not like to be obliged to jump up half a dozen times to talk when anybody else is talking. I have not much to say on this question, but I think the difficulty that has been so fairly and candidly suggested by the hon. minister is one which the members of the House consulting together can overcome. I am inclined to think that the conditions under which this binder twine was sold had a good deal to do with the fact that a ready sale was obtained last year. I am particularly anxious to speak on this subject to-night, because I want to congratulate the hon. minister on the frank way in which he meets the case, and I wish I could always compliment the ministry in the same way. In this connection I hope this business will not be handed over to another member of the government. I think it is a very good sign when we find an hon. minister coming forward and admitting that there is something he does not know. I think that when the hon. minister, who has recently come to this department, takes the committee into his confidence and asks us to advise him as to the best means of disposing of the twine, he has taken a very good departure. I have also much pleasure in noting the fact that the minister does not endeavour to make political capital out of this matter, that he does not try to make out that the fault is all on the part of the members on this side. I do not know that he could very well take that position in any case. My hon. friend from Peel has pointed out the position of the matter when it was discussed last year, and I do not know that I can add to what he has said.

The resolution which was moved by the hon. member for Alberta last year was as follows:

> That so long as the government continues to manufacture twine, the same shall be offered for sale directly to the farmers up to July the 1st of each year at cost of material and manufacture, calculating wages on the basis of fair wages for free labour; and that the twine unsold and on hand on July 1st of each year be sold by tender to the highest bidder after advertisement.

Speaking on that resolution the hon. gentleman said:

> That is entirely in line with the policy pursued by the government during the past year, except that it carries it a little further and makes it more definite.

He thus claimed, as my hon. friend from

Peel has said, that the policy of the government was not departed from by virtue of what was done last year, in anything essential, but that this resolution secured an additional advantage to the farmers. I do not agree to the suggestion that we should go back to the state of things which we had a year ago. I am strongly of the opinion that whether all we should have accomplished has been accomplished or not, the movement inaugurated a year ago was in the right direction, and I am entirely of the opinion that we should have even more stringent regulations regarding giving the first chance to the farmers to buy this twine. As to giving up the industry, the argument of the hon. member for Guysborough, if he put it as an argument in that regard, is one most easily answered, and I do not think that I will weary the committee with answering it, because I think it has already been answered by almost every member of the committee in his own mind, and could be effectually disposed of in words if necessary. I do not agree with the hon. member for Guysborough, nor have I yet had any occasion so far in the session to agree with him, but would be happy to do so if he would give me any reasonable opportunity. But I am very happy in this instance—and I believe it is the first opportunity I have yet had—to be able to refer to a minister of the Crown as having met this side of the House from the point of view that we are representatives of the people, anxious to do our duty and assist the government in bringing about what is most advantageous in the best interests of the country.

Mr. STEWART. Representing, as I do, one of the greatest wheat producing electoral districts in the Dominion, one which produced a crop of 12,000,000 bushels of wheat last year, and in which therefore this binder twine question is of considerable importance, I wish to express my entire dissent from the view that the manufacture of binder twine in the Kingston penitentiary should be closed. If the idea should prevail that it does not pay to manufacture it in the penitentiary in the east, let that industry be moved to the penitentiary at Winnipeg, where it would be in close proximity to the wheat fields where most of its product is used. In 1900 binder twine was quoted very high in the west. In the towns of southern Manitoba, it was quoted in the spring of that year as high as 18 cents a pound. A number of our farmers refused to give orders at that price, and communicated with Mr. Platt, the manager of the Kingston penitentiary works, and got quotations from him. They were not able to get the first quality of twine but used the second which proved very satisfactory. It costs us a shade over ten cents, when the regular dealers were quoting the first quality at 15 cents and the second at 14 cents. We claim that the introduction of the penitentiary twine reduced the price 2 cents.

That was one reason why I would not like to see that industry closed. It has been said that in the east only pure manilla would obtain a sale, but we have always been told that there is no such thing as standard pure manilla twine, and that it is all mixed, that a certain percentage of cheaper material No. 1 is composed of a percentage of filling, and that there is a little more filling in the second quality. My advice is that there should not be more than two standards made—a finer twine for the new binders and a coarser for the old, because when a binder is getting old it will probably do better work with the coarser twine.

Mr. McGOWAN. I agree with my hon. friend from Lisgar that they made too many grades in the penitentiary last year. If there were but two or three grades at the most, that would be much more advantageous to the farmers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What grades does my hon. friend suggest ?

Mr. McGOWAN. I think the best would be manilla twine, as every farmer knows what manilla twine is. I agree in the opinion expressed that it would be a mistake to close up the concern at Kingston, because these large factories are liable to get into the hands of a combine, which would be a lamentable affair for the farmers. Even if the penitentiary industry does not pay, it would still be an advantage to the country to keep it up. As to the mode of selling the twine, I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice will find some trouble in that regard. Some of our farmers in my constituency complain of the great expense of sending the twine by express. Many who ordered twine from the penitentiary have had to pay very large express charges, and some did not get the twine they ordered, but perhaps that was their own fault in possibly not having ordered it soon enough. One of the farmers in my county was very wrothy about this. He said that he had ordered a certain amount of first quality manilla twine, and got word back that his order was put in and would be filled as soon as he sent word to have the twine forwarded. He sent the money down and they sent him an inferior brand of twine, and he said he would not order from Kingston again. Our farmers complain very much about the heavy express charges. Perhaps if the hon. minister would have stations in certain parts of the country, to which he could send carloads of twine, he would thereby get rid of this difficulty. He could choose points in all the different provinces to which carloads could be sent, and to which the farmers could drive for what they wanted. That would be different from appointing a number of agents to travel about.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let him put it in the hands of the retail merchants.

Mr. McGOWAN. I do not know that that would do. But if he would send it to the county town or some such places, he would better suit the convenience of the farmers. And even if it had to be sold at the end of the season, it would sell much more easily than in Kingston. I am glad the hon. minister is open to suggestions, and I hope that these I have offered will be of use.

Mr. McCREARY. I am glad to hear the hon. member (Mr. McGowan) speak on this subject. The question of binder twine is one of the most important that we have in the west. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Stewart) has told us that he represents a county whose product of wheat last year amounted to 12,000,000 bushels. My county adjoins his on one side. Though it did not raise 12,000,000 bushels it raised almost as much. This will give some idea of how important this question of binder twine is to us. The Minister of Justice should take into consideration the question whether it is well to have all the binder twine manufactured at Kingston. In the Stony Mountain penitentiary, which is in my county, there are, I think, about 120 prisoners, and these prisoners hardly know what to do with their time. I understand that sometimes they are engaged in making roads, but there is not enough work for them. I do not see why the raw material should not to be sent to Stony Mountain as well as to Kingston and the twine that is required on the prairies of Manitoba and the North-west manufactured at Stony Mountain. But, until that is done, I do not see why the twine could not be sent up in car lots, not through agents, but sent to different points, such as Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Prince Albert, Edmonton, and other points throughout the west, where the farmers can buy it and pay spot cash. If the farmers could get binder twine at 9 cents or 10 cents, instead of paying 18 cents, it would be a great help. The present Minister of Justice, who is an energetic and progressive man, should look into this question. I hope he will do something this year to bring the twine to the west and put it into the hands of farmers at the most advantageous prices.

Mr. DAVIS. Following out the suggestion of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), I would point out that there are jails at Regina, Prince Albert and Edmonton. Why not send the twine out to the jailers, who are officers of the hon. minister's department, and let them dispose of it. I am sure they would be willing to take the responsibility and do the work. The farmers would be able to get the binder twine and get it at a reduced price. At present this manufacture of binder twine is of very little use to us. The farmers came to me last year and wished me to get twine for them. But the freight is high; it was out of the question to get it by express, and nobody cared to take the responsibility of ordering a carload. But I am sure that the burser or jailer in these different institutions in the west would be willing to take charge of consignments and sell them for spot cash to the farmers.

Mr. BLAIN. As I was the mover of the original motion of last year, there may be some responsibility attaching to my suggestion to change the system of selling the twine. I wish to draw the committee's attention to the fact that the original motion I moved contained no clause to the effect that the binder twine on hand after the 1st of July should be sold to the highest bidder. That is the portion of the resolution as carried that I objected to. The resolution as I moved it, was as follows :

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that all binder twine now held by the government, together with all twine that may hereafter be manufactured by them, shall be sold direct to the farmer at a price to cover the actual cost of raw material and manufacture only, with one cent per pound added, and that no twine manufactured or paid for out of the Dominion treasury shall be sold or disposed of in any other way.

The amendment moved by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) added the provision about selling the twine on hand after the first of July. I venture to say that if that clause had not been added to the motion, all the twine would have been sold last year to the farmers, for, at the close of the season there was a great scarcity of twine both in Ontario and in the west. I venture to say, also, that, with the omission of that clause the motion as I presented it covers the best system for the sale of the small quantity of binder twine—for it is a small quantity in comparison to the quantity consumed throughout the country—that the government manufactures. As to what the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McGowan) has said, I think the government system of filling orders is as up-to-date as that of any manufacturing establishment in Canada. The farmer sends in his order at any time after the beginning of the year. He can order a small quantity if he chooses. His order is booked. He can send his money down as the season approaches and the twine is sent direct to his address. The reason why some farmers did not get their twine exactly at the time they wanted it and why it was sent forward by express was that, instead of sending their money a month or two weeks before they wanted the twine, they waited until the eleventh hour. I am sure that the reason why it was sent forward by express was that the managers of the institution knew that it was needed in the wheat fields at the time. I think the government should continue the manufacture of binder twine as they are now manufacturing it, but that they should change to the extent of manufacturing what is understood as pure manilla only.

This they should sell direct to the farmers as they are now doing, omitting that clause of the resolution which was added, for the reason that the harvest in the wheat fields in the west, about which we hear so much, does not come on until our harvest in Ontario is about finished. If there is any twine in the Kingston establishment that the farmers in Ontario do not buy before the 1st of July, it can be sent to the west and there find a ready market, at prices that will pay the government well. I hope the hon. minister will continue this industry. I do not wish to unreasonably criticise the government with respect to the manufacture of binder twine. It need not be manufactured at a loss; the government can make money, even though manufacturing the small quantity that the capacity of the works will permit. If they continue the manufacture of the proper twine and put it on the market in the early season they will have no trouble in selling every pound they are able to manufacture.

Mr. CLARE. I believe that one reason why the twine was not disposed of is likely to have been that it was offered to the farmers at too high a price. I would like to know whether the spirit of the resolution passed by the House last year was carried out. I know that the farmers of this country are reading people; I know that they want to get a bargain when they can, and I know that they have the money to pay for it. They certainly would have bought the twine manufactured by the government at Kingston if they could have got it at a lower price than other manufacturers were selling it for. We are told that the binder twine was put in at cost, but it may have been that the raw stock that the government used was bought at too high a price. I believe that last year the government could have sold all their twine if they had put it in at cost to the farmers.

Mr. SCOTT. The only thing that seems to be lacking in the way of a suggestion for the solution of this problem is to turn the other way around the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) last year, and pass not only a resolution but a law declaring that the farmers shall buy the twine manufactured in Kingston penitentiary. By this means the problem would be solved and the department relieved of all difficulty in the way of disposing of the product. But speaking seriously, I wish to join in the expression of opinion of a number of my hon. friends from the west. Last year when the matter was discussed, I stated that, under present conditions, the farmers of Manitoba and the North-west Territories were not in a position to reap as much advantage as the farmers of Ontario, who were near the point of manufacture. As a matter of fact, while the business of wheat-growing in the west is a great one, it is yet in some degree a lottery. There is no guarantee of the extent of a wheat crop until a short time before harvest. It is, therefore, impossible for a wheat-grower in Manitoba or the territories to place an absolute order for his binder twine until late in July, too late to admit of his sending on order and having it filled all the way from Kingston by ordinary freight transportation. I suggested then to the government that it would be a good policy to ship a few carloads of twine to centres in Manitoba and the territories. There might be some risk, doubtless there would be some risk of the shipments remaining unsold, but not more than is incurred by holding all the output at Kingston, and I am confident that a considerable quantity could thus be disposed of to the advantage of the business from the departmental point of view and of the western wheat-growers.

Mr. McCREARY. I would like to ask the minister whether binder twine could not be manufactured in the Stony Mountain penitentiary in Manitoba? No doubt carload rates on raw material would be almost as cheap to Winnipeg as to Kingston. I think if the minister will look into this question he will find that the prisoners in the Stony Mountain penitentiary could manufacture just as cheaply as they do at Kingston, and I do not see why the binder twine required for the western prairies should not be manufactured on the ground.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I will be quite willing to consider that suggestion. But my hon. friend must bear in mind that this industry is already established at Kingston. We have there the advantage of a larger population to draw from to get the labour we require, and we have also a certain number of men who are fairly well trained.

Mr. McCREARY. I don't think you have as large a purchasing population.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think we can do better work where the men are already trained, and where we have a larger population to draw from to find workmen. There have been many suggestions made to-night as to the disposition of the twine. The discussion has been pretty full, and I will endeavour to get the warden and superintendent of the Kingston penitentiary down here and have a consultation with them early next week, along with the inspector, and see what can be done towards starting the industry again, because we have a provision for the raw material that we may require.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be as well to let the item stand.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I suggest that we let the item go through, with the understanding that on supplementaries we will have the matter up again, and I will then be able to make a statement as to the results of my conference with the officials. I will say to the hon. member for

Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that there is very little prospect of being able to establish a binder twine industry at Stony Mountain this year.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the officials appear before some special committee ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They are at the disposal of any committee you choose to select, and at any time. I would suggest Wednesday.

Mr. McCREARY. If the minister cannot promise to start the manufacture of binder twine at Stony Mountain this year, will he promise that next year machinery will be installed and raw material shipped there? Perhaps he can also promise to-night that a large quantity of the binder twine manufactured at Kingston will be shipped in car lots to various points in the west so that the farmers can get it at actual cost.

St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, $118,600.

Dorchester penitentiary, $55,900.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The increase with respect to St. Vincent de Paul is caused by the fact that we have increased the reservation by 208 acres which will cost us $10,620. The penitentiary reserve contained 170 acres. To this was added the Gagnon farm, 38 acres, purchased from John Loftus, in March this year, at $75 per acre, making $2,850. This is especially valuable, because of a quantity of building sand it contains. It is proposed to add three parcels aggregating 145 arpents (122½ acres) making about 350 acres in the reserve. Of this, 300 will be available for farming purposes. The farm will be worked by convict labour. For some years farm products to the value of $3,500 a year, have been purchased for consumption in the penitentiary.

A vote is asked to pay for these parcels :

1. Maxime Archambault, about fifty arpents at $89 per arpent, $4,450.

This land adjoins the penitentiary quarry farm. The soil is of excellent quality throughout, thoroughly cultivated, clean and well kept. Stone of like quality and dimension to that in the penitentiary quarries underlies eight or ten acres close to the quarries. The possession of this addition to the quarry will ensure an ample supply of exceptionally fine building stone for future requirements.

2. Hector Lussier, about forty-five arpents at $76 per arpent, $3,420.

This land lies east of the St. François road between the railway station grounds and the road of the quarries. Soil rich and deep. It is conveniently situated near the penitentiary and in full view of the guards on the towers.

3. Joliceour, about 50 arpents at $55 per arpent, $2,750.

Four acres of south end is rocky, next is a strip of three acres of sandy loam. The balance is clay. The soil is good, but its cultivation has been neglected.

At Dorchester the increase is caused by the fact that we are making provisions for the salary of a chief keeper, $800, for an instructor, $700, and for a fireman, $500. Under the new schedule which was adopted in 1895, provision is made for the appointment of these gentlemen, and of course we all understand that when the statute provides for the appointment of officials it is pretty hard to prevent them from being appointed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that supposed to be necessary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it appears so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I mean under the statute.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it is justifiable at all events.

Manitoba penitentiary, $51,600.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is a decrease of $7,600. That is because last year we took a vote of $8,000 with which we intended to purchase a piece of land, but after the vote was taken we found that the property was not suitable and we allowed vote to lapse.

Mr. BLAIN. How many inmates are there ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On the 30th June last year, there were 117 prisoners. The average number of prisoners at Stony Mountain is from 100 to 120.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it a fact, as stated by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary), that these men have nothing to do ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Perhaps they are not kept very busy, but as far as possible they are kept employed doing work on the farm, and in connection with the building, and also in the making of roads. That is the only occupation we can get for them. As hon. gentlemen know, one of the great unsolved problems of our penitentiary system to-day is to find profitable employment for the inmates of the penitentiaries, and if we are deprived of the benefit of the binder twine industry at Kingston we are going to be embarrassed to know what to do with the convicts.

Mr. McCREARY. Before this item passes I would like to say a word. I will not object to the passage of this item but when the supplementary estimates come down I will ask to have $5,000 or $10,000 put in to buy more ground in connection with Stony Mountain penitentiary. If we could get a binder twine plant put in, or have some other line of business established, the prisoners would have something to do, but as it is at present they have nothing to do. That penitentiary is situated on the wide prairie. There are practically no roads to construct. They will not allow the prison-

ers to go outside the penitentiary grounds. If they could make a road to Winnipeg or Stonewall, or some other point, then, I could understand the question. But there are, within a certain prescribed limit, 120 people for whom there is nothing to do. I submit to the hon. minister that if he will take this question up he will find that there is something that might be done with these people. They could either be employed in manufacturing binder twine or making a road to Winnipeg, a distance of 16 miles. I think the hon. minister ought to put into the estimates for this penitentiary a sum to be expended in buying more land. Land can be bought, not for $55 an acre, the price that the minister quoted as being charged in Ontario, but for $7 or $8 per acre—land which will yield 30 or 40 bushels of wheat to the acre. These prisoners might better be employed cultivating that land and producing some revenue than being allowed to remain idle. I think the hon. minister should look into the question and suggest something that will improve the condition of this penitentiary.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the prisoners doing now ?

Mr. McCREARY. I do not know that they are doing anything except building a wall 5 feet through and 14 feet high all around the penitentiary. That has been going on for five or six years. What it is going to be used for I do not know. They have been building that wall for the last five or six years and it is going on now—just putting in time.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The suggestion as to the purchase of more land is one that we are willing to agree to at once if we can get desirable land in a proper location and at a proper price. If we can do that and get the land on business principles we are prepared to do it. In respect to making a road to Winnipeg, of course, that is not possible. A prisoner cannot be taken beyond the prison reserve because if he is he is at large. This is a question of the number of guards to be employed. We have been overburdened with guards there in proportion to population because we have no wall to keep the convicts confined, and if we were to send them out to build roads to Winnipeg I am afraid we would have to consider the propriety of increasing our allowance for guards in that district.

British Columbia penitentiary, $52,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase for that also.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We have a considerable amount of work going on at the British Columbia penitentiary. There is a very considerable amount required for the purchase of materials for a new wing. We are endeavouring to have a new wing which will contain 100 additional cells. There is also a considerable increase in the cost of the maintenance of convicts on account of the increased prices of all that is required there compared with former years.

Prince Albert jail, $8,200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an increase of $2,200 principally for lands, buildings and water surface.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In connection with Prince Albert jail the reserve only contains 16 acres and that cost $50 per acre. The intention is to add 20 acres to the reserve, and we will purchase these 20 acres for $25 per acre. The land belongs to the Presbyterian Church.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not delayed the passing of these items although I think there are some hon. gentlemen who are not here to-night who may have a few words to say upon some of them. I take it for granted that anything can be said on the supplementary estimates.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The whole question is at large.

Expenses of litigated matters which may be paid for services in connection with the litigation conducted within the Department of Justice, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was the expenditure last year ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. $7,461.75.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is really for the work that is done in the Department of Justice outside of the duties of the officers ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice what arrangement he has for doing this work. Does the hon. minister have an agent in every county in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has he agents that are appointed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, we have agents that are appointed in any place where we have business to be done. We appoint an agent in the locality for the purpose of doing the business required.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are these agents authorized to hold themselves out to the public as such ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. Of course, they are authorized to do the business of the department.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have a letter here which I have no objection to show the hon. minister if he requires to see it in which a solicitor in St. Catharines states as an advertisement at the heading—that he is the :

Agent for the Minister of Justice for the county of Lincoln.

I would like to know if that is done with the approval of the department? Those of the legal profession in St. Catharines do not think that it is right according to the ethics of the profession.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I never heard of that. I suppose it is a matter of taste which should be dealt with by the Barristers' Society, as to the question of advertising. I am afraid that the profession has departed from the old rules.

Mr. LANCASTER. I should think that now that the minister knows about it, he would be able to deal with the matter. It must be done for some purpose, and if the minister knows that it is done and does not take means to stop it, the inference is that he approves of it. I call his attention to it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have seen cards issued by different firms in which they say they are solicitors for such and such a bank, and I apprehend that no great distinction can be drawn between a case of that sort and the case mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I suppose a gentleman may think it is rather to his credit to say that he has been appointed solicitor for the Department of Justice. It does not go beyond that. He does not say that he is appointed special solicitor for the purpose of doing business with the government; he does business for the government. I cannot see that there is much distinction between one man mentioning that he is solicitor for the Department of Justice, and another man saying that he is solicitor for a bank or for some great corporation. I do not want the name, but might I ask, is this gentleman as a matter of fact a solicitor for the Department of Justice?

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not know. I was going to ask the Minister of Justice if he has a newly-appointed agent for the county of Lincoln.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot remember.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not object to the minister seeing the name privately, and I will hand it over to him.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not remember the name now that I have seen it, but I am quite willing to inquire.

Mr. LANCASTER. And let us know later on.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to point out that the gentleman who does that sort of thing is in a different position from a solicitor for a bank. He holds himself out as representing the Crown by delegation of the Minister of Justice, and when a man assumes to represent the Crown, he is in a different position entirely in any county in Ontario, from a man representing a private corporation such as a bank. I thought it was my duty to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that that sort of thing was going on with the view of seeing whether the minister will permit it or not.

Consolidation of the statutes, $20,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have the commissioners been appointed?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, but they will be between this and the end of the session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister any expectation as to when the consolidation will be completed?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My intention is to appoint a greater number of commissioners than we have had heretofore, both with the intention of getting the work done expeditiously and of endeavouring to cut down the expense. I have been looking over the accounts in connection with the last revision of the statutes, and I find that the great bulk of the expenditure was caused by work being given outside, such as translation; and special parts of the statutes were given to special persons, who were charged with their preparation. My idea is to make the commission a little more numerous than the last one, and to endeavour to have the work done entirely by the commissioners. I hope the work will be done within two years.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 28, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and Aleutian Islands and each of the parishes and missions of the said church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—Mr. Oliver.

PACKING AND SALE OF COMMODITIES.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 141)

to amend the Act respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities. He said: The only alterations proposed by this Bill are the addition of the word 'dealer,' and certain amendments dealing with the penalties to be inflicted in case of infractions of the law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 142) to further amend the General Inspection Act. He said: The amendment consists in the addition of the word 'binder twine' to the list of articles covered by the law.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

On the motion being called.

Introduction of Bill intituled: 'An Act to amend the Chinese Immigration Act, 1900.'

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) with the consent of the House, I will substitute for this Bill a resolution. The Bill is intended to deal with the disposition of funds collected under the Chinese Immigration Act. I will drop this notice and give notice of a motion.

GRAIN INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Before the Orders of the day are called, I desire to ask the government if we are to have the amendments to the Grain Act that were promised early in the session, and, if so, when? I understand we are approaching the close of the session, and as this is a very important matter to the people of Manitoba and the North-west, I trust that the government will take us into their confidence and let us know when we are to expect this measure, so that we may be prepared to discuss it intelligently.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). We expect that this Bill will be introduced within a day or two.

TORONTO AND NIAGARA FALLS COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 100) to incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.—Mr. Campbell.

On section 11,

Mr. CLARKE. I gave notice of an amendment to clause 11, the purport of which is to make it clear that this company, when incorporated, shall not be permitted to discriminate against individuals or municipalities in supplying power for any purpose, whether for lighting, heating or for motive purposes. The clause reads now:

> The company may supply hydraulic, electric or other power. . . . . at such rates and upon such conditions as are agreed upon, and the company may contract with any company or person having erected or having power to erect.

I propose to amend the clause as follows:

> The company shall supply hydraulic, electric or other power by means of cables, machinery or other forces, to all persons, corporations and municipalities desiring the same along the line of its works, or within a reasonable distance thereof; and at such rates and upon such conditions as may be agreed upon; and if unable to agree, upon such terms as may be ordered by the Railway Committee of the Privy Council of Canada.

The object, Mr. Chairman, of the amendment is this: It may be merely a coincidence, but the gentlemen who are now applying for incorporation and asking for this Act from parliament are those who practically control the Toronto Railway Company and the Toronto Electric Light Companies. The franchise of the Toronto Railway Company has some years yet to run; it will be a most valuable franchise when it falls back again into the possession of the city. If this company is permitted to discriminate in the sale of power, it may render valueless a franchise that otherwise would be of very great value. There is nothing to prevent this company, after it has obtained incorporation, from using the power that it may become possessed of at Niagara Falls, only in its own interests, or in the promotion of those industries, the Electric Light Companies and the Toronto Railway Company, with which it is now specially identified. The feeling in favour of municipalities operating their franchises, such as tramways and lighting, is growing stronger every day. This company is being given very large powers in this Bill, and I think it is not at all unreasonable to make a reasonable provision that if in future, in five years, or three years, or ten years from now, the municipalities along the line of the company's works between Niagara Falls and Toronto should desire to operate a municipal electric light, or to operate their tramways, there should be no discrimination as to the rates at which the power should be supplied by this company. I think that these provisions are so reasonable and so just that the promoters of the Bill cannot offer any serious objection to them. I hope the committee and the promoter of the Bill will agree with me, and allow clause 11 to be amended in the direction I have indicated. It has been suggested that possibly the company might not have enough power to supply all the demands that may be made upon it by the municipalities or by individuals. It is proposed to

obviate a difficulty of that kind, if it should arise, by section 11a of which I have given notice, that is, that the Railway Committee, upon application, shall adjudicate between the parties.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Bill has received very careful attention from the committee, and when these amendments were proposed it was not thought in the interest of the public that they should be adopted. For my part, I cannot see any necessity for changing the word 'may' into 'shall.' We have never done it in any Bills that we have passed through the House. This company is investing a large amount of money in an enterprise that is in the public interest, and like every other company, they have asked the right to supply municipalities, corporations and individuals along their line with hydraulic, and electric power, and so on. It is, of course, their business, and their interest to supply these companies, that is what they are investing their money for, and they hope to make a profit out of it. But when you come on and say that they shall supply—make it compulsory, why, it is going a great length indeed; it is something that I am sure the committee will not insist on, because the company may not be able to supply all the power that is required. The amendment proposes that they shall supply 'to all persons, corporations and municipalities desiring the same along the line of its works or within a reasonable distance thereof.' A far-reaching clause indeed, and I do not think it would be fair at all to put such a clause as that in the Bill. This is not the first instance in which we have had legislation of this kind. Last year this House chartered the St. Lawrence Power Company, assented to on the 23rd of May, of last year, identically the same Act asking for the same power. We did not then find the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) insisting in putting in the word 'shall' instead of the word 'may.' Again, we have had the Ottawa & Hull Power Company, a company seeking the same powers that this company is doing, asking the same privileges, and there was no question then that the word 'may' should be struck out and the word 'shall' be inserted. Then we have had the Ontario and Niagara Falls Power Company, identically the same as this, with the same powers and privileges, authorized by this parliament only two years ago, and in all that Bill there is no such stringent provision—absurd provision to my mind, I may say—as is proposed now by the member for West Toronto.

Mr. COWAN. And it gets its power from the same source.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Then we have the Hamilton and Lake Erie Power Company also granted a charter by this House, and we have the Continental Light and Heat Company. All these charters have been granted by this parliament on precisely the same conditions as this company, asking the same privileges for generating heat, light and electricity by hydraulic power, and furnishing it to municipalities and corporations along the line. Parliament has never insisted on those companies being forced to do so, compelled, whether they can or not. The committee can readily see that if that word 'shall' goes in there instead of 'may,' and if, for any cause, they are unable to furnish the power that might be demanded of them, they would be put in a very disastrous position. The men at the head of this company are men of standing, men of ability, their financial strength is undoubted, they are going on in a regular way, and propose to enter into this as a business venture, and will, I have no doubt, supply all the corporations, municipalities and persons along the line as far as they are able to do it. I, for one, must protest against the amendment that is proposed by the member for Toronto.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I am inclined to agree altogether with the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell). In the first place, we have incorporated a large number of companies giving practically the same power that is given to this company. If it is desirable to have legislation along the lines suggested by the hon. member for West Toronto, then, it should be incorporated in a general Act and all companies should come under this general Act the same as railway companies do. Imagine picking out the Canadian Pacific Railway and saying that that road should be subject to a certain regulations to be fixed by the city of Toronto and at the same time exempting all other companies. It seems to me that if there is anything in the suggestions made by the hon. member for West Toronto they should be introduced into a general Act and made applicable to all companies similarly situated. The city of Toronto was represented by its solicitor before the committee when this Bill was considered and he appeared to agree with the changes and amendments made. Other representatives from the city of Toronto were also present at the committee and there was not any prolonged discussion of the matter. There are no extraordinary privileges being granted to this company; they are simply asking for the usual Act of incorporation to enable them to do business. The hon. gentleman gives notice of an amendment proposing to strike out of clause 13 the words 'unnecessary damage.' Perhaps the committee have gone further on this occasion than is customary in other incorporations of this kind, because, when this point was brought to the attention of the committee, they did strike out the word 'unnecessary.' So, the Bill has been amended so far as this point is concerned. I submit that the amendments of which the hon. member for West Toronto has given notice should be incor-

porated in general legislation and not applied to this Bill, thus placing other companies that have already been incorporated in a better position than this company which is composed of most substantial men and men who are probably more likely than any other to carry out what is desirable in bringing electrical power to Niagara Falls and distributing it through that section of Ontario. I do not know what view I might take upon the merits of these suggestions if they came before the House in a proper way, but, I think it would be most unfair that they should be specially directed against this company, preventing them from going on with their business and leaving the work which they propose to do in the hands of others who are now incorprated. I think that we should not direct this special legislation against this company while not applying it to all other companies.

Mr. PRINGLE. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Private Bills Committee, I took some interest in this Bill while it was under discussion. As stated by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland), the matter was very fully gone into in the committee. Mr. Fullerton, the very able counsel for the city of Toronto, raised a number of points and some of these points were met by the committee. I was under the impression that the Bill as passed was perfectly satisfactory to the representatives of the city of Toronto. I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that if any restrictions are placed on commercial corporations such as this they should be placed by a general Act. We find that some years ago, in the state of New York, a charter was given to a large corporation for the development of power on the American side. In examining that charter I find that there are no restrictions of the sort which it is sought to impose here. It is optional with them to supply power and not imperative as is desired by the hon. mover of this amendment (Mr. Clarke). It seems to me that in regard to an enterprise of this sort, it is open to the keenest possible competition, because, there is not only the competition so far as Niagara is concerned, but there is also the competition from other plants and I therefore think that the duty of supplying electricity should not be made imperative as desired by the mover of the amendment. We find that the Ontario and Niagara Falls Power Company have also got large powers, and unquestionably there will be keen competition in so far as these two companies are concerned. Last year I took some interest in the incorporation of the St. Lawrence Power Company. I am aware that that company has developed a very fine power and now they are looking for consumers of that power and I am satisfied that competition will regulate matters of this sort. I find that we have precedent for the Bill which is now before the committee. Almost similar provisions are in the Bills of the Bay of Quinté Railway Company, the British American Pulp and Paper Company, the Canadian Power Company and the Welland Canal Power and Supply Company, and dozens of others that have been passed within the last four or five years by this parliament. For these reasons I think the clause settled on by the Private Bills Committee should stand and that this amendment should not carry.

Mr. OSLER. It is always difficult to frame an amendment to such a Bill as this is, but I think the argument which has been introduced here particularly against this amendment that because other Bills have been passed containing similar provisions this amendment should not be adopted is entirely fallacious. I noticed that the chief argument was that because Bills of this character have been passed before, we should not adopt this amendment, but if a wrong has been done in the past, if provisions have been adopted that do not properly protect the public, I think this wrong should not be perpetuated. I believe that all these power companies, from Niagara Falls particularly, will be amalgamated into one company and I venture to make the assertion that in ten years all of these companies will be under one control. That control will have a franchise that this House will recognize and will be worth an enormous sum of money. We are proposing to grant to this company all the powers of expropriation that a railway company has. For that reason I contend that this company should be under control as completely as any railway company is under control, and while I am not able to agree to some of the amendments which have been suggested to the charter, because it is difficult to say just now wherein the danger lies with a company of this character or with several companies together and combining to control the whole of the electrical power from Niagara, I think the suggestion thrown out by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) is a very good one that such clauses should be embodied in a general Bill. I would suggest that in all these cases that the provisions of this charter should be subject to whatever Acts may be passed by this parliament hereafter. If that clause is put in I think it would safeguard sufficiently all the powers that may be dangerous which are granted in this Bill. I think that clause should be accepted by the promoters of this Bill, and it is one which is entirely on the lines suggested by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) is perhaps not aware that the Railway Act does apply to this company so far as expropriation powers are concerned, and that the clause was most carefully considered by the committee.

Mr. OSLER. Would it do any harm to put in this simple clause stating that this charter shall be subject to all Acts that may be passed by this House referring to electrical companies of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There can be no doubt that it is.

Mr. OSLER. We have too many disputes with companies on that very point. In the committee this year we have not had very many disputes, but it is stated that certain companies are under the control of the government and the companies themselves say they are not under the control of the government. Let us make this quite clear. If it is in the clause already, why not insert this and make it without any doubt.

Mr. PRINGLE. I cannot see the necessity for adding that clause. Parliament is supreme in these matters, and it can at any time pass a general Bill which will govern matters of this sort. The clause proposed might be a serious handicap to the people who are endeavouring to develop the power at Niagara. It is very uncertain whether it is possible to profitably transmit power for a long distance, and anything which might hinder the company in its financing would possibly destroy the franchise which they will obtain under this Bill. I know nothing whatever about this company, but it may be that they would require to issue bonds, and I do not think we should put in the Bill anything which would prevent them carrying on their operations. We all know that parliament is supreme and can at any time pass a general Bill, if it is thought that injustice is being done.

Mr. COWAN. As chairman of the Private Bills Committee it is only fair to the House that I should state what took place in that committee. We had probably the largest meeting of the committee which took place this session, when we considered this Bill. Thirty or forty members must have been present. Mr. Fullerton, the solicitor of the city of Toronto, was in attendance. We brought Mr. Fullerton up to the table and told him that the committee was quite willing to extend to him all the privileges of a member, and that if at any time he took objection to a clause, either on behalf of the city of Toronto or any other municipality, the committee would deem it a favour if he drew attention to it. Mr. Fullerton took a seat at the table and several times he made suggestions, very many of which, if not all, were adopted by the committee. Mr. Brock, the member for Centre Toronto, was also present. As we know, Mr. Brock is largely interested in the financial affairs of Toronto, and his business interests are identified with the prosperity and progress of that city. The committee considered this Bill for upwards of two hours, and the following sections were amended : 5, 8, 12, 13, 21. An absolutely new section was inserted, and section 20 with four sub-clauses was stricken out. Mr. Fullerton raised the point concerning the right to supply every municipality, but when his attention was drawn to the fact that section 90 of the Railway Act was incorporated in the Bill, it apparently satisfied his objection. Section 90 of the Railway Act reads :

> When any company has power by any Act of the parliament of Canada to construct and maintain lines of telegraph or telephone, or lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power, or electricity, such company may with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon.

While this company has power to expropriate, they have not the power, without the consent of the municipality, to use these streets or public places, and Mr. Fullerton, as counsel for the city of Toronto, did not deny this. The committee thought the entire matter rested in the hands of the city of Toronto. When this company goes to erect poles or wires across the streets of Toronto, it can only do so with the consent of the municipal council of that city, or of other municipalities in which it operates. Surely the city of Toronto, with its solicitor, and able representatives like the gentlemen who have spoken to-day, ought to be able to look after this Bill. If the municipal council of Toronto have not sufficient ability to guard the interests of the city and to make a contract that light, heat and power shall be supplied at the current rates, the committee thought that they were not called upon to interfere. I rose for the purpose of stating that this Bill was considered with great care; that no less than nine amendments were made; one new clause inserted, and one clause with four subsections absolutely stricken out. Whenever a suggestion was made that suggestion was adopted with the unanimous consent of the committee; at no time was there a motion made that did not meet with the approval of the committee, and the committee at no time was divided.

Mr. MONK. I do not think that because this Bill was not amended in the committee in the sense in which it was desired to amend it now, that we should be estopped from amending it, if it is thought just to do so. It happened that my hon. friend (Mr. Cowan) was not present once when a Bill was considered in committee, and the House came to his relief on that occasion.

Mr. COWAN. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. I believe it did.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. MONK. I think that was the case in connection with the Red Deer Valley Bill.

Mr. COWAN. The motion before the House was to refer it back for further consideration. I never asked to have amended in this House something that had been passed after due deliberation in the committee.

Mr. MONK. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that he was absent from the committee when the Red Deer Bill was considered.

Mr. COWAN. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. And he wanted the Bill referred back.

Mr. COWAN. Not because I was absent, but because of a technicality the opponents of the Bill had taken advantage of, and that had never previously been taken in the Railway Committee.

Mr. MONK. There is no question but that my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) has the right to propose any amendment in the House which he deems advisable. I quite agree with the Minister of Marine that it would be desirable to have a general law applicable to companies of this kind, but as I understand, the promoters of this company at present control the Toronto Street Railway as well as the lighting of that city. As was pointed out by my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) the franchise of one of these companies is going to expire within a few years, and it is evident that in this particular case should the city desire to retake control of the franchise it will be quite possible for this company to hold up the city in respect to the power. This is, therefore, a very special case. As coming from the city of Montreal, I may say that we have seen such things happen there. It will be desirable to provide if it is possible to do so by this amendment, that in case of difficulties of that kind arising it would be possible for the city of Toronto to obtain that power upon the payment of what might be considered legitimate compensation to be fixed by an independent authority. It seems to me that if it is possible to provide for this contingency, as it may present itself very shortly, it would be desirable to do so.

Mr. FRASER. If that was the point, there might be something in it, although even then it should be done by a general law. The city of Toronto has power already to acquire the company. It has power to do that, whether the company want to or not.

An hon. MEMBER. No.

Mr. FRASER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. If 'shall' was inserted in the place of 'may' that might be the case, but there is not a man along the whole line of this company that can compel them to supply him.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. gentleman read section 11a.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. FRASER. What has that got to do with it? 11a will be read in the light of section 11. It says:

> The Railway Committee shall, upon application of the company or any person, corporation or municipality, have power to make an order, in lieu of an agreement under clause 11, which shall be binding on the parties.

Until we have a general law covering all such cases, I do not think we should commence with one particular company.

Mr. CLARKE. Where are you going to commence?

Mr. FRASER. Commence by bringing in a general law. Why did the hon. gentleman not introduce a Bill in that direction at the beginning of this session? I regret that these amendments were not moved in the committee; but at any rate I shall have to vote against compelling the company to do what is proposed, whether it wants to or not.

Mr. CLARKE. I have been listening now for four or five years to the argument which is made use of at times and abandoned at times, when it suits the particular exigencies of the case, that because a Bill has happened to pass through a Standing Committee of this House, therefore it ought not to be amended in this House.

Mr. FRASER. No, by no means. We can change the whole Bill here if we want to; but what I said was that after a large committee had gone carefully into a Bill, they had a better opportunity of arriving at a correct decision than we have now.

Mr. WADE. If the hon. member for West Toronto considers the matter a little more carefully, I think he will see that this amendment is not advisable. I had occasion last year to make inquiries from the very best authorities with regard to the transmission of electricity over long distances, and I learned from those parties that it is an open question to-day whether it is possible to tap a long distance line very frequently along its route. It has not been demonstrated that it can be done successfully; but the amendment lays on the company the absolute burden of tapping their line from the time they start at Niagara Falls until they reach the city of Toronto. That is absolute and binding. Section 11a, if the interpretation placed upon it by the hon. member for West Toronto is correct, is in conflict with section 11. It seems to me we should have some very good reason before making such a departure as is proposed in the case of this company. We have been granting similar powers to other companies all along. It may be suggested that we were unwise in doing so; but if we were, and if a departure is now made, it should be in the form of a general law. If the city of Toronto is going to fall heir to its rights in the street railway in a few years, is there

any reason why we should lay this burden on these people ? There is no monopoly in electricity, because there will always be the check involved in the cost of producing it by steam. Besides, the city has the right to harness the power, and bring it in for itself if it likes. If the Bill is amended as the hon. member for West Toronto proposes, you will not find a capitalist to put a dollar into the enterprise, because it will be at the mercy of every person and municipality along the line.

Mr. CLARKE. I cannot undertake to express an opinion as to the soundness of the views of the two hon. gentlemen who have last spoken, not being a lawyer ; but the simple object of these amendments is that this company, which now practically owns the street railway and the electric lighting of the city of Toronto, ought to be compelled, before the powers asked for in this Bill are granted, to supply power to every municipality along its line that may apply for it and may be willing to pay for it, provided the company has the power to dispose of.

Mr. WADE. What objection would there be to these different municipalities through which this line passes before they give their consent to the erection of poles, saying : 'We will only allow you to do this on condition that you supply us with electricity at certain prices '?

Mr. CLARKE. I am advised that the municipalities have not that power. This company being incorporated as a company to construct works for the general advantage of Canada, is given a very great privilege.

Mr. FRASER. How does the hon. gentleman think the company could enter a municipality without its consent ?

Mr. CLARKE. The municipality, as I am advised—I speak, of course, as a layman—cannot declare that this company or any similar company must not enter within the limits of the municipality until it agrees to supply power to the municipality on reasonable terms. If the hon. gentlemen opposite, who are objecting to these amendments, will provide in this Bill that this company cannot enter into the city of Toronto or exercise the powers asked for under this Bill without the consent of the municipality, we shall be prepared to withdraw all these amendments. The gentlemen who are applying for this Act of incorporation control the Toronto Street Railway and the Electric Light Companies, and if this provision is not inserted in the Bill, they can sell to themselves all the power available at Niagara Falls.

There is nothing to prevent them from thus possessing themselves of all the power that will be available when these works are constructed. The hon. gentleman asks me why the city does not supply its own power. It endeavoured to obtain authority from the legislature of Ontario to generate power at the Falls and bring it across for municipal purposes, but was refused that right ; and now we have half a dozen private individuals, however worthy they may be, coming to this parliament and asking for authority to construct these works and be given practically a monopoly of all the power generated at the Falls, which they may sell to whom and at what price they please. Is that a reasonable proposition in view of the value of the franchise we are giving them under this Bill ? The hon. gentleman says that Bills giving similar franchises have passed this House time and again.

Mr. PRINGLE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question to him ? The question I wish to put is : How this section 90 of the Railway Act, as amended in 1889, affects this question ? The amendment is as follows :

> When any company has power by any Act of parliament to construct and maintain lines of telegraph or telephone or lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, such company may with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon, &c.

The reason I put my question is this: We had this matter up in committee and it was there threshed out. The hon. gentleman was not present. The effect of this amendment of section 90 of the Railway Act was there thoroughly threshed out. I rather gather, from what the hon. gentleman says, that the section of the Act does not mean what it purports. Well, I understand that it means just what it expresses. All companies have to obtain the consent of a municipality before passing through it. And I want to ask, what is the effect on this question of section 90 of the Railway Act, as amended in 1899 ?

Mr. CLARKE. I did not know that the hon. gentleman was going to make a speech when he asked permission to put a question. Well, I am not qualified to answer what the force and meaning of section 90 of the Consolidated Railway Act really are. But these amendments were prepared by the counsel of the city of Toronto, who considers them essential to protect the interests of the city, and therefore asks that they be incorporated in this Bill before it becomes law. It is surely not unreasonable to ask that a great municipality like the city of Toronto, which contains more than one-tenth the population of the whole province, shall be protected in its rights when a company is seeking incorporation giving it such great power ? There is no desire on the part of the city of Toronto to prevent the incorporation of this company. But what we do desire is that if the company is given power to erect works in order to bring electric energy from Niagara Falls to Toronto, it shall not be allowed to discrimin-

ate after it has done so, against any individual or corporation, even the corporation of the city of Toronto. What objection can there be to a provision of that kind, especially when, in case of disagreement or dispute, the Governor in Council is authorized to adjudicate between the parties ? It may be only a coincidence, but it is a fact that the people seeking incorporation control a lot of railway companies, whose franchises are becoming more and more valuable. They control the franchises of the Toronto Railway Company and the suburban roads running out of Toronto, connected with the Toronto Railway Company, and the franchises of the electric light companies, and when these franchises fall in——

An hon. MEMBER. When will that be ?

Mr. CLARKE. It does not make a particle of difference, so far as the principle is concerned. Is it not reasonable to ask this House to provide that when they do fall in, should the municipality decide to operate these franchises itself, it shall be enabled to do so ? That is the effect of the amendment the committee are asked to agree to. It has been said several times that I was not present at the meeting of the committee at which this Bill was considered. Well, I am not a member of that committee, but I had another committee meeting to attend to, or I would have been there. I do not know what was done at the committee meeting, but, of course, accept unreservedly the statement of hon. gentlemen who were present ; but I say that these amendments were prepared by the counsel of the city of Toronto, and handed to me before he left Ottawa. If it be said that this company and all other similar companies will come under the operation of a general Act, when it is passed, that need not have a deterent effect on those who propose to put their capital into this scheme. What I assume to provide against, is discrimination, and I contend that there ought to be a clause in this Bill providing that this company shall come under the operation of any general law that may be passed in the future, dealing with this and other companies of a similar nature. Surely it is not unreasonable that we should have a provision of this kind in the Bill ? It would be a great injustice if parliament were to pass a Bill, under the operation of which this company might hold up any municipality, by having a monopoly of electrical energy, and prevent the people getting the greatest amount of benefit out of any franchise which they desire to dispose of or to operate. There is no desire to prevent the incorporation of this company, but there is no reason why the rights of municipalities should not be protected. I hope, therefore, that the committee will agree to the amendment suggested.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. CLARKE.

Mr. CLARKE. I beg to move that the following clause be added :

11a. The Railway Committee shall upon application of the company, or of any person, corporation or municipality have power to make an order in lieu of an agreement, under clause 11 hereof, which shall be binding upon the parties, and may determine to whom and at what prices and within what distance such power shall be supplied under the provisions of clauses 11, 12 and 13 of this Act.

Bill reported.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE. Notwithstanding the adverse decision of the committee, I desire to take the sense of the House on this measure, and I beg, therefore, to move that the Bill be not now read the third time, but be referred to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Is the amendment in order without notice being given ?

The SPEAKER. The amendment is in order. It is that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration. Besides I think that notices have been given of the amendments.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Clarke) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Barker,	Lancaster,
Birkett,	Léonard,
Blain,	McIntosh,
Cargill,	Monk,
Clarke,	Oliver,
Earle,	Osler,
Hackett,	Simmons,
Kaulbach,	Tolton,
Kidd,	Vrooman.—18.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Macdonald,
Angers,	Mackie,
Bazinet,	MacKinnon,
Béland,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Belcourt,	McCool,
Blair,	McCreary,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	McGugan,
Boyd,	McLennan,
Brunet,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Bureau,	Matheson,
Calvert,	Maxwell,
Campbell,	Meigs,
Carroll,	Monet,
Champagne,	Parmelee,
Christie,	Paterson,
Costigan,	Pringle,
Cowan,	Reid (Restigouche),
Davis,	Richardson,
Demers (St. John),	Riley,
Douglas,	Roche (Halifax),
Dugas,	Rosamond,
Dyment,	Ross (Ontario),
Emmerson,	

Farquharson,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Flint,	Russell,
Fraser,	Sifton,
Gibson,	Stewart,
Girard,	Sutherland (Essex),
Holmes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tarte,
Johnston (Lambton),	Thompson,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tucker,
Lavell,	Turgeon,
LeBlanc,	Wade,
Lewis,	Ward,
Logan,	Wright.—74.
Loy,	

Amendment negatived.

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

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville).

Bill (No. 96) to incorporate the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 129) respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 128) respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 118) for the relief of James Brown.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 126) to incorporate the Bishop of Moosonee.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Cowan.

Bill (No. 125) to amend the Acts relating to the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway.—Mr. Champagne.

QUESTIONS.

CADETS, ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, AND THE CORONATION.

Mr. PORTER—by Mr. Roche (Marquette)—asked :

1. Has any application been made by the commandant of the Royal Military College, Kingston, for leave to have a detachment of the cadets of the college accompany other detachments to the Coronation ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to send a detachment of cadets from the Royal Military College, Kingston, to attend the Coronation ?

3. If any application has been made, as in question one, has any, and if so, what, reply has been given there to ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden).

1. No.
2. No.

SOCKS FOR SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.

Mr. HENDERSON—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Were tenders invited for the supply of socks required for the third contingent of constabulary sent to South Africa ?

2. If so, to whom was the contract awarded, and at what price per dozen pairs ?

3. If no tenders were invited, from whom were such goods purchased, and at what price ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). This is purely an Imperial matter, the contract is for the Imperial government.

TOLLS ON BRITISH YUKON RAILWAY.

Mr. CLARKE asked :

1. Are the by-laws respecting the tolls and charges to be fixed, regulated and charged by the British Yukon Railway Company, mentioned in the Order in Council published in the 'Canada Gazette' on the 1st day of March, 1902, still in force ?

2. Has any one, or more, and if so, which, of the said by-laws, or the approval thereof by the Governor in Council, been rescinded ?

3. With regard to the condition of the said Order in Council :—'That by-laws Nos. 4 and 5 be approved, subject to the express understanding and condition that no tolls deemed excessive by the Governor in Council will be charged for transport over the railway between Skagway and White Pass ; and that, if such excessive tolls are charged, the Governor in Council may rescind any Order in Council approving the tolls fixed by the said by-laws, or may reduce such tolls,' is the government aware that since the date of the said Order in Council, a charge of $31 per ton—taking class 10 as a basis—is made for hauling a ton 21 miles, from Skagway to the Summit, while from the Summit to White Pass, 90 miles, the charge is $14 per ton, making a total charge of $45 per ton for 110 miles ?

4. If such a charge is made, does the government consider the toll excessive, within the intention of the said Order in Council ?

5. Has the government rescinded the said Order in Council in whole or in part, or reduced the tolls thereby approved ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) :

1. Yes.

2. Not any one or more of the said by-laws or the approval of the Governor in Council have been rescinded.

3. The government is not aware that since the date of the said Order in Council a charge of $31 per ton is made for hauling twenty-one miles from Skagway to the Summit while from the Summit to White Pass, ninety miles, the charge is $14 per ton.

4. The government is not aware that such charge is made, and has therefore had no reason to consider the question.

5. No, it has not.

GARDEN PRODUCE—A REMODELLING OF THE TARIFF.

Mr. J. E. EMILE LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) moved :

That it is greatly in the interest of the market gardeners and the farmers, that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

In moving this resolution, which is the first one I have the honour to submit to this House, allow me, Mr. Speaker, to define my policy on all matters pertaining to agriculture, which is the corner stone of the prosperity of our country. I am in favour of protecting the Canadian farmer, and that by any means and at any cost ; and to this end, both sides of the House should join hands, and, in discussing this national question, they should meet on neutral ground, when all party divisions being cast aside, we could all direct our common efforts to improving the condition of the farming community. For my part, I have no hesitation in saying that I would be ready to support and co-operate with any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, and even with out and out Liberals. I have the honour to represent in this House the county of Laval, which is rightly called the garden of Montreal, and in that county, as in most agricultural counties in Canada, garden produce is an important feature of the farming business, and I believe that the government ought, without further delay, to readjust the duties imposed upon market produce imported into this country, so as to satisfy the demands of the gardeners. Several important delegations have waited upon the government with a view to asking for a more efficacious protection in favour of their products, and, since then, our farmers have been anxiously awaiting the changes, the need of which is so keenly felt and which should be granted by any government who strives to protect and encourage the tillers of the soil. What do our market gardeners require at the hands of the government ? What they are asking for, Sir, is but fair and reasonable ; like all workingmen, they want to be well paid for their work, or in other words, they want to be protected from the encroachments of foreigners. Now, Sir, a very simple way of reaching that object would be to change our small *ad valorem* duty into a specific duty, and that is the only way in which we can give them fair protection. Market gardening is developing very rapidly in this country, and in my county, and in the neighbouring county as well, there are nearly 200 market gardeners, who employ on an average four or five hands each, some of them even employing as many as thirty hands, in the raising of vegetables for the Montreal market. Those gardeners rank in the census as farmers. Out of that number about 125 grow vegetables in hot-beds, and the number of those hot-beds is very near 20,000, of a total value of $150,000, and the capital invested in that business, such as horses, teams and implements or tools, must reach a still higher figure. The implements used by gardeners, the teams, the clothes, and indeed everything that they require, is highly protected by duties to which they do not object, provided that their products receive the same protection. At the present moment, market gardeners in Canada are only protected by a duty *ad valorem*, based on the cost prices in the Southern States, where those vegetables are raised in open ground at very low cost, at a season of the year when, in Canada, the snow still covers the ground.

I have now on my desk a petition signed by a large number of gardeners of West Lambton, asking for a readjusting of customs duties. That petition has been submitted to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), but so far it has remained unanswered. This petition reads as follows :—

We, the undersigned, farmers and gardeners of the electoral division of West Lambton, beg to call respectfully your attention to the following articles of the American tariff as compared with the Canadian tariff.

Then they go on to say that a duty of 25 cents per bushel is levied on potatoes, whereas, under the Canadian tariff, they pay only 15 cents per bushel. Cabbages must pay a duty of 3 cents each, under the American tariff, whereas the Canadian tariff only imposes a duty *ad valorem* of 25 per cent. Onions pay a duty of 40 cents per bushel under the American tariff, whereas the Canadian tariff imposes a duty *ad valorem* of 25 per cent.

They further state that, as to those three articles, the Canadian producer finds it well-nigh impossible to compete on the American market, on account of the difference in tariff rates ; whilst the American producer can easily come in here to compete with the Canadian producer on his own market. As a consequence, the American producer, having the advantage of a milder climate, in the south of the United States. can put his products much earlier on the market, and at the very moment when the Canadian producer could hope to reap the benefit of his early production, he finds his own market flooded with foreign products, which, as is well known, cannot compare in quality with those raised here, but only serve the purpose of lowering prices, to the great detriment of the Canadian producer.

A remodelling of the tariff would, in our opinion, remedy that evil. Such a readjustment should have for its object the raising

of our tariff so as to enhance the price of American vegetables to the Canadian consumer, and enable our farmers to secure a sufficient price for their vegetables grown during the winter season.

This petition is backed by a resolution passed by the Association of market gardeners of Ontario, who also ask the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to amend the tariff and to impose the following duties :—

Asparagus, 3 cents per lb.
Cabbages, 3 cents each.
Cauliflowers, 3 cents each.
Celery, 25 cents per doz.
Beans, 50 cents per bushel.
Green Cucumbers, 20 cents per doz.
Onions, 40 cents per bushel of 56 lb.
Beans, 50 cents per bushel.
Tomatoes, 5 cents per lb.
Water melons, 5 cents each.
Musk melons (cantaloupe), 3 cents each.
Spinach, 25 cents per bushel.
Other vegetables, not elsewhere enumerated, including green corn, 25 per cent.

It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to speak at greater length on this question, the more so as the hon. Minister of Customs is perfectly acquainted with the matter, from the great number of petitions bearing on this special subject which have been presented to him within the last two years. The only serious objection that can be raised is that the consumer will have to pay a little more for early vegetables. Well, even this objection falls to the ground if we take into consideration the fact that those who can afford to eat green vegetables in the winter, when there is a great scarcity of them, have certainly the means to pay a little more without inconvenience. Moreover, what has taken place in the case of manufactured products will also happen in the case of farm produce ; and the impetus thus given to market gardening will give rise to local competition, and in the end the consumer will not have to pay any more than he does at present, and we shall have promoted and encouraged an industry which may well be truly called national.

I agree that it is somewhat late, at this stage of the session, to present this resolution. But I could not do it sooner, having had to wait for some of the papers asked for, and which the minister has just brought down. At any rate, this question is essentially a Canadian question, and this House, irrespective of party affiliations, ought forthwith to take into consideration the grievances complained of by Canadian market gardeners. Those complaints do not come from any single province, but they come from every province, and, as a matter of fact, the department of the Minister of Customs is flooded with similar requests coming from all parts of the Dominion.

It is not sufficient for the government to encourage railways, and to protect commerce and manufactures, because, if the wants of the farming community are not attended to, and farmers are unable to get a living, it is to no purpose that we are passing legislation here to encourage railways, manufacturers or immigration, agriculture being the very corner stone of our national prosperity.

Before voting appropriations for immigration, before throwing away our money, and launching upon extravagant schemes, as the present government are doing, we ought to consider if it is not possible for us to remedy the existing evil. What I have just called your attention to is one of those evils which we ought to be able to eradicate. If that evil exists among the farming community it is only for want of adequate protection. I have spoken at greater length than I intended because the question is a very important one, as it affects a large number of our fellow-countrymen. I think all the honourable gentlemen representing agricultural counties ought to participate in this debate and support my demands.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). (Translation.) Would the hon. deputy, before resuming his seat, be kind enough to tell me upon what particular articles he desires to have higher duties imposed than those now in force ?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I have pointed them out a little while ago, namely, asparagus, 3 cents a pound ; cabbages, 3 cents each ; cauliflowers, 3 cents each ; celery, 25 cents a dozen ; green pease, 50 cents a bushel ; green cucumbers, 50 cents per dozen ; onions, 40 cents per bushel of 56 pounds ; potatoes, 25 cents per bushel ; melons, 3 cents each ; spinach, 25 cents per bushel ; other vegetables, not elsewhere enumerated, including green corn, 25 per cent. Such are the demands embodied in the petition of the market gardeners.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) One word only. We should bear in mind that the present tariff is the same as was in force in former years. Then it should not be forgotten that the articles on which they want us to impose higher duties are the very same which we cannot produce all the year round. There is a considerable trade in garden produce, especially in Montreal. The city of Montreal is the great distributing point for the products mentioned by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Leonard.) I entertain considerable doubts as to the increase of duties on those products imported from abroad being likely to result in something practical, if you take into consideration the fact that our farmers cannot supply that foreign market, because they do not produce those vegetables all the year round. Many articles, amongst those just mentioned by the hon. gentleman, are imported from the United States, to which country a little later in the year many similar products of our own are

exported. If we raised the duties on those products as asked for by the hon. gentleman we should incur the risk of retaliation on the part of the United States as to products coming from Canada. We carry on, for instance, a considerable trade in melons with our neighbours, and our duty on that article is 25 per cent, whereas it is on the free list in the United States. What would my hon. friend say if the American government should decide to impose on that article a similar duty to ours ?

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) That would make no difference.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman says that it woud make no difference. But I think it would make a good deal of difference. If it was the same for the United States, why should it not be the same for us ?

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) They don't grow melons in the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I may tell the hon. gentleman that I have eaten some excellent melons in the United States.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) They had, no doubt, been grown here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) Of course, they are not so palatable as those grown by some constituents of my hon. friend. At any rate, it is of public notoriety that the greatest number of the articles, upon which we are asked to increase the duty, are not produced in the winter months. We should thereby be increasing the prices of those products to the great mass of consumers without our market gardeners being benefited thereby.

That question was much debated during the last election in the county of Laval, and that is no doubt, one of the grounds on which my hon. friend (Mr. Leonard) has thought it fit to-day to address the House, in discharge of the mandate received at the hands of those who are anxious to have the duties increased.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) My hon. friend wants us to raise the duties upon lettuce, cucumbers, tomatoes, asparagus, celery, beets, onions, &c. It is well known that in the winter months we do not grow cabbages nor cucumbers. We are also aware that it is extremely difficult to raise tomatoes in the winter season. We had to pay, last winter, 50 cents a pound for tomatoes of Canadian growth, whilst American tomatoes were being sold on the Montreal market at 20 cents a pound.

I am no free trader, but it is necessary to use common sense in our transactions in this world, and I declare here and now that I object to paying 50 cents a pound for Canadian tomatoes, when I can have American tomatoes for 20 cents. It is really going too far. This shows conclusively that tomatoes cannot be grown here with advantage in the winter months. So with asparagus and cucumbers. We do not produce asparagus nor celery in the winter season. There is not to be found one single gardener in the whole island of Montreal, or around Ottawa or Toronto, who can grow lettuce as good as that imported from the United States in the winter.

It is idle to appeal to prejudices. There are enough people buying tomatoes and lettuce, for let it be known that I am speaking the plain unvarnished truth. Cauliflowers are not grown in the winter months in Canada. I agree that during a certain season of the year they can be kept, perhaps during two or three months. The cauliflowers we buy in the winter are imported from the United States.

In short, I believe that what the hon. gentleman is aiming at is to make political capital with the electors and to catch popular favour rather than appealing to their reason. Let my hon. friend allow me, in all due deference, to call his attention to the fact that, in the province of Quebec, as elsewhere, farmers have a great deal of common sense. Go through the county of Laval and ask the market gardeners if they can produce cucumbers, celery, tomatoes and cauliflowers in the winter months, and they will tell you that they cannot do so.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) How then does the hon. minister account for the uneasiness which prevails among market gardeners ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) It is very easy to create ill-feeling among people who think they do not sell their products high enough ; but that grievance can easily be remedied. The market gardeners around Montreal receive just as much protection as any other class of the community does, and I may further say that those gardeners are the most prosperous people in the country. Should I be disposed, nevertheless, to add something to their happiness, would that be conducive to the happiness of other classes of the community much more numerous than the market gardeners are. To my mind, the consumers of Montreal should not be forced to pay extravagant prices for these products.

The consumers would be forced either to deprive themselves of vegetables or to pay exorbitant prices for them. Should we impose additional duties, consumers would have to pay 25 or 30 per cent more, nor could we hope thereby to increase the production of those articles which cannot be grown to advantage in this country the

whole year round. There are seasons when we must import vegetables from the United States, because they can there be grown more easily and much more cheaply.

As I have stated before, the Canadian tariff is the same as the American tariff.

Mr. TALBOT. (Translation.) With the exception of potatoes, which pay 10 cents more in the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) I say that our tariff is about the same. Now, by increasing our tariff all we would gain would be to see our products shut out from the United States.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) There is this great difference, that the climate of the United States is favourable to the production of vegetables, whereas the Canadian climate is not so advantageous. And that is why our farmers ought to receive more protection than is given to the farmers in the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) My hon. friend knows very well that, even if additional duties were imposed on peas, tomatoes, cucumbers and other vegetables, that would neither improve the climate nor enable us to grow those vegetables to advantage during the winter months. The increase in the duties asked for by my hon. friend would only result in forcing the consumer to pay more for those products, without improving the condition of the Canadian producer. To my mind, such a proposition is preposterous.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) is not very familiar with the subject, but that does not surprise me, because it is not in his department. I am sorry that he should look upon this matter as a purely electoral matter. I am afraid that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) looks upon it in the same light, from the words which fell from his lips while the hon. Minister of Public Works was answering my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard). It is not a mere electoral matter. It is a serious question. Although a local question, it interests deeply all the gardeners who live in the vicinity of large cities, not around Montreal only, but in the vicinity of Toronto and all of the great cities of this Dominion, and if that statement is well founded, I do not think a matter which interests such a large class of people should be treated in the light manner in which it has been treated by the hon. Minister of Public Works. Of course, it is not in his department, but it is surprising that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) should not be here and say a few words upon this matter and be able to give us the views of the government. This motion has been on the Order paper since the first day of the session. It has been the first order on the paper for ten days, and under these circumstances, as this is the last day, if I understand it aright, reserved for motions of this sort, I submit that it was the duty of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to be here in his seat and tell us what the position of the government is upon the question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will be sorry to know that if the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not in his seat to-day it is because he is unwell and cannot attend.

Mr. MONK. I am sorry to hear that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is unwell, but in his absence, I presume, that some members of the government will be able to give to the question a little more consideration than it has been possible for the hon. Minister of Public Works to do. This is not a new matter, before this parliament, or before the government. It has been pending for two years. It is a matter affecting not only interests of the market gardeners of my own province, represented here by the hon. member for Laval, and by myself, but of the gardeners of the province of Ontario, for, Sir, it is not very long ago that the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell) who, at that time, seemed to be extremely zealous in the interests of the gardeners of West York, came down and met me here in Ottawa. I came with a delegation of the Association of Market Gardeners of the province of Quebec and with the delegates of the Association of Market Gardeners of West York, the delegates of the Association of the province of Quebec waited upon the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and I think the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), and there exposed what was considered to be a real grievance. This was just before the election in West York, and although no positive assurance was given us by the government, we went away having been assured by the three members of the government present that our requests and petitions would receive the earnest consideration of the government. Now, it seems to me, that that earnest consideration is not manifested by the few remarks which the hon. Minister of Public Works has made. It is impossible, I deem it, Sir, that the requests and the claims we made could have been as carefully investigated as we were promised, if, as I take it, the answer of the government is contained in what was said here by the hon. Minister of Public Works. Not only was this important step taken by the market gardeners of both provinces, but both provinces were absolutely in accord, not only as to the necessity for a change in the tariff, as a matter of justice, but even, what is more remarkable, both the association of the province of Ontario and the association of the province of Quebec, without

having conferred previously, came to precisely the same conclusions as to the alterations to be made. This, it seems to me, is an indication that there is something more in what we are doing now than a mere election clamour. There is a grievance, and it is the duty of this government to remedy that grievance. Take the city of Montreal—I have no doubt the hon. member for West York will continue to support us in the demand we are making and will give us a similar explanation as to the condition of things in his own neighbourhood—in the neighbourhood of the city of Montreal we have over 200 gardeners. This will be news, I am sure, to the hon. Minister of Public Works, and to some other members of this House. We have over 200 gardeners who each employ 4 or 5 people.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to tell me how many of these gardeners are carrying on winter culture ?

Mr. MONK. Winter culture ? Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) tell me if he means the early culture that takes place in the beginning of spring when the snow is still on the ground ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. MONK. Because, if he does it affects these two hundred men. As to those who have hot houses or conservatories around Montreal, I could not speak, but there is a large number. Mr. Legare, in my own county, I should say, has one mile nearly of conservatories and he burns 1,200 tons of coal in carrying on winter culture.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What kind of products is Mr. Legare selling in the winter months ?

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will see in a moment how entirely erroneous his statement is in regard to winter culture, because there is not a single vegetable, except asparagus, on which we are asking for no protection, that we cannot produce and that is the reason why we want some change in the tariff.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to know what products these gentlemen put on the market in the winter months. Take Mr. Legare, for instance; he does not produce beans and peas in the winter.

Mr. MONK. He produces them all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is wrongly informed.

Mr. MONK. They are all produced, but they are not produced to any considerable extent, because they cannot compete with the American producer. We are not Negroes or Chinese, and we do not live in South Carolina. If we were, and if we lived in South Carolina, we could compete, but we cannot do it under existing conditions. I say that these two hundred men in the vicinity of Montreal employ from four to five persons each. That is the average number of men which they employ. Some of them employ twenty-five and even thirty men. These two hundred people, with the others I have mentioned, cultivate vegetables purely and simply—exclusively vegetables for the Montreal market. They are not farmers in the ordinary sense of the word; they are market gardeners, and it is they and others in a like position whose interests we are defending here. The hon. Minister of Public Works spoke about winter culture. That, of course, is an interesting question, because there is a beginning of winter culture which would be greatly increased if we could only obtain what we are asking. The hon. Minister of Public Works, himself, eloquently, at a banquet at Montreal not very long ago, a very important banquet, the banquet of the Board of Trade at which the hon. Minister of Finance was present, and eloquent as the hon. Minister of Finance is, to my mind, the hon. Minister of Public Works was far more eloquent upon that occasion—advocated reciprocity of tariffs with the Americans and the adoption of a higher tariff to protect us. That is all that we have asked. We do not ask for anything more than that. We ask to be placed, as respects American garden produce, not on the higher plane, but on the same plane as the Americans.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Are we not on the same plane now ?

Mr. MONK. No, that is where the hon. gentleman makes a mistake and that is why I say this subject has not been investigated, because, if it had been my hon. friend would not have committed himself to such a heresy as that. The Americans have heavier duties against us than we have against them, and what the market gardeners of Canada ask for is similarity of tariffs with the Americans. I have not the privilege of being a market gardener myself, but I am speaking from information furnished to my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Leonard) and to myself by the market gardeners who live in the vicinity of Montreal, and I may say that a more competent and capable body of market gardeners you cannot find in the whole Dominion of Canada. There are about one hundred and twenty-five of these market gardeners who cultivate in the very early spring which begins in the month of March, and they use about 20,000 glass coverings which cost all told about $150,000. Even under the unfavourable tariff at present they have $150,000 invested in the vicinity of Montreal in this one particular item of their trade, and excluding of course such articles as implements, carriages, horses, and other things which they require in the pursuit of their industry. If these were included the capital invested in the business would be found to be a large sum

indeed. The implements—l'outillage as they are called in French—have a 35 per cent protection, and the carriages, carts, and vehicles, are also amply protected. The very clothes that these market gardeners wear are protected. They do not object to that; they accept the principle of protection but they ask that they shall have protection themselves, just as well as the manufacturers, the farmers, and the fruit-growers. As regards the products of the farmers we have specific duties; on hay, $4 a ton; on meat, 2 and 3 cents a pound; on eggs, 3 cents a dozen; butter, 4 cents a pound; cheese, 3 cents a pound; grain, 10 and 15 cents a bushel; honey, 20 cents a gallon. Again the fruit-growers have specific duties on their products, and let me say that it is only by specific duties that we can be protected in respect to garden produce. The fruit-growers have a protection of: 40 cents a bushel on apples; peaches, 1 cent a pound; grapes, 2 cents a pound; strawberries and raspberries, 2 cents a pound. The market gardeners are protected merely by a small ad valorem duty of 25 per cent upon the immense importation of vegetables that come here in the early spring and which are produced in the fields of South Carolina by negro labour, and in the fields of California by Chinese labour. Every one who has knowledge of the trade knows, that the valuation of these vegetables is on the basis of the value at the place of production which is extremely low, and which is made as low as possible when they are entered up at customs. These vegetables are sold on the Montreal market at a very high price, and a very large profit goes for the benefit of some people in the States, and perhaps a few dealers in the city of Montreal. I am afraid that personally the Minister of Public Works does not know much more about market gardening than I do, but there is this difference that he has not been to the sources of information as I have been. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) spoke about celery, and I may tell him that celery is kept in Montreal the whole year round.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not produced.

Mr. MONK. It is not produced the whole year round, but it is kept in storage and it is ready for our markets on the 1st of April. Canadian cabbages are placed upon the market about the 15th of June, and they are easily kept in good condition during the whole winter until the 15th of May. The Canadian market gardeners meet the competition of the American cabbages from the 1st of April until the month of July. I am informed that cucumbers may be cultivated in the vicinity of Montreal during the entire winter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They have never been to very large extent.

Mr. MONK. They never can be unless you give protection.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid that protection will not change the course of the sun.

Mr. FRASER. Perhaps we could get the sun to change.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) says that we must get the sun to change and I hear my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) sneer.

Mr. TALBOT. Where did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) get the sneer from?

Mr. MONK. I got it from the other side of the House, and I thought I got it from you.

Mr. TALBOT. You are mistaken.

Mr. MONK. The market gardeners of the vicinity of Montreal contend that they can cultivate cucumbers for the Montreal market very early in the spring.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I make bold to say that there is not a Canadian cucumber in the Montreal market before June or July.

Mr. MONK. Give them protection and you will have them.

Mr. FRASER. How would any amount of protection do that unless you have hot houses?

Mr. MONK. We have. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Fraser) think that we live in Montreal as he does in Guysborough. If my hon. friend will come down with me and spend a Sunday in Montreal I will show him one of the most extensive hot houses in Canada, which it will take him two hours to go through.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Has the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) any suspicion that the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) is a hot house plant.

Mr. FRASER. We live as God gives us opportunity.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend is a free trader, and I refer him to the able speech made in Montreal some time ago by the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said nothing that was not common sense.

Mr. MONK. I stated that the protection of our clients, if I may use that expression——

The PRIME MINISTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. The hon. Prime Minister laughs at that expression, but I think he will admit that to a certain extent the constituents of members of this House are their clients in the broader sense of the word.

The PRIME MINISTER. Do not explain. I think it is quite natural.

Mr. MONK. They state that cucumbers can be cultivated here during the whole year if properly protected. Cucumbers arrive in our markets from the States about the 10th of June.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have them now. We buy them every day.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend will allow me, I say they appear in great quantities about that time, though there is no doubt that some people get them before, and what comes is the surplus from the markets of New York and Boston. What cannot be sold there is sent here in large quantities, and is entered at a very low valuation, and is sold for what it will bring. The same thing happens with peas, beans, tomatoes, cauliflower, lettuce, onions, radishes, parsley and watercress. My hon. friend asked what vegetables could be cultivated here by our own market gardeners. They can cultivate lettuce, radishes, parsley, watercress and mushrooms, a very great industry in France, as it might be in this country if properly protected.

Mr. FRASER. We have it. We have all the mushrooms we want in Nova Scotia.

Mr. MONK. We have not enough in Montreal. We want more and we want to be able to say that we are eating Canadian vegetables. All these vegetables can be cultivated all the year round in Canada in large quantities. That is what my information is, and it is a matter for verification. My hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, who seemed at the time the delegation came here to take a lively interest in this matter, asked if, as a matter of fact, some of the vegetables mentioned were cultivated. Let me tell him that cucumbers, tomatoes and cauliflowers are cultivated all the year round by many persons in the district of Montreal. My hon. friend shakes his head, but that information, though second hand, is very good.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be much interested to learn that cauliflowers and cucumbers are produced in Montreal during the winter months.

Mr. MONK. That is a matter I would be very glad if my hon. friend would investigate, and I will give him every opportunity to investigate it in my own county next winter if he will do me the honour of coming down there. Of course, our pretention is, as the House will readily imagine, that the cultivation would greatly increase if it were better protected. Now, my hon. friend made a mistake when he said a moment ago that we have the same tariff as the Americans. That is not so; but that is what we are asking, and what we claim this government should give us. Our climatic conditions are not as favourable as those of the United States, and therefore we think we are entitled at least to the same protection that they have, if not more. A few years ago, under the Dingley tariff, I think it was, the Canadian market gardeners sold very large quantities of cabbages to the Americans. The same remark applies to onions and potatoes, of which we sold car load after car load. But under their present tariff, with 3 cents a head on cabbages, 40 cents a bushel on onions, and 25 cents a bushel on potatoes, we are not selling them any more, and there is no fear of retaliation, because retaliation is not possible, except in melons, as my hon. friend suggested. But the Americans will not retaliate in melons, because in the state of New York and in the New England states they have no melons, or scarcely any; they have no good melons; and therefore they open their gates to the entry of Canadian melons, and we send them very large quantities, and they have a special value. Now, I will not weary the House by reading the petition made by the market gardeners. That petition, though adressed to the government in French, was brought here, I believe, by the representatives from both the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, and this is what was asked simultaneously by the market gardeners of both provinces, who agree absolutely to a cent as to the rate they ask, without having had any previous consultation: Cucumbers, 25 cents a dozen; lettuce, 25 cents a dozen; celery, 25 cents a dozen; cauliflower, 25 cents a dozen; green peas, beans and spinach, 50 cents a bushel; tomatoes, 5 cents a pound; onions and potatoes, 25 cents a bushel; cabbages, 3 cents a head; radishes, 10 cents a pound; parsley and watercress, 25 cents a pound. This petition I will leave with the reporter of 'Hansard,' in order that he may have it textually placed on the official report.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. member to the fact that if he wants the matter to be inserted in the debates, he will have to read it to the House.

Mr. MONK. Then I will give it up, rather than take up the time of the House. The reason I wish that their petition be entered is that they gave one of their reasons, their faith in the present government.

The American tariff is not yet put on the same line as that mentioned in the petition. I believe that vegetables in general are subjected, as the hon. minister has said, to a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem, but beans have a special duty, under article 241 of the American tariff, of 45 cents per bushel of 60 pounds.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not import them in the summer months.

Mr. MONK. No, this duty would be specially useful to us in the spring, perhaps in three or four months of the year, and why should we not have a sliding scale of duties in order to protect our market gardeners and thus develop that most useful industry, which is not only profitable to the large class engaged in it, but is a course of instruction for our farmers around our cities. Under article 242 of the American tariff, cabbages are charged a duty of 3 cents per head. Article 249 imposes 40 cents per bushel on onions; article 250 charges 40 cents per bushel on green pease; article 253 fixes the duty on potatoes at 25 cents per bushel, and under article 247 fresh tomatoes are charged 25 per cent. In his organ in the city of Montreal, the Minister of Public Works has argued that the time of production of the American vegetables is different from ours, and he asks why should we deprive the consumers in our cities of those vegetables at a time when the Canadian market gardener is not in a position to compete. That contention, however, is not correct. Take, for instance, lettuce, we produce very large quantities all the year round in Montreal. Go into any of the green grocers' stores, and you will find Canadian lettuce side by side with the American all the year round. The date when American lettuce competes is from December until May. The contention of my hon. friend was that lettuce is produced in Canada about the middle of April, and that the American competition was in October and May. But that statement is not correct, according to our information which, I believe, is more reliable. In rhubarb there is no competition. In cabbages, the Canadian vegetable is produced from the 15th June until the 15th May following, and the American competition is from April to July. My hon. friend must see at once that we suffer from that competition. Some people contend that the cabbage is not produced until the middle of July in Canada, but that is erroneous. We compete with the American cabbage from the 15th June onward.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We could not get fresh cabbages in Canada at the time when we import the American ?

Mr. MONK. They are fresh enough for our people. Our Canadian cucumbers are on the market from the 10th June, and the American competition is from May until July. Peas and beans are produced in Canada, in the ordinary course, on the 1st July, and the American competition is from May until the end of July. So that if you take these vegetables one by one, you will find that in all of them we have to meet American competition. Of course, I am not speaking of our vegetables, which are produced in the field, without any extraordinary effort, and which perhaps come up at dates that may not coincide with the American seasons exactly. But if we had the protection against American vegetables, which the Americans have against ours, we would produce these vegetables the whole year round and that industry, which at present is not very considerable in the vicinity of Montreal, would be increased tenfold within five years. And these vegetables which come from the United States are sold in Montreal at exorbitant prices, although they cost scarcely anything in their own country, and although they are admitted here at very low valuation and pay but 25 per cent ad valorem duty and no specific duty. Still they are sold during the winter and early spring at the same prices as our market gardeners would ask were they protected as the Americans are. Under the circumstances, it is only fair that we should give our people the same protection against the Americans as they give their people against us. We are not asking for anything more. Everything we work with is protected. There are duties of from 30 per cent to 35 per cent upon our tools, vehicles, horses, and the clothes we wear, and yet our produce is only protected to the extent of 25 per cent ad valorem against American vegetables, which are entered at extremely low figures—figures very often absurdly small. I see no reason why we should not be protected against the American negro and the Chinamen of California. Let me give two or three figures to show the increase of importations from the United States. At the port of Montreal in 1900 we brought in from the United States, 1,667 bushels of potatoes. In the following year, 1901, we imported 6,498 bushels. Of fresh tomatoes, we imported into Montreal from the United States in 1900, 6,548 bushels, and in 1901, 9,764. And this applies to Toronto in the same way. We are here pleading the cause of the constituents of my hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell) and I hope he will join us. In Toronto the quantity of fresh tomatoes imported from the United States in 1900 was 2,937 bushels, and in 1901 it was 6,066 bushels. I will not take up the time of the House in quoting all the figures I have here, but these that I have quoted are enough, I think, to show that this is a case which commends itself to the attention of the government; and we are very anxious to know if the government will entertain our claim and remedy our grievance.

Mr. O. TALBOT (Bellechasse.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the position taken by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard), on that question of the protection to be accorded to market gardeners in the vicinity of Montreal and of the larger cities of the province of Ontario. And, when I say that, I am surprised, it is because I do not see what advantage my hon. friend can expect to accrue from it, at least in favour of the working classes. My hon. friend is no doubt logical in the stand he has taken, be-

cause, during the last election in Laval, he has clearly given some pledges to the market gardeners of his county. But, even supposing that the government would increase the duty on the articles already enumerated, how does he make it out that the working classes would be benefited thereby ? What he asks for would only result in preventing those early products, coming in from the south of the United States. As we all know, the working classes do not consume those products in the winter, the prices being too high. The working classes will only buy them when they are put on the market at reasonable prices, and when his resources allow him to make that expenditure. What is my hon. friend asking for, by his motion ? He is asking for protection in favour of the market gardeners of Montreal and Toronto. As the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) remarked a moment ago, we have to contend in this country with climateric conditions well nigh insurmountable. On the other hand, there is no winter in the southern States. In my opinion, it would be idle to attempt remedying that state of things by readjusting the tariff. If, for instance, the United States produce water melons in large quantities, and can export them to this country by car-load lots, I do not see how my hon. friend can remedy the evil without shutting out their water melons from our markets. We are asked to protect the melons of Canadian growth. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has stated that in the United States melons are not so good as our Canadian melons. I do not agree with him on that point ; but why should we be asked to increase the duties, for closing our doors to products which are scarcely grown at all in the United States ?

Now, if we look at the tariff, what do we find ? We find that on the staple articles of market gardening the tariff of both countries is absolutely similar. Thus, cucumbers pay 25 per cent under the tariff of both countries. There is, however, an exception in favour of cabbages which are charged a duty of 3 cents per head in the United States, whereas the rate in this country is 25 per cent ad valorem. My hon. friend from Laval knowns very well that, were cabbages charged 3 cents each in this country, that would be a prohibitive tariff. The consumers, in the district of Quebec, get their cabbages from Montreal, and we pay for them 3 or 4 cents per head. As I said were they charged a duty of 3 cents, the price would become so exorbitant as to be almost prohibitive. Take tomatoes : under the United States tariff, they pay a duty of 25 per cent per bushel. In Canada, the duty is 20 per cent. The difference is very slight. Lettuce is 25 per cent. The rate is the same in Canada. Asparagus, 25 per cent ; same rate in Canada. Take radishes, the tariff is 25 per cent in both countries.

So with cauliflowers, celery, beets, artichokes, carrots, leeks, parsley, turnips and parsnips. And those are the staple articles which are consumed by the working classes.

Now, let me ask my hon. friend from Laval : when do workingmen in Montreal eat cucumbers when they sell at 25 cents ? Most assuredly, they never eat any in the winter season nor in the early spring.

The government is asked to impose a protective tariff on those early vegetables which are only bought by people in easy circumstances. If such a demand were granted, what would happen ? Simply, that rich people would be deterred from buying by those prohibitive prices.

What do we see just now ? Is it not a fact that American market gardeners stop exporting their produce as soon as our farmers can supply the local market ? Thus, lettuce is put on our market by the end of April, cabbages by the end of July ; cucumbers, towards the end of July ; tomatoes, from the middle to the end of July. Asparagus, at the end of May or the beginning of June. Celery, in August. So with beets and carrots. Onions are offered for sale in September and October. And we export those products not only to the United States but even to Europe.

Leeks are offered for sale in September and October. Radishes, in June. Cauliflowers, parsley, mushrooms, turnips, potatoes, beans, parsnips, in July. Those are the different dates on which those products are put on the Canadian market by our own producers.

We are being told that we need protection. But if there is one class more than another which deserves to be protected, it is surely that of the consumers which for the most part, consists in workingmen.

I am strongly opposed to any protection which would, only result beneficially to a certain class of people, and detrimentally to many others, not to say to almost all classes of the community. As to protecting articles which we cannot grow in this country, that is out of the question. During the winter, we cannot import vegetables in large quantities from abroad because the freight rates—I mean the railway rates—are too high, and because also the risks are too considerable. It is only in the spring of the year, when cold storage cars are available, that we begin to import those vegetables. Now, no sooner do our own products reach the local markets, when imports come to an end, because they can no longer stand local competition. As to fruit-growing, take the peaches which we cultivate in this country, you will find that they pay in the United States, a duty of 25 cents per bushel. In Canada, the duty is one cent a pound, including package. Strawberries and raspberries, blackberries, currants, in fact all the small fruits grown by our farmers, are charged a cent per quart, whilst under the

Canadian tariff they are charged two cents a pound, including package. So, as will be seen, as to those products, although they are not necessaries of life—are none the less palatable and of great value to the workingmen, the Canadian tariff is higher than the American tariff. The government is asked to impose duties well nigh prohibitive on articles which we do not produce in this country, or which we do not produce all the year round, with a view to protecting a few market gardeners in the vicinity of Montreal and Toronto. Such a policy would only result in enhancing the prices, to the great detriment of consumers at large, and to the benefit of a few individuals.

To sum up, let me say that it is perfectly useless for my hon. friend from Laval—except in so far as he may wish to redeem his pledges to the Laval electors during the last electoral campaign—to come and ask the government to increase the duties on articles which are not articles of household necessity, with no other result than that of saddling the working classes with new burdens. Although I represent here an agricultural district, I am opposed to the increase of duties on the articles which he has mentioned.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (West York). I regret very much that I was not able to follow the remarks of the hon. gentleman for Laval (Mr. Leonard) in introducing this motion, owing to not understanding the language in which he addressed the House. However, I think it is only right that I should say a few words on this question. In the first place, I regret very much that the hon. member has seen fit to bring forward this motion at this particular time. He put this notice on the Order paper, I believe, in the first days of the session. This was before the House and the government had come to a decision as to what should be done with the tariff. Then was an opportune time to have discussed this question ; we could have discussed it then with a good deal of profit, not only to ourselves, but also, I hope, to the market gardeners. But, though this order has been called day after day, and week after week for over two months, the hon. gentleman has allowed it to remain. He has been like the dog in the manger that could not eat the hay himself and would not let any other creature eat it—for nobody else could proceed with a motion of this kind while the hon. gentleman had this order upon the paper. And, after allowing it to stand all this time, he now, near the close of the session, when the government have decided, and the House also have decided by a large majority, that there is to be no change in the tariff this session, the hon. gentleman brings forward this resolution. What possible good can he achieve by having the matter discussed at this time ? What can be the hon. gentleman's object ? Is it to make political capital out of the question? It would seem so. Certainly no other object is to be attained by discussing it now. But if the hon. gentleman thinks he will make political capital out of the question, I think he will find himself very much mistaken. If the market gardeners of this country are suffering under any grievance, to whom do they owe it, and who is responsible for it ? Why, the party which the hon. gentleman for Laval supports. For, in 1894, when the tariff was revised by the administration that preceded this one, the duty on market garden stuff was very largely reduced. There were no objections then by the hon. member who has brought forward this motion or any of his friends. They accepted the reduction that was made without raising any protest at all. This continued from 1894 until 1896, when there was a change of government and the Liberal party came into power. They left the duty as it was before. No protest had been entered by the hon. gentlemen who are now so solicitious for the welfare of the market gardeners—they had raised no voice of protest against the action taken by their friends in reducing the tariff. It was quite natural, therefore, that this government, on coming into power shold leave the duty as they found it. During the last few years, there has been some agitation on the part of the market gardeners claiming that they were not sufficiently protected. Last year I had the honour to be asked by the Market Gardeners Association of West York to come down with them early in the season to interview the government here. This was a long time before the election in West York took place, in fact, it was before there was a vacancy in West York at all. Therefore, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was altogether astray when he said that this was immediately before the election in West York. However, as I say, the Market Gardener's Association asked me to come down with them and lay their case before the government of the day. I thought it was my duty to comply with their request. They are a very large body of people. Immediately surrounding the city of Toronto there are 2,000 or 2,500 men, women and children who get their livelihood altogether from the raising of vegetables for the market.

Around the city of Montreal and all the great cities of this vast Dominion you find market gardeners a hardy, industrious and saving people, who are well to do, and working hard, men, women and children. They are cultivating a small quantity of land. A farmer works two or three hundred acres of land, a market gardener works probably four or

five acres, and he employs on those four or five acres more people than would be employed perhaps on two hundred acres in the country. Therefore, if the raising of vegetables in this country can be encouraged, with a due regard to the interests of the consumers, I think that it is a question that should receive the careful attention of the government. The government have to look at this question from two sides: They not only, as this resolution states, have to look at it from the standpoint of the market gardener and the farmer, they must also look at it from the standpoint of the consumer. So that while perhaps we are a little prejudiced, and while we may be a little partial in our views, looking at it from the interest of one class alone, I can readily see that the government must view the question from the standpoint of the consumer as well as of the producer.

As I say, there are around the city of Toronto between 2,000 and 2,500 people engaged in this industry. It is certainly hard for these people to find, after they have raised their vegetables and got them ready for market, that across from Buffalo and from the other ports of the United States, there are large quantities of vegetables thrown on the market of the city of Toronto, thus depressing the price and taking the ground away from these people. They are satisfied with the prices they obtain, but they find that when their vegetables are ready for the market, a large quantity of foreign vegetables are thrown in and the market is flooded with them. Now, our gardeners say that these goods are brought in at a great undervaluation. I have known it to be the case that these goods are often brought in in carload lots, and as the duty is an ad valorem one, they are invoiced as damaged goods. The appraiser of course goes to look at the car, he takes the invoice and sees it is a very small, miserable price, and he goes and opens the car. He perhaps may not have any intimate knowledge of the particular kind of products, but he sees that these are, especially on the top, damaged vegetables, and he passes them along; and so these goods are entered, I am told, very much below their actual value, and consequently the duty imposed upon them is almost nil. You can readily see by the statement that was made before the House by the Minister of Customs a short time ago that the amount of duty collected in Montreal last year was a little over $9,000 on all the vegetables imported from the United States. Now, I say, that to my mind is a hardship, and I believe it would be wise for the government carefully to consider this question. I would like to see them increase the duty a little. I dont think we need go very far, because if the effect of the increase in that duty is to advance the price of these vegetables in the early spring, it is only the well-to-do people who consume them. If you pay a cent, or two cents, more for your cabbages to get them in April or May, it is only the wealthy classes that use those goods at that season, it is not the poor people that consume them. Then when our own vegetables come into the market our people will be able to supply the market of Canada with all the goods the consumers require, and there is sufficient competition among the market gardeners in Canada themselves to keep the prices right.

As I said before, I do not think this is an opportune time to discuss this question. I think the mover of the resolution, if he had been sincere and had the interests of the market gardeners at heart, would not have brought forward this motion to-day. No possible good can be achieved by discussing it now, it is not the right time. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and myself, who introduced the deputation from Montreal and Toronto last year, took a very opportune time to approach the government. We made a very strong case, and I was in hopes that some result would follow from it. But I do not despair. The government, as everybody knows, are going to send a representation to the colonial conference in England, when the premiers of all the provinces of this Dominion will meet there and adjudicate upon the tariff, in reference not only to the colonies, but to the mother country as well. So it is quite in order for the government to say this session, we will make no changes in the tariff this year, we will see what is the outcome of this colonial conference, and then we will be able to decide how far we shall go, and what we shall do another year. So I think the government's position is a strong one this year, and recognizing that, I would have been glad had there been no discussion on this question at all until after the conference is held; and then, by bringing this matter before the government in a proper way and discussing it fully, I am in hopes that some result will flow from it. But the moment you throw this question into the political arena, whenever a member gets up and tries to make political capital out of it for his party or for his friends, he has damaged the cause he has at heart, and he is doing harm to those he is trying to support. So I think that the market gardeners of this country will not thank the hon. member (Mr. Leonard) for bringing forward this motion to-day. I believe that it is greatly in the interests of the people of this country that we should increase the population as rapidly as we can, and wherever we can, and I think that might be done by some simple modification of the tariff, either by the reduction of the duty on the raw material, or by a slight increase of the duties on manufactured goods; we can thereby build up the great institutions of this country and develop our resources. I say that is the wisest thing for us to do. In this particular case I believe

that a very slight increase of the duty on some things would not entail increased prices to the consumer, except it might be early in the spring when only those who are well able to pay the price of those goods would purchase them, and the competition between the market gardeners and dealers in our own country will regulate the price.

I am in hopes that when the proper time comes we will be able to discuss this matter free from politics altogether. It is not a question that should enter into the political arena. I say again that I regret for my part that the matter has been evidently brought forward, not for the purpose of doing any good to the market gardeners, but for the evident purpose of manufacturing a little political clap-trap to the advantage of the hon. member who has brought it forward.

The hon. gentleman will make nothing out of it, because the market gardeners know that for the eighteen long years during which our Conservative friends ruled the destinies of this country there was no help then for the market gardeners. They appealed in vain ; in other words, they asked for bread and they got a stone. That is the way they were treated by our Conservative friends. I have confidence in this government, I believe that this government will see that their rights and privileges are maintained. I repeat, that I have confidence in this government knowing the ability and statesmanlike character of the hon. gentlemen who comprise it, and I believe that when the proper time comes that all interests, all classes, all creeds and all parties will be properly protected.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, I hope that when a colonial conference takes place in London it will have questions of greater importance to discuss than the question of the market gardeners in and around Montreal. If the representatives of Canada descend to the consideration of questions of that character they will be open to censure when they return to this country. The last speaker has referred to the desirability of increasing the population of this country. As to that I think we all agree, but we want the people of all the provinces of the Dominion to be allowed to eat fruit and to buy it when they find it is not produced in this country. We know that in the spring of the year and in the early part of the summer, if we are to have fruit at all, we have to depend upon the United States for it, but once our own fruit is brought into the market, there is no competition. The people buy our own fruit at the proper time and no other. We, in Nova Scotia, have first to buy American strawberries, then we have to buy Ontario strawberries until our own are ready, and when our own strawberries are ready we would not look at either of these. Now, speaking about the quality of the cabbages that come from the United States, I would say that it is only their surplus, after their own market is well supplied, and of a very inferior quality, that we receive. As to the value it will be based on what the cabbage would bring in the United States at the time it would be exported, so that, I think it would be only right to collect duty on the value of the cabbage in the United States at the time it is exported. But, we must not forget that there are other people in this world besides the market gardeners in and around Montreal, and that we have to protect also the interests of those people who must be permitted to buy fruit even from the United States when it cannot be produced in their own country. We have, in Nova Scotia, perhaps the best quality of fruit in its proper time that there is in—the world—I was going to say.

Mr. FRASER. Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). Whenever it is fit for market we use it and use it alone and we only use other fruit when we cannot get our own. Therefore, let us be true to ourselves and consider that we have other interests to protect besides the interests of the market gardeners in and around Montreal.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a very few words upon this important resolution now before the House. I am a little surprised that we find representatives on the other side of the House who would oppose this simple, yet important resolution. Let me read it :

> That it is greatly in the interest of the market gardeners and the farmers that the duties on our Canadian garden products be so adjusted as to guarantee the Canadian farmer an effective protection against foreign competition.

We have had to-night another illustration of the difference of opinion which exists upon the other side of the House. From the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Hon. Mr. Ross, Victoria), I would judge that he is an ardent free trader. However, he ventured to remark that the vegetables that come into Canada now are simply the surplus. He made the statement that after their own people are supplied the trade in the United States send their surplus to the Canadian market. That, I think, is a strong reason why the Canadian farmer and market gardener should be protected from the surplus production of the American farmer and market gardener. Just let me quote from page 142 of the Trade and Navigation Returns for the year 1901. Under the item of vegetables, including potatoes, tomatoes, and other vegetables imported into Canada, I find that we imported last year $445,385 worth of vegetables, coming from the United States and competing with the products of the Canadian farmer and market gardener. I wish to say that in my opinion the resolution is making a very simple and reasonable demand upon this government.

It is asking not that the government shall obtain for the market gardeners and farmers of this country the market of the United States, which they cannot obtain, but it is asking that this government shall so arrange the tariff that the market gardeners and farmers of Canada shall have their own market for their own supply. I think that is a reasonable demand. It was said by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte), I think, if I caught what he said correctly, that it was impossible for the Canadian gardener to produce these vegetables in time for the Canadian market. What I have to say is that if the government will so arrange the tariff that the market gardeners and farmers in Canada will understand that they are securely protected from foreign competition, then I have faith in believing that the Canadian market gardeners and farmers will so equip their plants that they will be able to produce all the vegetables that the Canadian people want throughout the whole season. Between the city of Toronto and the city of Hamilton, as an illustration of the conditions that we have in Ontario, I may say that there is a large quantity of land which is suitable for the growth of this kind of product. In Ontario it is well known that we cannot produce grain now in competition with the western country, and it is well known, further, that the population of the central counties of Ontario is fast decreasing. Why is it decreasing ? For the reason that the people are going to the west and notwithstanding what has been said in this House they are still going to the United States from the province of Ontario. If that condition of things exists, as it does exist in Ontario, then, it is the duty of this government to so arrange the tariff that every article that can be produced on the farm, whether a small or large farm, shall receive the protection that it deserves, so that the producers who pay the taxes in Canada shall have at least the market of the five and a half millions of people that we have here to-day. It has been said during this debate that our climatic conditions are such that we cannot produce these particular products of the farm and the market garden early enough in the year for consumption in the large cities. I wish to say, that if the government will arrange and increase the tariff so that the market gardeners will understand that the higher tariff would be permanent—and it will be permanent so far as the Conservative party in Canada is concerned—then we will be able as Canadians, in and around the great cities of Montreal, Hamilton, Toronto and others, to produce every dollar's worth of these products that the people want, and we will give them a better article than they get now, and we will give them that article as early in the season as it is required. I was surprised at the wonderful statement made by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Campbell). The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Léonard) is in this House for the first time ; a young man who won a county for the Conservative party against great odds, and it was unkindly at least to find this old parliamentarian (Mr. Campbell) who has held a seat so long in this House, rebuke that young Canadian member ; still more strange was it that he rebuked him for trying to advance the interests of a class of our population to whom the member for West York (Mr. Campbell) made great promises during the election campaign. I had the honour of listening to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) on the hustings.

Mr. COWAN. They say you elected him in West York.

Mr. BLAIN. If I did you ought not complain. I have no quarrel with the electors of West York for what they have done, but I would remind the hon. member and his friends, that there is another time coming soon. The hon. member (Mr. Campbell) went up and down the county specially pleading from every platform, that he had come to this government as a delegate to lay the case of the market gardeners of Canada before the government, and he promised these 2,500 people, many of whom are market gardeners of West York, that if they helped to elect him he would stand up in parliament to advocate an increase of duties on their products. Well, the electors of West York have long memories, and when the proper time comes they will not forget the strange manner in which their representative failed to redeem his promise to-day. What does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) say ? He tells us that this wicked member from Laval stood in the way of his purpose, because he put a resolution on the Order paper which prevented the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) from advocating in this House what he promised the people he would advocate. Does any one suppose that the electors of West York will be deceived by such a plea as that ? Do you think they will take any stock in an excuse of that kind, coming as it does from a member who is so well versed by experience in parliamentary procedure. Do you think they will accept that explanation from the hon. gentleman who promised from every platform in the county that he would support just such a motion as this, and whose promise was published in the 'Globe' newspaper, and endorsed by his friends in that campaign. These gentlemen went from one end of the county to the other urging the electors to support the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) on the ground that he could get very much more from the government than could a member who sat in opposition. But, mark the contrast to-day between the conduct of the hon. gentleman who represents Laval (Mr. Leonard) and the conduct of the hon. gentleman who represents West

York (Mr. Campbell). We see the Conservative member for Laval standing on the floor of this House to advocate a higher protection in the interest of the farmers and market gardeners of Canada, and we see the Liberal member for West York combatting that principle, although he made solemn promises to his electors that he would take a different course. Mark the member on the Conservative side of the House redeeming his promise to his electors, and mark the conduct of the member for West York who also made these binding promises to his constituents, and who at the very first opportunity calls on the House to vote down the resolution of the hon. member for Laval because he says forsooth that it is inopportune. He declares : Wait until you see us nxet year ; and see what we will do for the market gardeners then.

For myself, Sir, I am strongly in favour of this resolution. I believe it is the duty of this government to so alter the tariff that the market gardeners and the farmers of this Dominion may have a profitable return from the results of their labour. I am glad, Sir, that the principle set forth in this resolution suits every part of the Dominion. I was delighted to find representatives from the great province of Quebec advocating in this matter exactly what is required by the farmers and market gardeners of the great province of Ontario. In every province in this Dominion, from the far east to the far west, we find that the people are in accord with the resolution moved by the hon. member (Mr. Leonard). I trust that every hon. gentleman on either side of the House, especially those who represent the farming districts, will give their support to this resolution. I trust that on this important question they will take one part of the advice of the member for West York and let politics go. I trust the government will see their way clear to so arrange the tariff that we will not allow one dollar's worth of these products to come in from the United States. I say that, not in any spirit of retaliation, because I do not believe in retaliation ; but I do believe that the adoption of the principle of this resolution is a sound policy for Canada and is a policy in the best interests of our own people.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I do not rise for the purpose of engaging in the general discussion, but merely to repeat, if it be necessary, what was stated early in this session ; that the view of the government—I say this particularly in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) who is anxious there should be a definite statement on this question—the view of the government is that no tariff changes of this character shall be made during this present session. I thought that understanding was clear and distinct enough to have removed it from any possibility of doubt. But, if it is necessary to repeat that statement I say now : That it is not the policy of this government to make any tariff changes this session other than those trifling ones as to which notice has already been given. As to what may happen at a future stage, it will be time enough to consider when we reach that stage. There is one thing however I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) of, and that is, that in this particular matter we happen to have precisely the same rate of duty that we had under the so called national policy. Sometimes hon. gentlemen opposite like to allege that our present tariff is simply the national policy over again, although at other times they tell a different story. But whatever may be said as to the tariff generally, there is no room to doubt that on this particular class of goods the duties are as they were under the national policy. Where the duties were not excessive it was not deemed wise to reduce them, and the duty on this class of goods was 25 per cent. It was not thought to be a very excessive duty, and it was not deemed necessary to reduce it. That does not necessarily prove that it was a good duty, of course ; but it does prove that so far as that item is concerned there is nothing to complain of as between the two political parties ; it happens to be one on which both agree. However, I only rose to say that the policy of the government is not to make any change in the duties this session, and that being the case, I move that the debate be now adjourned.

House divided on motion for adjournment of debate.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Lovell,
Béland,	Loy,
Brown,	Macdonald,
Brunet,	Mackie,
Bureau,	MacLaren (Hunting'n),
Calvert,	McCool,
Calvin,	McCreary,
Campbell,	McGugan,
Carroll,	McIsaac,
Champagne,	McLennan,
Cowan,	Madore,
Davis,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Matheson,
Douglas,	Meigs,
Dugas,	Monet,
Edwards,	Oliver,
Emmerson,	Paterson,
Farquharson,	Power,
Fielding,	Préfontaine,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Fraser,	Puttee,
Gallery,	Reid (Restigouche),
Geoffrion,	Riley,
Gibson,	Ross (Ontario),
Girard,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gould,	Russell,
Guthrie,	Schell,
Heyd,	Scott,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Sifton,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Smith (Vancouver),

Kendall,	Stewart,
Lang,	Talbot,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tarte,
Lavergne,	Tobin,
LeBlanc,	Wright.—71.
Lemieux,	

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Kidd,
Avery,	Lancaster,
Barker,	LaRivière,
Bell,	Lennox,
Bennett,	Leonard,
Blain,	McIntosh,
Borden (Halifax),	Monk,
Boyd,	Morin,
Clarke,	Osler,
Cochrane,	Richardson,
Culbert,	Roche (Marquette),
Earle,	Taylor,
Fowler,	Tolton,
Gourley,	Vrooman,
Hackett,	Wilmot,
Halliday,	Wilson.—33.
Hughes (Victoria),	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Christie,	Roddick,
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Horsey,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormick,
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Bickerdike,	Cargill,
Sutherland Oxford),	Haggart,
Farmelee,	Pope,
Archambault,	Ball,
Beith,	Birkett,
Belcourt,	Brock,
Bernier,	Broder,
Blair,	Bruce,
Borden (King's),	Carscallen,
Bruneau,	Casgrain,
Copp,	Clare,
Costigan,	Ganong,
Delisle,	Hale,
Demers (Levis),	Henderson,
Erb,	Johnston (Cardwell),
Fisher,	Kaulback,
Fitzpatrick,	Kemp,
Flint,	Kendrey,
German,	Maclean,
Harwood,	McGowan,
Holmes,	McLeod,
Laurier (L'Assomp.),	Porter,
Lewis,	Rosamond,
MacKinnon,	Seagram,
McCarthy,	Smith (Wentworth),
Mulock,	Clancy,
Stephens,	Lavell,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Thompson,	Ingram,
Tolmie,	Robinson (Elgin),
Wade,	Sproule,
Morrison,	McLaren (Perth),

Amendment agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

COLONIAL APPEALS TO THE IMPERIAL PRIVY COUNCIL.

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé) (translation) asked for :

Copies of the correspondence exchanged between the Imperial authorities and the Canadian government, in reference to the colonial conference respecting colonial appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. Speaker, the motion which I have the honour to submit to the consideration of this House requires very little explanation. I shall therefore confine myself to offering a few brief remarks called for by the importance of the matter. I am asking for copies of the correspondence exchanged between the imperial authorities and the government of Canada, in connection with the colonial conference, which was called together and sat in London, last summer, in order to modify the composition of the judicial committee of the Privy Council. I think it is desirable that this official correspondence should be brought down, so that there may be no missing link in the chain of evidence as to such attempts as have been made in high places to impose upon us imperialism under one of its forms. That is a chapter that will later on make interesting reading in the history of this country. Of course, that pet scheme of the Colonial Secretary could not fail to arouse the attention of the members of the legal profession, in the province of Quebec and elsewhere. I may say here and now, that the course of action of the present government, under the circumstances, was one that ought to commend itself to the approbation of the people of this country. It is only fair to state that the reply sent by the federal government to the invitation extended to them by Mr. Chamberlain embodied a flat refusal on their part to endorse the pet scheme of the Colonial Secretary.

Allow me, Sir, to read an extract from the Order in Council recommending that the hon. David Mills be deputed to attend the colonial conference in London :

The committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration a despatch hereto annexed, dated the 15th February, 1901, from the Right Honourable Mr. Chamberlain, Secretary of State for the Colonies, referring to a contemplated measure 'to provide for strengthening the representation of the self-governing colonies on the Judical Committee of the Privy Council by the creation of four additional law Lords with seats in the House of Lords as well as on the Judicial Committee,' and requesting the appointment by Your Excellency's government of a delegate qualified by his legal knowledge to represent it at a proposed conference with the Lord Chancellor and the Law Officers of the Crown, having for its object the solution of a question vitally affecting the common interest of the empire.

The committee recommend that Your Excellency's government do co-operate with His Majesty's government by deputing the Honourable David Mills, the Minister of Justice, to

attend such conference, and represent Your Excellency's government thereat.

The committee would at the same time observe that Your Excellency's government is not dissatisfied with the manner in which the board of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is at present constituted, and is now advised that they do not see any advantage to be gained by the creation of four additional law Lords, to be chosen from the self-governing colonies with seats in the House of Lords as well as on the Judicial Committee.

As will be seen from the above, Sir, it was on good grounds that I stated that the reply sent by the present government, embodied a flat refusal to acquiesce in the contemplated measure, and the government deserve great credit for having taken such a decided stand on that question, and one which tallies with the feelings of the people of this country.

Now, when taking such a stand in their dealings with the imperial authorities, have they not given their traducers a most unequivocal answer ? Moreover, the appointment of the hon. Mr. Mills was a guarantee that the constitution of the country was not to be interfered with. The former Minister of Justice is a thorough Canadian, in the truest acceptation of the word, and we knew that he would vigorously oppose any scheme affecting the relations of Canada with the empire. As upon many other occasions, so upon this occasion, this great experience coupled with his thorough knowledge of the constitutional law did prove of the greatest value and assistance to this country ; and Canadians owe him a debt of gratitude, for the efficient manner in which he has discharged his duties.

Moreover, from that pet scheme of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, no advantage was likely to accrue to Canada in her relations with the empire. No advantage is to be gained by the contemplated change in the composition of the judicial committee of the Privy Council and by the creation of additional judges to be chosen from the ranks of judges or lawyers in the self-governing colonies. And no wonder that this imperialistic scheme was denounced by the most eminent members of the Canadian bar. I happen to have before me clippings from newspapers containing the views expressed by members of the legal profession in the province of Quebec, by English-speaking and French-speaking lawyers as well. Let me quote from a letter published in the Montreal 'Gazette' of the 10th July last, in which the writer, who is an English lawyer of Montreal, adduces overwhelming evidence, in my opinion, against the contentions of those who support Mr. Chamberlain's scheme :

> Admitting then, that the Privy Council is, and has been, quite satisfactory and free from this reproach, the only grounds in favour of the proposal which have been urged are :
>
> First—That the creation of an imperial court, on which permanent representatives from the colonies and India would sit, in London, would have the effect of stimulating the imperial political idea and of emphasizing and crystallizing the unity of the British empire ;
>
> Second—That the local knowledge of judges from different quarters of the empire would be of assistance to the Judicial Committee, in arriving at proper conclusions.
>
> With reference to the first point, the very reverse would seem to me to be the case.
>
> Apart from the hopelessness of using the composition of a court of justice as a warming-pan for imperialism, it seems to me there is great danger of imperilling the very object which it is designed to promote.
>
> If, for instance, Australians objected to having their cases decided by a board of judges from South Africa, India, Canada, Hong Kong, Ceylon and Newfoundland, or if Canadians were similarly dissatisfied because of the British members of the court were outnumbered by the other colonial dignitaries, of whom they had little acquaintance, and in whom they had, naturally, little or no confidence, the result would be that, in a short time, the court would lose its prestige, and would be avoided by suitors.
>
> In the long run, the value of the court must depend upon confidence which suitors have in its members and in their decisions, and if there are no appeals to the Privy Council, the court itself will become valueless, and the idea it was intended to embody, namely, imperial unity, receive a decided blow. I believe such would be the result.

And further he goes on to say :

> Another question which arises is the following :
>
> Of what value would the judgment of Canadian lawyers be upon Indian appeals, where the customs, laws and procedure are completely foreign to anything that we have ever known ?
>
> Undoubtedly a position on the Judicial Committee is one to which Canadians ought not to be forbidden to aspire ; but if in the future we produce jurists of sufficient eminence to warrant their being selected for that honour, there is nothing to prevent His Majesty from creating such persons members of his Privy Council.
>
> It is the permanent appointment of colonial judges that is objectionable, and I venture to say that the opinion of nine-tenths of the profession in Canada is that such appointments would weaken and seriously damage the court, which, on all hands, is now regarded as satisfactory.
>
> The attendance of colonial judges occasionally, in the last two or three years, has not, in my opinion, tended to increase the efficiency of the court.

The PRIME MINISTER (The Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation). Would the hon. gentleman give us the name of the lawyer who signed that letter ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. (Translation). The writer is Mr. R. D. McGibbon. In addition to the above, I could give the views expressed by the hon. Mr. Béique, by the hon. member from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and many others as well. As a matter of fact, that scheme was endorsed by but an insignificant minority of the Bar.

As I said before, the changes suggested by Mr. Chamberlain in the composition of the

judicial committee of the Privy Council are utterly at variance with the views of the people of this country, and I daresay that, had Canada acquiesced in the contemplated measure, she would take a step back to past ages. The pact which binds us to the mother country ought to be scrupulously respected and adhered to by both parties, and I may say that when the government declined to co-operate with Mr. Chamberlain and to approve of his scheme, they did the right thing and their action, I daresay, will be endorsed by all those who believe in the future of this country of ours.

When I am on my feet, Sir, allow me to say further in connection with this matter of the Privy Council, that the right of appeal ought to be restricted, rather than enlarged. I think we, in Canada, ought to take a leaf from the history of Australia, as to those appeals to the Privy Council. In the Commonwealth of Australia, as we all know, no appeals to the Privy Council are allowed except in constitutional matters. It is a matter of public notoriety that in Canada, our appeals are the ruination of poor litigants. None but powerful corporations can avail themselves of the right of appeal by going from the lower courts to the courts of last resort, as is generally the case, when they go to law against private individuals in reduced circumstances. Last year, Sir, Alexander Lacoste, chief justice of the province of Quebec, speaking at the annual banquet of the Montreal Bar Association, did not hesitate to say that the number of appeals ought to be restricted. So far as the Privy Council is concerned, we are told that it is the inherent right of every British subject to go to the foot of the Throne ; but it should be borne in mind that the Privy Council is by no manner of means the only tribunal of justice entrusted with the administration of justice, in the name of royalty. To hold the contrary doctrine would be an egregious mistake. Justice, Sir, no matter where it is administered, no matter before which tribunal it is appealed to, always is and under any circumstances, an emanation of sovereignty. Whether you appeal to the Court of Appeals, or whether you appeal to the Superior Court, the judges that sit on those tribunals do administer justice, in the name of the King, as truly and as efficiently as the Lords of the Privy Council do. And in so saying, I do not think I am saying anything in the least derogatory to the members of that high tribunal.

Before resuming my seat, I wish to say once more that the composition of the Privy Council should not be changed, but what is more desirable is that the right of appeal to that tribunal should be curtailed. I cannot help reminding the House of the disastrous effect of a judgment just rendered by that tribunal. I say without any hesitation that the judgment in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is an unqualified outrage against our civil code, and that our whole jurisprudence has been upset and replaced by English common law. Although the Privy Council, as a rule, has respected our constitution in those cases in which the provinces were opposing encroachments upon the rights of the Dominion government, and dispute the fact that we owe that tribunal a debt of gratitude on that score, it is none the less true that for many years to come, the remembrance of that judgment, which has provoked a debate in this House at an earlier stage of this session, will rankle in the breasts of the judiciary, of the Bar and of those who are amenable to the courts of justice in the province of Quebec.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I fully concur in the remarks just fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). In my opinion, the dividing line between the legislative power and the judiciary power is confused and involved enough, without there being any need of making it still more intricate. The legislative power and the judiciary power go hand in hand, and cannot exist one without the other. It cannot be held that the legislative power is supreme, when the judiciary power is not. From that co-relation between the legislative power and the judiciary power, we are enabled to form a correct estimate of the question submitted by the imperial authorities to the government of Canada. What the imperial authorities were aiming at, was judicial federation, and from judicial federation was bound to flow legislation federation. Therefore, it was a question of imperial federation which we cannot too strongly oppose.

I equally concur in the remarks fallen from my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), with regard to the jurisdiction of the Privy Council as to litigations between private individuals. Every time the judicial committee was called upon to render judgment upon the construction to be put on the British North American Act of 1867, or in cases relating to merchant shipping, the decisions were always received with the greatest respect, but why so ? Because it was then acting within its own sphere of action. But whenever the Privy Council was called upon to give a decision on litigation between private individuals, as to certain points of law, such, for instance, as that of party wall, public opinion has always questioned the soundness of the views of the law Lords, on the ground that such a question was not one of the subjects that they could properly deal with and decide.

As to the question of appeals to the Privy Council, my views coincide with the views of Bentham. That celebrated jurist, replying to this question : 'In which cases is an appeal allowable ?' Answers without any hesitation that never should it be allowed. Why appeals should not be allowed is

easily understood. Justice like men, is liable to error, even in clear cases. As to doubtful cases, it is in the interest of the litigants that they should be settled with as little delay as possible.

I hope the government will not recede from the position they have taken and that they will avail themselves of such opportunities as may offer to secure changes in the composition of the judiciary committee of the Privy Council.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. Mr. Carroll)—(Translation). There can be no objection to the paper asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux), being brought down, and I would not have risen to take part in this debate, but for certain remarks fallen from the lips of the hon. gentleman. There is a prevailing feeling in the province of Quebec, that the judgment rendered by the Privy Council in the case of Roy vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, strikes at the very root of the Civil Code of the province.

I am quite free to say that as a matter of fact, the jurisprudence that had obtained so far under the civil code of the province has been changed by that judgment. But I also hold that the Privy Council did not override the law, and to prove my contention, it will suffice to quote from the very judgment of the Privy Council :—

The argument appears to be founded on the suggestion that Quebec has a civil law of its own and that in that province all corporations like all other persons are responsible for causing damage to their neighbours by a fault that is to say, any objectionable wrong whether imprudence or want of skill, and another article of the code provides that civil corporations constituting by the fact of their incorporation, ideal or artificial persons are as such governed by the laws affecting individuals saving the privileges they enjoy and the disabilities they are subjected to.

If the immunity claimed for the appellants were simply claimed upon the ground that they were a corporation without reference to what they are authorized to do in that capacity, the argument would be well founded, but the fallacy of the suggestion lies in supposing that that immunity is claimed because they are a corporation. If it were so there would be no difference between the law of England and the law as so expounded in the province of Quebec, but the ground upon which the immunity of a railway company for injury caused by the normal use of their line is based is that the legislature which is supreme has authorized the particular thing so done in the place and by the means contemplated by the legislature, and that cannot constitute an actionable wrong in England any more than it can constitute a fault by the Quebec Code. The principle has been lucidly expounded by Lord Hatherley in the case of Geddis vs Proprietors of Bann Reservoir, L.R. Appeal Cases, Vol., 3, page 433, thus :

And further :—

Much was argued by the learned counsel for the respondent as to the peculiar jurisprudence of Quebec, but in truth there is no such difference between the law of England and the law of Quebec in this respect as he seemd to suppose. The law of England equally with the law of the province in question affirms the axiom : Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedes, but the previous state of the law whether in Quebec or France or England cannot render inoperative the positive enactment of a statute and the whole case turns not upon what was the common law of either country but what is the true construction of plain words authorizing the doing of the very thing complained of.

The legislature is supreme and if it has enacted that a thing is lawful such a thing cannot be a fault or an actionable wrong. The thing to be done is a privilege as well as a right and duty and it seems to their Lordships it comes within the expressed language of the Code (Art. 356.)

As will be seen from the above, the Privy Council holds that the doing by a company of the thing it is authorized to do in the place and by the means contemplated by the legislature, cannot constitute an actionable wrong, according to the construction put upon sections 1053 and 386 of the Civil Code. Such is the decision of the Privy Council and it cannot be said that the law Lords have wrongly interpreted those articles.

We are told that the Privy Council has set aside the law of the province of Quebec. I think there is a mistaken notion prevailing in that respect, in the province of Quebec, which requires to be corrected.

It must be borne in mind that our jurisprudence originates from the French law. A statute was passed under Louis Philippe in 1845, under which proprietors were forbidden to put up any building within sixty feet from the railway line. Under that statute, the responsibility of railway companies has been restricted. Of course, our jurisprudence was overridden by the Privy Council, but I hold that the principles of our civil law have not been set aside by the Privy Council, to adopt the English common law.

As to the question of appeals, I may say that I was rather taken by surprise, and that I am not ready to discuss it now. But I should like my hon. friend to tell me one thing : If the right of appeal were done away with, does he think that those who are amenable to the tribunals would be satisfied with such a state of things ? Certainly not, and I do not think my hon. friend will gainsay it. If you look around you, and take a survey of what is transpiring and what is being said, you cannot fail to come to the conclusion that under the conditions which prevail in the community, the right of appeal is still of great value and assistance and that it is better not to do away with it now.

Motion agreed to.

THE TRANSPORTATION PROBLEM.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan) moved for :

Return showing the amount of money spent on the St. Lawrence river from Montreal to Quebec, with the object of making Montreal a National port.

He said: The subject brought up in this motion is one that has been discussed in this House at great length on several former occasions. The transportation problem, is, in my opinion, the greatest we have before us to-day. It is the great national problem of this country, and will have to be dealt with in the near future, if we are ever to attain the position to which our natural resources and position entitle us. I have no desire to discuss the question from the standpoint of a province or a territory, but from a national standpoint and on broad lines. Regarding the amount of money spent, for the details of which I am now moving, on the route between Montreal and Quebec, I may say, from what I have been able to gather—and I have given the matter a great deal of study—it appears to me that Montreal is not likely to ever become the great national port of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know?

Mr. DAVIS. Because there is not sufficient water in the channel between those two cities to float the class of ships now being built. Another reason that it can be used only during five or six months in the year, and hon. members who are acquainted with the growth and development of the west, must know that it is impossible for us to depend on a port which can only be kept open during that period.

We had a great deal of discussion the other day about the Intercolonial Railway, and I wish to begin my remarks with a consideration of the role which that road may be made to play in working out the transportation problem. According to the figures in the blue-book, it has not been financially a paying concern, but in order to ascertain its real value as an asset, we must not confine ourselves to one point of view. The question to my mind is this: Does it pay the people? Is it a great advantage to the people of the lower provinces? The matter of a deficit of a few hundred thousand dallars here or there does not amount to very much provided the people of that end of the country are being benefited, provided that railway gives them cheap rates and transportation. Another feature we must not lose sight of is the fact that the Intercolonial Railway belongs to the people. True, it has cost us somethink like $60,000,000, but we own the road, and I believe that the time will come when it will be a valuable asset. I believe that it will become in the near future the starting point of a great national railway. It has occurred to me that if the government were to extend the Intercolonial Railway over some of the proposed lines we see outlined on the map, across through the province of Quebec by James Bay, and extend it out to Port Simpson on the Pacific coast, we would then have the shortest transcontinental route on this continent, and one which would belong to the people. True, we have paid something like $60,000,000 for the road, but we have likewise paid something like $234,000,000 in money and lands to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which we do not own, over which we have no control, and the road-bed and equipment of which are exempt from taxation for all time to come. So that, comparing the cost of the two and bearing in mind the fact that we own the Intercolonial Railway, the expenditure on that road, no matter what people may say, may be considered a good investment for the country. Looking over the report of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I find that they have still on hand 16,000,000 acres of land out of the grant given them on their main line and branches. Estimating that at $4 an acre, at which price they could sell it at once and get their money, that amounts to something like $64,000,000 that we have given them. Then, take the town sites which they own in Vancouver and other places, and which they have also received as free gifts, their value would amount to something like $20,000,000 more. And besides there is the cash bonuses and other moneys paid them, amounting to something like $35,000,000. To all this we must add a certain mileage of completed road, handed over to that company, worth $65,000,000. Then take the lands which they have sold and of which they have realized a sum of about $48,000,000. Adding all these together you will find that in all we have paid out $232,000,000 of our wealth for the building of that road, and we do not own one mile of it. And yet some hon. gentlemen will still carp because we have put $60,000,000 into the Intercolonial Railway, which we own ourselves and which will become a valuable asset later on. I believe that the government made a mistake in not having bought the control of the Canada Atlantic some time ago. The Intercolonial Railway should have been extended from Montreal to Depot Harbour, on the great lakes, so as to give an outlet by the government road from the great lakes to the seaboard. I believe also that we should continue the Intercolonial Railway through the province of Quebec, direct from the city of Quebec, the whole way to the Pacific coast, and we would then have a through rail route to the heart of the North-west Territories, and touching an ocean port at both sides of the continent, one open the year round, and the other of which could be kept open from nine to ten months in the year, or go further down to an ocean port that could be kept open the entire year. You could then have a system of transportation over which you could carry the products of the west to the sea, and which could be open every month in the year. That would be a main artery,

under the exclusive control of the people of this country. The 10 per cent clause then in the Canadian Pacific Railway agreement would evaporate into thin air. It would melt away like snow in the spring, because if you had a competing road owned by the government, the Canadian Pacific Railway, in order to hold their share of the trade, would have to reduce their freight rates to such an extent that the 10 per cent clause would be utterly ineffective. The government could then grant charters to any company to build branches to its main line as feeders of that road. These branches would be good paying institutions, and by this means the people of the west would be able to market their produce twelve months in the year.

I wish now to deal with the port of Montreal. With the modern progress we are making, with the enlarged vessels we are building, it will be found impossible to utilize that port as a national port. It will be impossible to get the larger ships into it, and we will find that we have spent a lot of money on it which might have been much better spent elsewhere. Montreal will always be a port of some importance, but not a great national port. The government should decide at once on some port as the national port of this country, and the government railways and its branches should touch that port. Then we should proceed to erect facilities there for handling the produce of the west and avoid the delays now experienced at Montreal and the head of Lake Superior. I have heard this question discussed in this House on other occasions, but I am sorry to say that nearly every one who has given his views on the question has had a port of his own to advocate. But we cannot all have ocean ports or lake ports at our own doors, and we ought to look at this matter from a national standpoint, with a sole eye to the development of the whole country from one end to the other. Unfortunately the larger part of the agricultural lands are situated about 2,000 miles away from the Atlantic seaboard, and the great problem we have to solve is, how we are going to get the produce of the prairies to an ocean port as cheaply as the produce of the western states is carried to the American sea coast, and thus give our people a chance of earning fair remuneration for their labour. From my standpoint, what we require is a through road from Quebec right through to the heart of the territories and thence on to the Pacific coast.

Now, as I have said before in this House, we have only 400,000 people on those plains, and last year, these people produced over 100,000,000 bushels of grain and also an enormous quantity of cattle, dairy products and other commodities. And I venture to say that if you were to put a fair valuation on that grain and those cattle and dairy products, and divide the total by the number of people in Manitoba and the North-west, you would get a result showing an average of production higher than that of any state in the Union or any province in this Dominion. The total value of these products represents an enormous sum of money. That money is not spent in the west, but comes down here to be spent in commodities that are needed for consumption by the people there. It is time that the business men of these older provinces, particularly those of the large cities and great manufacturing centres, should wake up to the fact that there is a long stretch of rocky land between North Bay and the head of Lake Superior, and that if we do not get better communication with the west than we have at the present time, that is, if we do not get better freight rates on our products from the North-west, the people that are now going into that country, at something like sixty or seventy thousand a year—and I believe it will be one hundred thousand this year—most of them coming from the United States, and not being accustomed to labour under these disadvantages of high freight rates on their freight products, will be sure to turn their eyes to the United States for an outlet for their products and a place for purchasing goods of all kinds. Now, this country east and west should stand together. The interests of the east, generally speaking, are those of manufacturing, while ours are almost entirely agricultural. Both interests should work together trying to solve this problem, that the trade of the North-west may be kept for this country.

Now, what position have the people of the North-west been in this year? We have already discussed in this House the shortage of cars and the grain blockade, and I think hon. members are seized of the facts in connection with those matters. Last year we did not have half enough rolling stock to move the crop that was grown in the North-west. The consequence was that the farmers lost something like six cents a bushel on a large portion of their crop. And I will explain why. The grain buyers in the west in ordinary seasons begin about the middle of November to pay less for wheat than in the early part of the season, because they must count upon it being stored at the head of the lakes during winter, on account of the closing of navigation. Last year they knew that the grain could not be moved before the close of navigation, and so they started early in October to buy on the basis of winter storage at the head of the lakes. If a farmer happened to get a car, load it and send it down to the head of Lake Superior in time for export, he was paid on the basis of six cents a bushel higher than the dealer was giving him. The farmer, therefore, naturally came to the conclusion that the dealers were robbing him to that extent. But I suppose that the dealer was hardly to blame, for he was merely protecting himself against the danger of not being able to get the grain out that

season. That having been the position of affairs last year, I submit that it is pretty nearly time that something should be done to remedy the evil. Next year, we are to have the Canada Northern Railway Company, and that will be an assistance, but we can hardly expect that it will remedy the difficulty. We have not sufficient elevator accommodation at the head of the lakes. The Canadian Pacific can store there about 5,000,000 bushels. But that can be filled up in about a week and then there is congestion. I do not know what the Canada Northern will provide, but I feel certain that it will not be sufficient to meet the requirements. Next year, should we have a large crop, with the larger acreage sown and with part of last year's crop still in the country, there will be a still worse state of affairs than there was last season. The government should take this subject into consideration, and take means to provide railways for the transport of the produce of that country. We are bringing people in there at the rate of from 60,000 to 100,000 a year. These people, as I have said, are coming from places where they have had low freight rates and can get all that their stuff is worth. We are inducing them to go in where there is no railway communication on the promise that railways will be built. And I may say here that those people are not going to stay for twenty years without railway accommodation as some of the earlier settlers have done. If we do not do something soon to provide railways, you will find those people going out of the country just as quickly as they are coming in now. We are spending a great deal of money to bring those people in, and it is to the interest of the whole Dominion that they should be induced to stay. But if we do not do something to give them railway facilities, you will have a large stream of them going out. There is a marked difference between the policy of the United States in opening up their new country and the policy of this Dominion. The territory opened by the United States was not nearly so good as ours—there was no comparison between their lands and the lands we have in the North-west Territories, for we have not only a fertile soil, but we have timber and many other things that they had not. Still, they managed to fill up their country, and they did it by building railways and then asking the people to come in and settle. But we have adopted the policy of asking the people to come in and of building the railways afterwards. Many people went in twenty years ago expecting that railways would be built out to them, and the railways are not there yet. This I say is the problem the government has to deal with.

I have already said that we have laboured under very heavy freight rates in the west. If we are to have the people prosperous and contented we must afford them the means of taking their produce out of the country as cheaply as it could be done on the other side of the line. But what is the present state of affairs ? We have one line of railway running from Lake Winnipeg to Lake Superior, the Canadian Pacific Railway. That was built in the early days and the freight rates upon it are under the 10 per cent clause, so that we have very little control over them. The Canadian Pacific Railway people charge 8 5-10 cents per bushel to carry our wheat 448 miles. I do not believe in dealing to any large extent in figures in addressing the House, but I have a few figures here that, I think, are very instructive. I find that wheat is carried from Chicago to New York via Buffalo for 4½ cents per bushel. Wheat is taken from Chicago to Montreal over the Canada Atlantic Railway, a distance of 904 miles for 4½ cents a bushel against 8 5-10 cents in the North-west for hauling it 448 miles. That state of affairs simply cannot continue. When we get in a large population—and we are going to have a large population in the near future—as the Yankees say, 'something is going to drop.' The people are not going to pay rates of that kind very much longer. We are told that our system of canals will relieve the situation. We have spent very large sums of money on our canals. But it seems to me they have outlived their usefulness. I have already made that statement in this House, and I make it again. To depend for the removal of our immense crop on canals that are frozen up for six months in the year is quite out of the question. It will not be many years before we shall be producing four hundred million bushels of grain. After it is stored in elevators along the road, the charges for insurance and interest on the money mean 6 cents a bushel and I say that 6 cents a bushel on that amount of grain would pay the interest on the bonds that built the railways that would take that grain out the whole twelve months of the year, or pretty near. We have got to have some system for taking it out. We have spent a lot of money on canals, and I find from a report that I have here that the trade in the canals is decreasing. I see there is $22,536.12 of a decrease in the revenue from the canals last year. Now with all that money spent on the canals, we ought to do better than that. But the trouble is that the railroad traffic is making such strides that the canals will soon be a thing of the past. The statement has been made in this House that the canals are a sort of safety valve against high rates, that they serve to regulate freight rates on the railways. After we have given $240,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, when we have subsidized hundreds of other railways in this country with vast sums of money and public land, it seems to me it would be a mournful thing if we have got to spend another hundred millions on canals for the purpose of regulating the railways. I think the people of this country should be in a

position to regulate the railways without spending any more money on canals. The canals will always be serviceable for local traffic. Here you have canals in Ontario, and I suppose you have some in the province of Quebec, and these canals will be very serviceable for local traffic running up and down. But to talk about taking the produce of the west down through the canals which are frozen six months in the year, is simply ridiculous. They have another project now on hand; some one is promoting the Georgian Bay canal which is estimated to cost something like $90,000,000. When you get that canal built you will find that it will be practically useless, for you will find that the railway people have made such strides that they will be able to carry the produce of the west so much cheaper and so much quicker, and that they will be able to take goods from the east up to the west so much quicker and cheaper, that there will be no use for the canal. It is a serious thing to spend $90,000,000 on another canal. I have heard about another scheme for building a canal down the French river. It would be better to leave that money in the Dominion treasury than to throw it away on canals at the present time.

Some people talk of another scheme which might not be a bad one. I have never advocated the government ownership of railways, because people tell you that the Intercolonial Railway cannot be managed properly on account of it being a political road. Well, if we had all the railroads in this country managed by a political head, I do not know that we should be much better off. But I think the means of transportation might well be put under a commission the same as any other business, and they could be run without the element of politics entering into the management. I want to say that the time may come before long when the people of this country will be obliged to acquire all these railroads in self-defence. Judging from what we see in the papers, great trusts and combinations are being formed to acquire control of our railroads, and how do we know that in the course of ten years, perhaps five years, some of those immense trusts may come in and buy up all the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railroads and amalgamate them so that we would have only one road. Therefore, I say the time may come when we shall be obliged in our own defence to acquire these roads and run them as government roads. Now, when we are building any more roads, it would not be a bad idea, if we have to grant subsidies to them, to have some kind of an agreement that in case of the government taking over the roads, that amount would be deducted from the purchase price of the road. We would know then that if we ever had to take over those roads we would get our money back. Up to the present time all the money and land we have given are gone, we can get no return from them. We do not even get decent freight rates. That is a proposition for the government to consider, that in future, in giving subsidies, they might make a condition that if such time ever came when we took over the roads, we should deduct the subsidy from the price we paid for them.

I consider this is a vital question to the people of the west, and that is one of the reasons that I have brought it forward at the present time. I felt it would not be right for us to go home from this session without trying to impress upon the government the necessity of speedy action, of building or assisting to build more roads in that western country, to provide better facilities for getting our stuff out to the lakes. I see that the Canadian Pacific Railway people intend to issue more stock, and it has been provided that a certain amount of that money shall be spent in purchasing rolling stock. That is a step in the right direction, because there is not enough rolling stock at present. They had last year something like 7,000 box cars for the purpose of moving grain. They used 4,000 of those cars for taking goods from the east to the west, and only 3,000 for the purpose of moving out the wheat. That proves that the money we received from the produce we sold from that country comes down here and is turned into manufactured goods which are sent back to the west. Probably more value is sent back west than is sent east, because, while they only use 3,000 cars for bringing out our wheat, they use 4,000 cars for carrying the merchandise back into that country that is bought with the money we realize for our wheat.

We have had another grievance this last year, and that is one which I hope a railroad commission, when it is appointed, will remedy. We have not been treated very well in the kind of cars the Canadian Pacific Railway gives us. I speak from knowledge, because I have been shipping grain this year myself, and I know that a lot of the cars that were used were in such condition that they were not fit to haul grain at all. There was hardly a car that I sent out on which I did not have to spend $1.50 or $2 in repairs before it would hold the grain. Now that is a matter the railroad commission would be able to deal with. I don't think it is fair that we should be treated so. I am paying high freight rates, and when they furnish cars they should be in a condition to hold the grain we put into them; if not, the company itself should be compelled to repair the cars at the point where the grain is loaded into them. The railroad commission might also remedy a lot of other things, although the Minister of Railways and Canals does not seem to think it would be as beneficial to us as some of us anticipate. I don't expect a railroad commission is going to cut the freight rates down so low that we are going to get our

stuff out or in for nothing, but I do expect that a railroad commission will see that the people in the western country are treated as well as the people in the eastern country. I have pointed out before in this House that as soon as we get west of Lake Superior we pay just double what you pay east of Lake Superior. Take the tariffs of the great railroads, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and you will see that we are paying in local rates and in through rates just double what the people in the east are paying. The 10 per cent in the original charter of the Canadian Pacific Railway does not extend to branch lines, and there at least the government have control over that company, and that control should be exercised in such a manner that the people got fair and decent treatment on those lines.

When we have paid for these roads and made a present of them to the railway companies I hold that we should get fair and reasonable freight rates, because that is what we expect. We expect that a railway commission will deal with that phase of the question and that they will take up and go into this question of discrimination and see that we are not paying any more for the transportation of our grain, our animals and our other produce than any other persons are called upon to pay. Why should we pay more for the transportation of our produce than the people down here are called upon to pay ? I do not see why we should be called upon to pay more, because it is a well known fact that we furnish a greatest portion of the freight traffic that the Canadian Pacific Railway have and they cannot say that it is on account of us not furnishing them with trade. We are paying double what we should pay for hauling our products and this is a question that a railway commission should be called upon to regulate.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not wish in any way to prevent the hon. member (Mr. Davis) from arguing his motion, but it seems to me that he is going beyond his motion. As this is the last day for motions I venture to raise that point. My hon. friend's motion is for :

Return showing the amount of money spent on the St. Lawrence River from Montreal to Quebec, with the object of making Montreal a national port.

The hon. gentleman has no right, upon that motion, to discuss freight rates of railways in the west.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that under this resolution, which is a resolution dealing with the transportation problem, I should be permitted to discuss these questions. I have been speaking of railways in the west right along. I have been alluding to the fact that the harbour of Montreal will never make a national harbour. I have been alluding to the fact that there has been a lot of money spent on that harbour and on the canals. I do not think that I have been outside of the question before the House. However, I will submit to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I would caution hon. members. I would ask those who are discussing these matters to keep as near to the resolution as possible. I would say that there is a great deal of time lost in this House by wandering too far afield, and therefore I ask hon. members to discuss the question that is before them as closely as they can.

Mr. DAVIS. My hon. friend the leader pro tem of the opposition (Mr. Monk), I see, does not care to hear about the grievances of the people of the west. I have no doubt they do not interest him to the same extent that they interest myself and other hon. gentlemen in this House.

Mr. MONK. I do not think my hon. friend has a right to say that.

Mr. DAVIS. And if he takes exception to that I think it is well the western farmers should know it.

Mr. MONK. I take a great interest in these grievances but they have a place in the discussions of this House.

Mr. DAVIS. I think their place is here and now and whenever we can get an opportunity of speaking of them. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for keeping me closely to the question as he thinks I have been wandering far afield. I was going to mention, in connection with this phase of the question, the large amount of money that has been spent on the harbour of Montreal and the large amount of money that has been spent in deepening the channel between Montreal and Quebec for the purpose of allowing larger ships to come up, and I suppose that as the harbour of Quebec is connected with this part of the resolution, my hon. friend will not object if I proceed to discuss it. Therefore, I intend to say a few words in connection with the harbour of Quebec. I had the pleasure of visiting the city of Quebec something like a year ago and it appeared to me from what I saw that the harbour of Quebec is a much superior harbour to that of Montreal for the reasons that there is a greater depth of water, that it is closer to the ocean, that the tide keeps the ice from freezing to any great extent, so that, with proper facilities for ice breaking, it should be possible to keep the harbour of Quebec open for ten months in the year. If we could not do that you could easily go a little farther down and get a harbour which would be kept open for ten months in the year. The great and important need in the west is of some means, railroad, or railroads, that will take our produce out of the country during twelve months in the year, so that, as soon

as navigation closes on the great lakes, we can run our stuff out by rail. We might just as well store our wheat at the head of Lake Superior as bring it down and store it at Montreal. We want to market our wheat at the proper time, so that we can get our money out of it and so that we can take advantage of a rise in the market when a rise takes place. At the present time, not only the farmers, but the grain buyers, are unable to get the grain out of the country and to take advantage of any rise in price. For instance, if grain went up in the fall 25 cents a bushel it would be of no advantage to the grain buyers, or the producers, because they could not get the grain out. They would have to sit and look at it and wait until the price went down again. We want facilities whereby we can send the grain out of the country during twelve months in the year. Now, there are three propositions before the country which it might be well to consider. As far as extending the Intercolonial Railway to the Pacific coast is concerned, I do not expect that my advice will be accepted in that respect. But, we have other schemes before the House. We have one scheme which has been submitted to the House and to which a charter has been granted—the Canadian Northern Railway. A charter has been granted to the promoters of this enterprise for the purpose of enabling them to continue the road through the centre of the territories and on to Port Simpson, with a branch running down through the Yellow Head pass. Then a charter has been granted to them under which they can extend their line through the territories and along near the edge of James' bay. It is a small matter to build a railway to James' bay and to a navigable port on that body of water. A great many people in the west believe that the Hudson's bay route is feasible and that some day in the near future it will be possible to send the produce of the west out in that way. If it should become an established fact that we can navigate Hudson's bay we will be able to utilize that railway, ship our produce over that branch to James' bay and send it out in that way. Then, in addition to these lines the charter provides for a branch to Port Arthur, another to Montreal, one to this city, and one to Quebec.

We have another scheme which involves a still shorter route—the trans-Canada railway, running from the city of Quebec straight to James' bay and right along the northern portion of the North-west Territories to Port Simpson on the Pacific coast. I desire to say a word or two in connection with this route. It has been said that this trans-Canada route is useless for the reason that, as it is said, while it is hundreds and hundreds of miles shorter than the Canadian Pacific Railway, the character of the country is such that there would be no local traffic and that you would have 2,500 miles of railway running from Quebec to Port Simpson on the Pacific coast without any local traffic whatever. I do not think that that statement is correct. I believe that the greater portion of the road running through the northern part of Quebec will pass through good agricultural lands. There are great resources in timber and minerals all through that portion of Quebec and when the road reaches the vicinity of James' bay it will pass through good farming land. I can tell hon. gentlemen that after the road passes the narrows of Lake Winnipeg and gets up into the northern country it will pass through just as good agricultural land as there is to be found in the province of Ontario. In the Peace river valley and all through the Smoky river region there will be found a magnificent farming country, and when that road is built and the country is by this means opened up there will be found room for millions of people, and the result will be that this will be the shortest and most direct trans-continental route on this continent. That is a question that the government might take up. Here, then, are three alternatives ; you could extend the Intercolonial Railway to the Pacific coast, and I would prefer that because it would be a government road. The money expended in the extension of that road will be well spent because it will belong to us, the existence of the road will be a safeguard against monopoly and excessive freight rates and against those large American syndicates coming in here and getting control of our railways. We will thus have a main artery owned and controlled by the government. Then, again, you have the Mackenzie & Mann proposition and then you have this trans-Canada railway. The government of Canada will have to take up one of these three schemes in the near future.

We want a policy that will develop that country. We are getting the people in now, but if we are going to retain them we must have some way of opening up the land for settlement and affording the producers a cheap means of getting their products to markets from the west. It is time that some definite scheme of transportation were inaugurated by the government. We should determine on what should be the national port, and we should spend money prudently on it, but we should not rashly decide on a port which in a few years hence we may discover will be of no use because it has not sufficient water. The government has a splendid opportunity now to open up the large tracts of land in the Saskatchewan and Assiniboia valleys as well as in other parts of that vast country. I have been told that it is the duty of the provinces to subsidize railways, but taking into consideration that 80,000,000 acres of our land were taken from us for the purpose of building railways, wisely or otherwise, it surely rests upon this federal government to do that work. At all events we have no province there now, and I do not think we will have one in the very near future.

If the government handles this question, and deals with it energetically they will find that they will have a hundred fold return in the increased population of the west, the increased consequent prosperity of the east; the increased value of Dominion lands, and the increased capital which will be invested in the country. Why, Sir, as I have already said, we have enough land out there to pay the whole national debt of Canada. This is a great national question. Some gentlemen may think that the members from the North-west take up too much time in discussing their affairs But if the Ontario members or the members from the lower provinces laboured under the difficulties we experienced last year in the matter of the transportation of our wheat, they would be sure to make a greater noise than we do. We are sent here to let the people of Canada and the government know the wants of the North-west, and so far as I am concerned I will not be silent on that question. If this question is dealt with intelligently now it will be only a few years until this country will increase in population as rapidly as the United States ever did, and then Canada will become to a far greater extent than to-day, the grandest colony in the British empire.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). There is of course no objection to bringing down the statement that my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) has asked for. I may tell him at once, however, that there has been no public money spent in the harbour of Montreal; not one single dollar. That statement will I suppose set at rest the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) who is so much down on us every session of this House. I repeat: There has not been a single dollar of public money spent in the port of Montreal. There is in Montreal a body politic called the harbour commissioners who have borrowed money on which they have faithfully paid every cent of interest that was due. As to the deepening and widening of the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal there has been spent, in round numbers, $5,000,000 on that work—$3.000,000 before 1888 and about $2,000,000 since. This a very small amount of money after all compared to what we have spent for the North-west in the past. It has been expended on a distance of 55 miles of the St. Lawrence river. When the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, about 30 years ago, undertook to deepen the St. Lawrence there were only about 11 feet of water in Lake St. Peter as compared with 27½ feet now. Within two years there will be over 30 feet of water between the sea and the city of Montreal at the lowest possible state of the water, which is in the months of October and November. During the other months there will of course be more water.

Mr. BELL. How much over 30 feet?

Mr. DAVIS.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the months of May, June, July and August, there will be between 33 feet and 35 feet; let us say 33 feet—in the month of the lowest water there will be at least 30 feet. Thanks to the generosity of parliament, I might add, thanks to the intelligence of parliament is represented by both sides of the House, my department is now completing the great undertaking of widening and deepening the St. Lawrence between not only Quebec and Montreal, but between Montreal and the Gulf to a depth of at least 30 feet, and to a width of 450 feet in the straight parts of the dredged channel and to 500 feet, 600 feet and even 800 feet in the curves. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) was good enough to pay us a visit to the St. Lawrence river below Montreal a few days ago for which I am very thankful indeed. Like a good business man he came down to see what is going on so that he may contribute his share to the national work. I do not think that it is necessary to be a prophet to say now, that when the supplementary estimates come down the country will be happy to see in them the amount necessary to buoy and light the St. Lawrence in a proper way from the Strait of Belle Isle to the city of Montreal. My hon. friend (Mr. Davis) has never spared us during the last five or six sessions. He has invited us to close our canals; he has invited us to be good enough not to deepen our waterways any further. I do not see what our friends of the North-west have to gain by asking the rest of the country to do everything for them and at the same time to deny us the right to do what we wish to do for the benefit of all Canada. I believe I give expression to the feelings on both sides of the House when I say that we have a great deal too much of that kind of talk here.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I know I am expressing the feelings of both sides of the House in making this statement. What is the use of saying that the waterways are of no value to this country? My hon. friend (Mr. Davis) has not studied the question at all I am sorry to say. He has just stated a minute ago, that a bushel of grain can be taken from Chicago to New York for 4½ cents. Does he really mean that? Why, to-day the rate on grain from Buffalo to New York is 11 cents per 100 pounds. What does the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) mean in view of that fact?

Mr. DAVIS. I took it from the report of the Minister of Railways last year. Something may have happened in the meantime, but that is the average.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend (Mr. Davis) is speaking

from a local standpoint only. Now, here are the facts. For some months in the year a bushel of grain can be taken from Chicago to New York for five or six cents; but those are only the summer months. My hon. friend ignores this fact altogether. The waterways are the only cause of cheap rates. The rates he has quoted are the Buffalo rates. A bushel of grain is loaded on a steamer at Duluth or Chicago or Milwaukee and taken to Buffalo for about one and a quarter cents, the same rate, I may say in passing, at which a bushel of grain is taken to our Canadian ports on the Georgian Bay. During the summer months, while the Erie canal is open that bushel of grain is taken from Buffalo to New York for about three cents. As soon as the waterways are closed up go the rates. My hon. friend wants us to have no more waterways. If we had only railways from one end of the country to the other we would simply have to close our shop. My hon. friend invites us to build another transcontinental railway without any delay whatever. Let us have no more waterways, he would say, and let the poor little village of Montreal be consigned to obscurity. We have in Montreal only a little population of about 400,000, about the same as that of the whole North-west combined. Last year the trade of Montreal represented only the very negligible quantity of $133,000,000. Let us shut the port of Montreal for the benefit of my hon. friend, and let us build another transcontinental railway without any delay. My hon. friend should not speak in that way. I can assure our hon. friends from the North-west that we entertain the best feelings towards them, but they must not ask us to give up everything. We won't do it; it is no use.

Mr. DAVIS. You don't now.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Our friends in the North-west have been treated in the most kind way. The Canadian Pacific Railway has been built with the money of Canada, and I make bold to say—and a railway commission will establish the fact—that the rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the North-west are lower than the rates of any of the American railways which parallel it. If my hon. friend inquires he will find that seventy per cent of the American farmers have built granaries for themselves at their own cost, while the Canadian farmers in the North-west do not build any granaries. Our farmers in Quebec do not ask us to build granaries for them, but they build their own granaries. Our friends in the North-west do not build granaries, but want every facility to be provided for them. The Canadian Pacific Railway was not able last year to accomodate them any more than the American railways were able to accommodate the western states. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, which I am glad to say is about completed, will in a year or two be in a better condition. But when my hon. friend asks us to believe that if we build another railway for their benefit all their grain will be carried on railways he is not speaking by the book. There are about eight or ten weeks in the fall during which the crops are moved. How are they moved? They are moved to the ports on the great lakes. Our Canadian crops are moved to Fort William and Port Arthur, which are our natural ports on Lake Superior, and from there they are carried in Canadian and American bottoms to the seaboard. No railway can compete with waterways for such a long distance; it is out of the question. I am not adverse to giving to the North-west every possible accommodation, but our friends must not ask us, I say again, to give up everything for them. The port of Montreal is one of our national ports, as New York is one of the national ports of the United States of America. Quebec is also one of our national ports; Three Rivers will be one; St. John is one; Halifax is one. Sydney will also be a great port. At the very moment when my hon. friend is asking us not to do any more to deepen the St. Lawrence, our magnificient highway, the Grand Trunk Railway Company are asking us to give them the right and privilege of settling down in the port of Montreal. I had the pleasure of reading yesterday a statement that their able manager was asking us permission to build on the Windmill Basin a large elevator of 1,000,000 bushels capacity as the beginning and also a large warehouse. In other words the Grand Trunk Railway Company are prepared to spend a large amount of money, amounting to probably a million dollars, in that small inferior port of Montreal. What does this mean? It means that the Grand Trunk Railway Company will develop their trade through Canadian channels and Canadian waterways, that the Grand Trunk Railway will carry to the port of Montreal grain that will be carried from the west to a Canadian port on the lakes. I do not know what that port will be. The Grand Trunk Railway has several ports at its disposal. Midland, Meaford, Collingwood, Owen Sound, are all Grand Trunk ports. We are developing all these ports to make them reservoirs of trade for the St. Lawrence route. Sir, this country will not develop if we do not stand together, and I blame our friends from the North-west because they are threatening to look to the other side of the line. I do not say at all that all the members from the North-west have done so. Several members of parliament have represented to me that my hon. friend should not have spoken as he has done. We are friends of the North-west, while the Americans are not. What is the use of turning our eyes to the Americans?

Mr. DAVIS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I do not threaten. I only made the statement that we are getting immigration to the extent of 100,000 a year from the United States, and that if this kept up, these people, not having the means of marketing their produce, would naturally look to the other side of the boundary instead of coming here, and it would be well for us to take that into consideration and provide means to hold the trade.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad to accept that explanation. I accept it cheerfully, but it reminds me of what is going on in the North-west. We are spending about a half million dollars for immigration to that country. The older provinces are paying a large share of that money every year. But our eastern provinces have also magnificent lands. In the province of Quebec there are magnificent lands. My hon. friends complain that they have not sufficient railway facilities in the west. But I know of splendid districts in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario which have no railways and which do not turn their eyes to the United States of America for relief. Let us have a little patience. Our friends were blessed last year with a splendid crop. Providence was kind to them —too kind I am afraid. They had too much of a good thing, and we could not carry the whole of their trade as quickly as they desired.

We have spent, not $240,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but $100,000,000, which is a large sum of money. I do not hesitate to say—I may be wrong in my view —that I view with some apprehension that large immigration from the United States to this country. I may be altogether wrong. I know that my views are not shared by everybody, but I am such a strong Canadian, from my feet to my head, that I would rather not dispose too quickly of our national heritage to foreigners, and would rather develop the country on safe lines than go too fast. My hon. friend says that those Americans, if we do not treat them better than we do our own citizens, will look to their own mother land. Then let us not go too fast, for we must not develop only one part of the country. Let us develop the country gradually as a whole. I cannot forget that there are maritime provinces, that we have a fast line in view, which will be a great benefit to this country ; that we have our canals to provide for and our other water-ways and the French river scheme and that all these undertakings are destined not only to feed our summer ports but our winter ports also. The port of Montreal, which is so heavily condemned by my hon. friend, is the largest commercial port in this country. We shall not close it, and my hon. friend will send his grain down there. Why? Because that is the cheapest route. I say without hesitation that when our canals are completely equipped, when the port of Montreal is completely equipped, it will be cheaper to send a bushel of grain from Fort William, Milwaukee or Chicago by the St. Lawrence route than any other. Will my hon. friend allow me to tell him that at this very moment grain is taken from Chicago to the city of Quebec for 5½ cents per bushel.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the distance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 1,100 miles. From Fort William to the port of Montreal by that French river scheme, which my hon. friend condemns so much, the distance will be 890 miles. From Fort William to New York there are 1,192 miles. From New York to Liverpool the distance is 3,105 miles. From Montreal to Liverpool 2,773. In round numbers we would have an advantage of over 600 miles in favour of the St. Lawrence route. From Fort William to Fort Colborne, let us take the canals, the distance is 737 miles; from Fort Colborne to Montreal it is 320 miles, making a total 1,058 miles. From Fort William to Buffalo there are 750 miles, and from Buffalo to New York, 500 miles, making in all 1,250 miles. The distance is in our favour. Let us equip the St. Lawrence route and make it what it should be, because we have the distance with us. My hon. friend says that the St. Lawrence route is closed six months in the year. In that he is wrong. It is not closed more than five months in the year. The port of Buffalo is closed just as soon as Montreal. And how many bushels of grain were shipped to Buffalo last year ? Over 200,000,000. So that my hon. friend must agree that for a port which closes so early, it is doing quite a little business.

My hon. friend has said that there are not sufficient elevator facilities at Fort William and Port Arthur. That is true, but he cannot ignore the fact that about a week ago the Canadian Pacific Railway gave a contract for an elevator of about 5,000,000 bushels capacity. The Canadian Northern have also a very large elevating capacity. In Montreal the Harbour Commissioners are building a large elevator which will be completed for the opening of the next season, and the Grand Trunk Railway will no doubt build a large elevator also. The Canadian Pacific Railway have already two elevators, and I have no doubt that when the eastern portion of the harbour is completed, they will have another elevator or two there. There will then be sufficient elevating capacity in the port of Montreal.

My hon. friends must not make up their minds that the country will build railways to allow them to ship their grain and other products to American ports. As long as I am here I will do what I can to prevent anything of that kind, if they have such an idea in their minds, and I believe that the country will be behind me and the government.

I firmly believe that the port of St. John is the one which is the best suited for our winter port. It is to-day a successful winter port. The Canadian Pacific Railway are taking a large quantity of traffic to it, not only from our own North-west but from the American North-west, as well. They have their connections not only with our Canadian North-west but with the American west. They are feeding the port of St. John in the winter months with American and Canadian grain.

When we are better equipped, when that French river scheme which my hon. friend so much condemns has been carried through, I do not believe that 1,000,000 bushels of Canadian grain will go to American ports.

My hon. friend has reproached us for not having purchased the Canada Atlantic. I think it would have been the utmost piece of foolishness to have done so. We have perhaps given too many subsidies to that railway. At the time we thought we were doing right, and I hope that we have not made a sad mistake. Still I am not sure. Only the future can tell. But if we had bought that road, we have been obliged to equip a fleet on the lakes. Mr. Booth has been able to feed his road and keep it in good fighting condition without losing too much money, because he is a trader and has a fleet on the lakes, which takes American products and American grain to a Canadian port, and because he is a large lumber merchant who has large mills and is carrying on important operations at Burlington also. Mr. Booth has been able to keep his road open and in working order because he has a large American trade. Mr. Booth has been able to keep his road open and in working order because he has been able to get American trade. Canadian trade would never have kept his road open—everybody who knows anything about railways knows that. Had he depended upon Canadian trade his road would have been starved, and he would have lost, I suppose, a million dollars a year. Now, is the Canadian government to engage in the grain trade and in lumbering operations? Mr. Booth's road is not running to the port of Montreal. To reach that port, it would be necessary for the road to spend a few million dollars. The government has not been ready to do that. The road that has no western connections in the winter months has to be handled with a great deal of care by this government. We are invited to extend the Intercolonial Railway to North Bay. But what good would that do us? Where are our western connections? Why, what is the use of talking that way? If the proposal is made to extend the Intercolonial Railway to the coast, let us discuss it. But we have to consider several railways that have facilities in Canadian ports. The Grand Trunk Railway is carrying on a large business at Midland, and Midland is the most important port for the Grand Trunk Railway on the lakes. But the Grand Trunk Railway for the winter months is not a Canadian railway, unfortunately, but is located at Portland for the winter, as Mr. Booth's system is located at Boston and Portland during that season. I am not going to spend much money to carry Canadian trade to American ports, if I can help myself. It seems to me we can do better than that. And the sooner our hon. friends who differ with us understand that there are people who will resist and resist firmly, the better for us all. This country must stand upon its own bottom. Let us have our own tariff, whether high or low—let us have our tariff to suit ourselves. Let us have Canadian bottoms on the lakes and on the high seas. What do we see to-day? We see an amalgamation of the biggest navigation companies on the high seas. And by whom was that amalgamation carried out? By American capitalists, who own the American railways and who also control the American bottoms on the lakes. It is not hard to see what will be the result to us of that amalgamation, if we do not stand up like men. Controlling, as I have said, the ships on the seas, the American railways and the carriers on the lakes they will simply make the rates to suit themselves. If we allow them too much latitude, if we have not enough confidence in ourselves to equip this country on independent lines and on national lines, I feel, Sir, that before we are much older, we shall have very grave results to face. I hope I am wrong in my views, but I firmly believe I am speaking gospel truth in saying this.

This is the reason why our North-west friends must not ask us to spend every dollar of our money in their territory. We will give them as much as we can, but we have something else to take care of. The older provinces also have their interests to be considered. When the Americans have control of the rates, they will squeeze my hon. friend (Mr. Davis) to the best of their ability, there is no doubt about that; and I believe the day is not far distant, when our railway companies will have to face that amalgamation and equip themselves on the seas as the American railways are equipping themselves on the seas—unless we make up our minds not to be a nation, unless we make up our minds not to be anything. It makes me tired and sick when I see the readiness of some of our friends in disposing of our national assets—our waterways, railways, everything, in favour of foreigners. Let us not be too——

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman is misquoting me, I did not make any such statement. A moment ago he said that the American companies were getting control of our roads and that we should protect

ourselves against that movement. That is exactly what I say. I said it might be necessary to build competing roads.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was not alluding to my hon. friend (Mr. Davis), but was speaking in a very general way. Now, I have not much more to say except this—the work of deepening and widening the St. Lawrence will be completed within the next two years. I hope the government will be supported by both sides of the House in what I may call the national policy we are carrying out to-day. We are equipping our ports and harbours in the maritime provinces. We have spent large sums of money on the Intercolonial Railway. I hope and trust the expenditure of this money will have satisfactory results. We are spending money in equipping some of our harbours on the lakes. But not so much as I would like to see. If I had my way, as I have said before, and I may say it again, I would spend more money within the next two or three years to meet the situation we have to face in the United States. However, we are moving as quickly as the public opinion of the whole country will allow us to go. Port Colborne is being equipped. My hon. friend (Mr. Davis) does not believe in the canals. If the hon. gentleman will consider the question he will realize why it is that we have not handled as much trade by the canals as we should have done. We have not a shadow of equipment at Port Colborne. My hon. friend knows that the size of the ships navigating the great lakes is increasing all the time. Buffalo, on one side of Lake Erie, is magnificently equipped. I was there the other day and saw something of what they have. They have five miles of breakwater and they are rebuilding the structure in concrete. The Federal government is spending millions. All the American ports are being splendidly equipped, and Buffalo is their gateway. The biggest ships on the lakes go there. In Buffalo they have fifty-five elevators. In Port Colborne we have not a single elevator. How could we handle grain there in opposition to Buffalo ?

Now we had no equipment in the port of Montreal, and how could we handle grain coming through our canals ? But that trouble will be remedied. This government has grappled with that question, and I am glad to say that we have received assistance from many hon. gentlemen opposite. When the canals are equipped, as they will be presently, when Port Colborne is equipped, as it is being equipped now, when the St. Lawrence is deepened, and widened, and buoyed and lighted, we will have western trade coming through our Canadian channels. There is no doubt as to that.

My hon. friend said a good word for Quebec. Poor old Quebec ! fine old Quebec ! I have spent there the best years of my life. I am glad to see Quebec coming to the front and getting a share of the trade, because Montreal is not able to handle all the trade, there will be too much. Three Rivers also will be equipped, and there is no doubt a large trade will be handled there also, indeed a large trade is now being handled there. Quebec will receive a large trade through waterways and through railways. My hon. friend must know that the Canadian Pacific Railway has reached Quebec, the Grand Trunk Railway has reached Quebec, the Intercolonial Railway has reached Quebec; still, last year Quebec only handled $10,000,000 worth of trade, while Montreal handled $133,000,000 worth. In Montreal we are not jealous of anybody, we know that last year we were not able to handle the trade, and that is the reason why so much of it has gone to other ports. For myself I am prepared to ask parliament to equip Quebec without any more delay. The equipment of Quebec will be necessary, especially when the fast line is established, and I hope it will be very soon. Quebec will then be more important than it has ever been yet. The port of St. John will also develop, and I hope that old historic city of Halifax will develop. Let us stand by our harbours, whether they are down on the sea, or on the lakes, or on the St. Lawrence. Let us stand by this country, I cannot say it too loudly, let us be Canadians. Let us not turn our eyes towards the United States. They are friends of ours, no doubt, if they could capture all our trade they would do it. But I firmly believe that the best thing for us to do is to be friends to ourselves, whether in tariff matters or in the development of our national railways and waterways. In conclusion let me tell my hon. friend that the people of the North-west will find that even we in Montreal are friends to them, though they have treated us harshly at times, and we will continue to be friends to them if they do not too often turn Turk on us.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to take exception to some remarks made by the Minister of Public Works. I think he has gone a little far afield in trying to impute motives to me when there was no need of it. He said, or insinuated that the people of the North-west Territories wanted the people of the east to build railroads for them. I do not know that I ever heard any person in the North-west Territories asking the people in the east, or asking the government, to spend any money in building railroads for us. We are only asking what any other citizen has a right to ask, that is, proper facilities to handle our products, and that is not only putting money into our pockets, but into the pockets of every citizen of this country. He says the little village of Montreal, with 400,000 inhabitants, has as much population as the whole of the North-west Territories. I want to draw the hon. minister's attention to the fact that the people of the North-west Territories are paying millions

of dollars to the city of Montreal, year by year, to help increase its population. Commercial travellers from the great centre of Montreal are swarming all over the North-west Territories, in season and out of season, like flies round a honey pot. That is where Montreal is getting its money. If it had'nt been for Montreal's trade with the North-west, there would not be 400,000 people in the city of Montreal. I have nothing against the city of Montreal, the city of Montreal is all right. I said that the city of Montreal would always have a good trade. There is a certain class of ships that will always go to the port of Montreal. But we must look to the future, and I will tell him that I do not think that the canal system will be sufficient to remove all the crop that we will grow in that country in the next few years.

The hon. gentleman spoke about the amount of money that is being spent in the west. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if any hon. gentleman will look at the estimates for the North-west Territories for the last two or three years, he will find nothing to blow about as far as money spent in the west is concerned. I had the honour of receiving about $12 in my constituency last year. I am not complaining about that. We don't want that kind of improvement particularly, but what we do want is increased transportation facilities so that we can handle our crops. We are not looking to these little two-penny half-penny grants for building wharfs and all that sort of thing. If there are wharfs all along the St. Lawrence, if there are wharfs hanging on every tree between Montreal and Quebec, I am not objecting to it. If there is an ocean port in front of every man's door between Montreal and Quebec, I am not objecting to it. I am only bringing out the needs and requirements of the people of the North-west Territories. The hon. gentleman took me to task for complaining about the freight paid on wheat between these different ports. I find in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for this year that the average freight rate last year on grain between Chicago and Buffalo was two and a fifth cents. I find in going over another statement of the freight on grain for the last year between Buffalo and New York, that the highest rate was three cents, and the lowest rate a cent and a quarter, an average of one and one eighth cents. That bears out the statement I made, and shows that the Minister of Public Works is not correct. I said that the canals are not keeping up with the times. I find in the report of the Minister of Railways and Canals a statement giving the tonnage of wheat, food and breadstuffs carried over the canals and over the railroads between Buffalo and New York. I find that in 1894 they carried 1,400,129 tons on canals and that during the same year they carried 5,681,185 tons on railways. I will come down to the last year, and I find that in 1900 they carried 472,857 tons on canals as against 6,525,862 on railways, which goes to show that in every year from 1894 to the present time there has been a gradually decreasing haul on the canals in the United States as compared with the haul on railways. Now, I made a statement and it cannot be contradicted, and I have the statement here taken from the hon. minister's report that there has been a decline in the trade on our canals ever since 1897. The figures are all against canals and all in favour of railways in this century, and I think it is going to go on in that direction. My hon. friend says that he wants to be patriotic. I am as patriotic as any man in this country. I have said nothing in this debate that is not patriotic. What I say is that we should have more transportation facilities and that we want a railway and an ocean port. My hon. friend goes on to say that Montreal handled so many million bushels of grain last year and that Quebec handled so many bushels, but he did not tell us how many million bushels of grain went to American ports. My object is to have all that grain handled at an ocean port in this country, and by building or extending our railways in a proper manner ship this grain, which is going to Buffalo and other American ports, through our own country and through Canadian ports.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) how many millions of bushels of wheat were received at Buffalo from Canadian ports ?

Mr. DAVIS. I have not the figures.

Mr. BENNETT. I will tell the hon. gentleman there were about 3,000,000 bushels only.

Mr. DAVIS. We have heard a great deal of complaint in this House about the trade going from Canadian channels to American ports. Another statement which the hon. Minister of Public Works made was that he wanted Canadian bottoms. Certainly we do. I believe that we should have Canadian boats to carry Canadian grain. I believe it was necessary to suspend the coasting regulations three years ago when American vessels were allowed to come in and carry Canadian grain from one Canadian port to another. That is not a desirable thing, but we had not sufficient Canadian bottoms to handle the trade on that occasion and that privilege was given. I may say that the Canadian west has passed its experimental stage now, and that business men might take up the question of providing sufficient tonnage and perhaps get the assistance of the government to do so.

Mr. OSLER. Might I suggest to my hon. friend that there has not been a time when there has not been a sufficient number of Canadian boats to carry grain from the west to the east.

Mr. DAVIS. I remember the debate that took place in this House after the government suspended the coasting regulations in order to relieve the congestion at the head of the lakes two or three years ago. If there had been a sufficient number of Canadian boats to carry the grain out it would not have been necessary to suspend the regulations.

Mr. OSLER. There was a sufficient number of Canadian bottoms to carry every bushel of grain out and the government were wrong in suspending the coasting laws.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) must not forget one thing. He forgets that half of those ships were engaged in other trade, and were not available for the grain trade. It is all very well to say in vague terms that there are enough Canadian bottoms. There are not enough. Far from it, because half of them are engaged in other trade.

Mr. OSLER. I might tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tarte) that at the end of last season's navigation, with the greatest crop that was ever produced in the North-west, there were three boats left at Fort William for the winter, because there was no grain for them to carry out. There were Canadian bottoms to carry out every bushel of grain that was available. Canadian enterprise is building Canadian boats as fast as the demands of the grain trade require. I speak of knowledge, because I have been interested in Canadian boats on the northern lakes for many years, and I can say that the boat business has been quite up to the grain business, and that the firms which are interested in boats are not only keeping up with the demand, but are building in advance of the demand and that within the last week contracts have been let for boats carrying half a million bushels. There has not been a shortage in this matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to remind him that when this government allowed American bottoms to navigate in Canadian waters it was to carry American grain to a Canadian port. Mr. Booth is the gentleman who applied for that privilege. He asked permission to use American bottoms to carry American grain and perhaps along with it Canadian grain.

Mr. OSLER. Canadian grain ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and why ? Because he could not find enough Canadian bottoms.

Mr. OSLER. These American bottoms were employed by Mr. Booth to carry American grain to his own port, and then by his own railway to an American port. That is not to a Canadian port.

Mr. DAVIS. My hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has just placed in my hands a report of the Winnipeg Board of Trade which deals with the question that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) spoke about a moment ago, and which I wish to read to the House :

> The tonnage of the Canadian lake vessels is not keeping pace with the annually increasing tonnage handled at Fort William, and it behooves Canadians to move in this matter with despatch, or an unduly increased percentage of Manitoba grain will seek the Atlantic seaboard via Buffalo and American lines. It is doubtful whether, if all the grain offered to the Canadian Pacific Railway last fall had been taken to Fort William, there would have been Canadian vessels to have taken it across the lakes, even when excluding the quantity actually taken to Buffalo in American bottoms. Late in the fall Buffalo was blocked, and owing to the coasting laws, American vessels were not allowed to carry grain from Fort William to another Canadian port. Either the Canadian fleet will have to be largely augmented or the coasting regulations suspended, for Manitoba grain cannot be held back at Fort William or Port Arthur, because the Canadian vessel tonnage is inadequate to handle it.

Mr. OSLER. I think the Winnipeg Board of Trade are like a great many other western institutions; they anticipate events that do not occur. They anticipate that there will not be a sufficiency of vessels to take out the grain. I made the statement that there were three vessels that were obliged to winter at Fort William because there was not enough Manitoba wheat at Fort William ready for them to take out on their last trip, and in consequence they had to winter there for want of the cargo which they expected. There was no grain available for them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Would American boats have loaded themselves with Canadian grain for American ports ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. All this discussion is out of order; let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davis) proceed.

Mr. DAVIS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) tells us that there was not sufficient grain with which to load these vessels. One of the reasons why there was not sufficient grain was that the Canadian Pacific Railway could not take the grain to the elevators. We had the grain in the west and if it had been brought down to Fort William these boats would not have been tied up. In reference to what the hon. gentleman said about the Winnipeg Board of Trade my hon. friend (Mr. McCreary) informs me that 7,000,000 bushels of grain went via Duluth through American territory because the Canadian Pacific Railway could not bring it to a Canadian port, which is a lamentable thing. That is what the Winnipeg Board of Trade wants to prevent, and I venture to say there is no body of men in the Dominion that knows as much about the question as the Winnipeg Board of Trade.

There is not a body in Canada that knows more about grain than does the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and I would further point out to my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) that his partner Mr. Nanton is president of that board of trade, and Mr. Nanton is a business man and he knows what he is talking about. The Minister of Public Works said that something might happen that would enable the American railroads to squeeze us. Well, the position I took was that it might be necessary for the people of this country from a national standpoint, to build the Intercolonial Railway to Fort Simpson on the Pacific coast as a main artery controlled by the Canadian government, in view of the fact that some day the Americans may control the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway and other Canadian roads. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Tarte) accused me of making the sweeping statement that our canal system was no good. I did not say that. I said that the canal system would always be valuable for local traffic, but that this was a railway age, and as the canal system was inadequate to serve the transportation purposes of the great North-west it would be necessary to secure transportation by railways. The Minister of Public Works told us that we spent $100,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway. I wonder how he arrived at that figure. The report of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shows that they still have 16,000,000 acres of land which is worth at least $4 an acre, and that represents $64,000,000. I was under the impression that we gave them $25,000,000 in hard cash, together with a completed portion of the road which cost the government $65,000,000, and that they got another 16,000,000 acres of land which would represent a further sum of $48,000,000. If the Minister of Public Works figures it out, he will find that the people of Canada gave the Canadian Pacific Railway $240,000,000 in lands and money, which is more than the whole system is valued at to-day. I complain that in view of all this we still have to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway exorbitant freight rates to carry our products. The Minister of Public Works told us that grain was carried 1,100 miles for 5½ cents, and in view of the fact that we have to pay 8½ cents for carrying it 448 miles, is not that a grievance that we suffer? He told us that the people of the North-west Territories were having $500.000 a year spent on immigration for their benefit. I believe that money is well spent but I never heard before that it was not spent in the interest of all Canada. Our immigration agents do not alone represent Manitoba and the North-west, but they represent the older provinces as well. Anyway, every dollar spent in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is a benefit to the whole Dominion. We are a producing people and we manufacture nothing. The money that we get for our products comes to the east and helps to build up the eastern cities. We are proud of that, and what I said was that it was necessary to take other steps to bring the west and the east closer together, so that our trade might increase and so that a friendly feeling might exist. When I said that I spoke from a national standpoint. I repeat that the only solution to the difficulty is for the government to build one great national artery, or if they want to keep to the old policy of assisting companies, let them assist a company to build a great highway from the west to Quebec or some port that will be kept opened ten months in the year, so that we may have the advantage of a fair market price for our wheat and not be compelled to store it all winter. Suppose we raise 400,000,000 bushels of wheat in the west and have to store it during the winter months, then when that vast quantity would be put on the market in the spring of the year down would go the price, and the farmers would lose not six cents per bushel but perhaps twenty-five cents per bushel. We do not want anything unreasonable in the North-west, we point out here what is required, and when we do that we are only doing our duty to our constituents. We don't want any one to build granaries for us ; we want liberty to build our own granaries though, and we do not want legislation that gives a monopoly to the elevator combine. Give us the reasonable facilities which we want, and you will hear little more about complaints from the west.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—WAGES OF TRACKMEN AND OTHER LABOURERS.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland) moved :

That considering the general prosperity of Canada, the minimum wage to be paid trackmen and other labourers on the government system of railways should be at least one dollar and a half per day.

He said : Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal to-night with reference to the west and I have a grievance to discuss in reference to the east. It is not the great transportation question it is true ; but still it is a question which concerns the working men on the government railways who have wives and families to support on small wages, and it is a question just as important to them as is the question we have been discussing to the farmers in the North-west Territories. I regret very much that the Minister of Railways and Canals is obliged to be absent this evening because I would have liked to address a few remarks particularly to him. I wish to speak Sir, on behalf of two classes of public employees who seem to have been neglected in the

general increase of salaries which the minister has made on the government railways. I refer to the trackmen and to the freight handlers. In reference to the Intercolonial Railway trackmen I may say that they feel under an obligation to the minister (Hon. Mr. Blair) for having increased their wages by five cents per day.

But I wish to point out that during the past three or four years—years of increased prosperity, and therefore increased prices for the necessaries of life—whereas the Intercolonial Railway trackmen have had their wages raised only 5 cents per day, the necessaries of life have cost from 15 to 20 per cent more than previously. I also wish to point out the increased service of the road and the increased responsibilities in connection with it. Up to the year 1896, the Intercolonial was looked upon as a byway. A man who will stand up in this House and say that the Intercolonial Railway was fitted in 1896 to be a national highway does not voice the sentiments of the maritime provinces. We had in those days slow trains, light trains and light engines, and therefore the work of the trackmen was not as responsible as it is at the present time. To-day we have some of the fastest trains that run on the continent of America ; we have engines of 80 or 90 tons hauling freight trains ; these things greatly increase the responsibilities of the men who have the care of the track. And yet, in this year of prosperity, when we boast of our national surplus, when we talk of the sun of prosperity shining all over Canada, we ask men to work on the government system of railways and keep their wives and children for $1.20 a day. All I have to say is that the man who can possibly make ends meet with such a small wage, when the necessaries of life are so high in price, must be a born economist. Some may think this is a small matter ; but I think any matter that affects the labouring men of our country is an important matter. If we make our labouring men happy and contented, we have a greater country than we had before. I am not bringing this motion up without having repeatedly brought the subject to the attention of the Railway Department, and general manager, and the minister himself. I have been told by the minister and by the management of the Intercoloning Railway that owing to the deficit on the railway, they cannot afford to raise the wages at the present time. Mr. Speaker, I say that no deficit can be so great as to justify a government in keeping down the wages of its employees to a mean, miserable pittance. We may have had a deficit last year, but we are not going to have one this coming year. Even if we have a deficit, that applies to the railways alone. We have a great surplus of millions of dollars in the treasury of Canada, and yet in this year of surpluses we refuse to increase the wages of the workingmen. The hon. minister deserves the greatest amount of credit for having raised the wages of many of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway. I refer particularly to the trainmen, the conductors, the brakemen, the drivers, the firemen, the telegraphers, and the station agents all along the line. The wages of these men have been increased by the present Minister of Railways ; and why is it that the wages of the trackmen, who have to work 10 hours a day, who have serious responsibilities, who are skilled workmen—because a man has to be a skilled workman to be able to look after any system of railways—are kept down to the pittance of $1.20 a day ? We send our immigration agents all over the world to bring men into Canada. It is a poor advertisement for Canada to have it go to the world that the government of this country pays its workingmen only $1.20 a day. Besides, these trackmen have devoted their lives to this work. I know men in my own constituency who have worked on the railway for 20 years or more as trackmen ; and if they left their job to-morrow, although they are skilled men in keeping up and maintaining a railway, they would be unfitted to earn a livelihood at any other kind of work. In reference to the freight handlers, I may say that these men are compelled by the force of circumstances and the class of work they have to do, to be men of education, men who can read and write well, and who are trustworthy and honest; and yet these men, who have serious responsibilities, who handle hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of freight, are compelled to work for $1.20 a day. Last year there was a strike of the trackmen of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and what was the answer of the company to the men who demanded higher wages ? There answer was, 'You cannot expect us, a soulless corporation, to give you more than the government of Canada pays to its men on the Intercolonial Railway.' It was that argument that killed the strike at that time, and the men were forced to go back to work. Within the last few weeks these men have been again negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the company have agreed to increase their wages to $1.25 a day as the minimum rate and to pay more in towns and cities where the cost of living is high. They also agreed to leave the question of the wages of the trackmen to arbitration, in case the trackmen would not accept $1.25 per day. It seems to me that this country cannot afford to continue the present condition of affairs any longer. I am in close contact with these men. I know many of them in my own constituency. I know their circumstances, and I cannot understand how under the sun a man can keep his family, with six, seven, eight or nine children in some cases, on $1.20 a day. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Gallery) says that the city of Montreal pays $1.50 a day for labourers on the public streets. In the town of Amherst we have to

pay the men who work on the streets much higher wages than are paid on the government railway. It has a deteriorating effect on the workingmen of the country who know that the government does not pay its workingmen sufficient wages. Therefore, without taking up the time of the House at this late hour, I desire to call the attention of the government to this condition of affairs, on behalf of these workingmen, some of whom are among the very best citizens of the country, in the hope that they will immediately take this matter into their consideration, and increase the wages of the trackmen and the freight handlers to a sum that will enable them to keep their wives and children in greater comfort than they can do on their present rate of wages.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, I just rise to endorse and support and emphasize what the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has said. In his motion he takes in the government railways of Canada, but he confined his remarks to the Intercolonial Railway. That was probably a mistake. I think that the government, in taking this matter into consideration, should certainly consider it as comprehensably as the motion on the Order paper, which says the government railways, and consequently includes the Prince Edward Island railway. As a matter of fact, I know that young men who go on the railways and get positions as trackmen, by being saving and sober men, are simply able to support themselves. After some time perhaps they get married, but they are not able to support their families on the wages they receive ; and after they have acquired experience and become more valuable, they are obliged to leave the railway service, and take up some other occupation in order to make a living.

I do not think that such a condition of things ought to be allowed to continue in this country. As my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has pointed out, the railway trackmen are above the ordinary labourer. Their work requires more intelligence, and in addition they have to be out in all kinds of weather and at all hours, which entails additional expenditure on clothing, etc. They have to provide themselves with suitable clothing to meet the conditions under which they labour or their health will be impaired, and I know of cases of men whose wages did not permit them to clothe themselves suitably to meet all kind of weather and support their families, in consequence of which their health suffered and they were obliged to quit work. Of recent years the cost of living in Canada has increased. It costs more to support a family now than it did in former years. Clothing is dearer, rents are higher, and because of the great progress of the country a higher standard of living is necessary. In consequence of all these reasons and others which could be adduced, the wages paid the trackmen are not sufficient to enable them to support their families. The pay of all other men on the government railways has been increased fairly well, but the trackmen are kept just where they were several years ago. I earnestly hope that the government or the Minister of Railways will take up this matter and deal fairly and generously with these men, and I am sure that such a step would commend itself to the House and country.

Mr. DAN. GALLERY (Montreal, St. Anne's). While I am in entire sympathy with the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have so well pleaded the cause of the trackmen, I regret that they should have confined themselves to that particular class of labour and other labour on the government railway. There are men employed on our canals whose claims deserve equal attention, and when the government is considering the justice of raising wages on the Intercolonial Railway, I would ask that the claims of these men employed on the canals should also be given some consideration. It seems to me that the minimum rate mentioned in this resolution should be made to apply generally, and if the government will go beyond the resolution when considering the question, and do justice to the conditions and claims of all classes of day labour in its employ, it will take a course that will gain for it the support of all the friends of labour in this country.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). I wish to say a few words to express my sympathy with this resolution. It is one which I thoroughly endorse. I notice that it is directed particularly to the Minister of Railways and Canals, who is not in his place tonight, but I hope that its approval by this House will have the effect of causing him to put it into effect without delay. I would myself have preferred a resolution in more general terms; I would have preferred that the minimum of $1.50 per day should have been made applicable to all classes of labour in the service of the government and not merely to those in its railway service, and in urging that this minimum be fixed, I do not think it is necessary to make any special argument with regard to special training or skill or anything of the kind. It should only be necessary to mention that the work is required to be done and that men have to be employed to do it. I do not think it is right that this government should hire men at any rate of wages which prevents their entering married life. The government should pay wages sufficient to enable every one employed by it to support a family and not a wage that compels him to remain single. We have on the Intercolonial Railway about 700 trackmen employed, and the

fact that they are not paid a sufficient wage has had a considerably wider effect than many people in the east may suppose. There are now about 12,000 trackmen employed on all the railways, exclusive of the government road, and I believe that the wages of these men have been kept down during the past few years just because of the low price paid by the government. Other railway companies have pointed to the fact that the people's own employees were getting even less than these companies were paying. This argument was specially used in their strike last year. At present the question of wages on the Canadian Pacific Railway, affecting 6,000 or 8,000 men, is a matter for arbitration, and I believe that if the Minister of Railways would act on this resolution at once and grant the increase asked for, that would have an immediate effect on all other railway companies. I would rather this resolution were drawn in broader terms, because I notice there is a Bill before the House affecting the wages in the Post Office Department. Should that Bill become law the lowest rate paid in that department would be $1.25 per day, and I am totally opposed to this government admitting at all that any man, who is required to give his whole time to the government service, should receive as low as $1.25 per day, because under that rate no man is in a position to support a family.

Mr. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). I would like to ask the attention of the House for a few moments while I make reference to the position of the railway freight checkers and freight handlers. I fully endorse what has been said with respect to the sectionmen on the track of our government railways, but the freight handlers and freight checkers are obliged to work usually from thirteen to fifteen hours per day, and receive only $1.20, though their work is of a nature that requires some considerable education. I believe that there is a condition inserted in government contracts for public works, which requires the contractor not to pay a less wage than $1.25 per day, and it seems very inconsistent that this government, which insists on such a condition, should pay its own labourers only $1.20 per day.

Mr. TAYLOR. In these growing times?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, in these progressive, prosperous days. I am sure that the Railway Department is entitled to great credit for what it has already done in this direction. Only a few years ago, previous to 1896, 90 cents and 99 cents per day were paid. The Minister of Railways increased their wages gradually, until now they have reached $1.20, and certainly the time has come when we should pay them a larger per diem allowance. In the railway department at Moncton, there have been a great many increases within the last few years. In the railway offices the wages of the clerks have been very properly increased. They were formerly living upon the most meagre allowance, starvation salaries, but gradually these have been increased. In the workshops at Moncton a system had grown up which worked great inequality in wages paid the mechanics. It was suggested that a commission should be appointed to classify the work, and that a certain wage should be fixed for each particular class of work. It seems to me that that would have been a proper course to pursue, but the Minister of Railways took a different course and instructed his officials to make schedules. Under the old system three or four men would be working at the same bench, each of whom would require the same skill and qualifications. One man, probably, would be getting 15 cents an hour, another 19 cents, another 22 cents—all the result of accident. This was the outcome of the so-called system which has prevailed upon the Intercolonial Railway since it was a railway. The man who was receiving a relatively high wage received it simply because he happened to be more fortunate than his neighbour. Perhaps he had a little more influence, and had been able to secure attention to his claim, while his neighbour had not been so fortunate. There has been a readjustment, and these inequalities have been measurably removed. The men who are working at the same class of work get now the same wage—at least, to a degree that condition exists. It seems to me that a more perfect system could have been inaugurated by a more perfect classification of the work, and scheduling it as to the wages paid, so that there would be no possibility of any political or other influence being exercised in favour of this man or that man, but every one employed on the road would be classified, and would receive the wage belonging to his classification. I heartily endorse what has been stated by the mover and seconder of this resolution, and would urge that this matter should receive the urgent and prompt attention of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. DONALD A. MACKINNON (East Queen's). I have listened carefully to the speeches made by those who support this resolution, but I must say that I do not agree with them. It seems to me that a matter like this should be left with the Minister of Railways and his department. The work of the Intercolonial may sometimes call for the services of some labouring men who are not worth $1.50 a day.

Mr. LOGAN. Then, they should not be there.

Mr. MACKINNON. They may be required for purposes which should not be paid for at that rate. It depends on the labour, and

it depends on the man. Some men are young, some are old; some are able to earn $1.50 a day and some are not. To my mind this is not a matter for parliament to regulate. The effect of passing this resolution would be to give both those who are worthy and those who are not worthy this wage of $1.50 a day. To say that they should not be employed unless they can earn that amount would be to exclude from the service of the railway this class of labour.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). But this applies to the trackmen.

Mr. MACKINNON. I contend that it is a wrong principle to pass a resolution of this kind, and it seems to me to yield too much to pressure from outside. It would not be fair to those whom we charge with the duty of managing this road. Here is a department in charge of the Minister of Railways, who is fit to direct that department; and he has under him managers who are fit for the work they have to do. To take the matter of wages out of their hands, as you will do if you pass this resolution, is to do something unworthy of parliament.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). This only fixes a minimum.

Mr. MACKINNON. Fixing a minimum or maximum is no part of the duty of parliament. That should be left to the officers of the road. Parliament must not forget other labourers not in government employ who have to contribute towards increased wages. I have every confidence that this question will be fairly dealt with by the Minister of Railways.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. He talks of a certain class of labour on the road. But this resolution has reference to the trackman. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he knows what the duties of a trackman are ? If he does he must know that these duties are very onerous and exacting. If a man is not fit for such duties he could not be employed as trackman.

Mr. MACKINNON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston, Cape Breton) will read the whole resolution, he will see that it refers not only to trackmen but to 'other labourers' as well.

Mr. ARTHUR S. KENDALL (Cape Breton). I lay it down as a general proposition that no business should exist in this country unless it can stand on its own bottom. I know that many hon. members of this House will dissent from that proposition. But I make this second proposition, which I do not think many will dissent from when they go before the electors—that no business should exist in any civilized country unless it is able to pay its employees sufficient remuneration to keep them and their families according to the requirements of civilization. I believe that the people of Canada will support that proposition, particularly with relation to the government, and will hold that the government should not engage in any business, unless it can provide for its employees a sufficient wage to maintain them and their families according to the requirements of civilization. I think the country will believe this also—that where the country itself is a great employer of labour, the government that acts on behalf of the country will be expected to be a model employer. Hon. members may recollect that last session I asked the government, during the recess then to follow, to collect information from other countries—New Zealand, Switzerland, Great Britain and others—with regard to the working out of measures which had for their object the betterment of the conditions of labour, particularly along four lines : (1.) A standard minimum wage; (2.) shorter hours of labour; (3.) compensation for injuries and death; (4.) old age pensions We have had mention here of the late Henry A. Harper, who was employd in the Labour Department. Before his untimely death, he collected a large amount of information on these subjects, which has been put in my hand. I am glad to see that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) has dealt with one of these questions, and has brought this resolution before this House. I have given notice of another motion, which, if time permits, I shall refer to later on. Coming back to the question immediately before us—in many of the towns on the Intercolonial Railway, Montreal, Quebec, Moncton, St. John, Amherst, Halifax, New Glasgow, Sydney and others, every one knows that the miserable wage of $1.20 or $1.25 a day must keep the men employed on the road and their families almost in a state of beggary. I say again that the people of this country do not wish the government to engage in a business in which they cannot provide for their employees and their families at least sufficient shelter, clothing, food and fuel. Not very long ago, I pointed out where the government railway of this country was losing a huge sum of money every year, which money it might save by getting its coal at fair prices instead of at exorbitant prices as it is doing to-day. I heartily endorse the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland, and I believe the people of Canada, when the question is properly put before them, will endorse it also.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). The grievance complained of by our friends in Nova Scotia exists on the Intercolonial Railway in the province of Quebec, and I have had occasion many times to bring the matter to the attention of the Railway Department but, like my hon. colleague without success. The principle which has been enunciated here this evening that the fixing of the wages of these men should be left to the officials of the railway, is a

wrong one. This parliament fixes the wages and salaries of all its employees in the Dominion of Canada, and I fail to see why the same generosity should not be extended to the poor men. We have been told that the salaries and wages of all the officials of the Intercolonial Railway have been increased. The country will be surprised to learn that the workmen, the trackmen, the labouring men, have been omitted from the benefits which have been extended to the other employees of that road. We all know the difficulties and hardships to which the trackmen are exposed, especially in this country where the winters are so long, and where they have to work for ten or twelve hours in a day, sometimes fourteen hours. If there is any class of men who should be well paid it is those who are charged with supervising the line and keeping the track in order. We travel over Canadian railways every day without realizing to how great an extent our safety, and our lives even, and the lives of those who are dear to us, are dependent upon the vigilance of the men who are looking after the track. I hope the Minister of Railways and Canals will extend the generosity of the government and of the country to the poorer classes of our employees. We are now in a growing and prosperous time, Canada is boasting of its surplus, and while we, the representatives of the people, are dispensing millions and millions of public money, let it not be said that we ask the poor man in our service to bring up a family of six, seven, eight, nine, ten children, as is often the case in the province of Quebec, upon the miserable pittance $1.20 a day.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I think while the House is in this generous mood we should extend our sympathies to another class of employees who are at least as much entitled to the consideration of the government as those already mentioned, I refer to the stampers, sorters and letter carriers employed in the Post Office Department. There are many of them in the city of Montreal, and they receive a very inadequate salary, much less than $1.50 a day. Stampers and sorters are just as much entitled to consideration as the humblest employees of the Intercolonial Railway and some of them are obliged to support families on a salary of less than $400. I therefore move to amend the resolution by adding after the word 'railway' in the motion :

As well as all men employed on the public canals of Canada, and all stampers and sorters, as well as letter carriers in the public service of Canada.

This is to meet the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Montreal. Many of those employees on the canals are found in my division, and they are as much entitled to receive $1.50 a day as those already mentioned.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure).

Mr. FLINT. I would suggest that the amendment should include employees on all the public works of Canada, in that shape I would vote for it.

Mr. MONK. I did not think that was necessary, because I had confidence that the Minister of Public Works would do justice to his own employees.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). I wish to say a word in regard to the salary of the public employees. I have read the list of the employees of the government and have noticed the salaries they are getting, and I do not know whether I am mistaken or whether they are mistaken themselves, but I have failed to hear of any case where they found fault for receiving too much. At the same time I have heard a great many complain that they were not receiving enough. This much I do know, that the salaries of public employees are not equitably divided. I know men who are working in the city of Ottawa here for $1.50 or $1.60 a day, strong, able and healthy men. I know other men who are getting $1,800 a year, $2,000, $2,600 and $2,800. I have felt disposed to ask some of those men whether, if they were dismissed from the public service, they would be compelled to beg their living, because some of them are hardly able to walk. If you look up their ages in the Civil Service List you will find that some of them are 73 years old. Some of these men get $2,800 a year for working four or five hours a day. That I know to be a fact. I quite agree with what has been said with respect to the wages of men employed on the government railways. A man working on the railway does the hardest kind of work ; he is exposed to heat and cold, to snow and rain. And yet these men are only paid $1.15, $1.20 or $1.25 a day. In many cases they have to beg their way into the service on the railway, and unless they have friends of influence they cannot even get appointed. Now, why should some men work ten and twelve hours a day for $1.15 or $1.25, while other men who can hardly walk get $2,800 a year ? But feeble as they are, they manage to get to their offices, because they have been coming for the last forty years. For my part I desire to see employees of the government treated more equally.

Mr. GALLERY. I have been informed that in some departments there are ladies employed getting $1,500 and $2,000 a year. It seems to me very strange that they should be getting such high salaries, when poor labouring men are only getting from one dollar to one dollar and twenty-five cents a day. In the city of Montreal, for instance, men employed in scraping the streets get $1.50 a day. Men who are employed on the canals in all sorts of weather, rain or shine, are deserving at least of $1.50 a day; if not they should not be there at all. I would

remind the House that these men who work in the canals are only employed seven months in the year, so that hon. gentlemen will see that the wages on which they have to support their families for the whole year is very small indeed. I hope the minister will increase the wages of the canal employees at once.

Mr. D. FARQUHARSON (West Queen's, P.E.I.) This is a question in which I take a good deal of interest. A good many men employed on the government railway in Prince Edward Island are not, in my opinion, sufficiently paid. It is a big question, however. The civil service list is an immense list to rearrange and readjust as it should be, and in my opinion it would be a big contract to undertake. The hon. gentleman who just resumed his seat and the previous speaker as well, in my opinion, touched a chord with which I sympathise deeply and that is that while some are getting too much others are getting too little. The remedy is perhaps far to seek. From what I have observed since I came to Ottawa and from what I had previously known, I would have thought that there would be many offices where there were too many men employed. I am satisfied that as a rule a great many men are receiving high salaries who do not do very much for them. But we must not complain too much. We find the world over that the men who work the least are paid the most. While that is the rule, I think the discrepancy is too great in this country as it is in any other country. Why should one man sit behind a counter in an office and get $2,000 or $3,000 a year while another man gets $300 or $400 a year under almost similar conditions ? I do not think that is right. I am perhaps too democratic in this respect, but my sympathies run in that direction. Let there be a commission appointed to investigate and make such a rearrangement as will give every man what he deserves, I sympathise with the poor man. He gets too little return for his labour. He has to pay out all he earns to support his family, with nothing for the future, and this is the man whose family is often large. I think we should look into this question, and endeavour to do what is fair to the men employed in this government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have been very nearly six years in the Department of Public Works, I am paying salaries that seem to be high, and I am paying salaries that are not always high. Now, I am free to say that perhaps we do not pay enough to our employees. It is a peculiar statement, but any business man who handles large business will agree with me that you cannot pay too much to a good employee. If you give $2,000 or $3,000 to a man who has only moderate ability and give $10,000, or $15,000 to a man who has superior ability, the man whom you pay $10,000, or $15,000 will be cheaper than the man to whom you pay $2,000 or $3,000. Look at the large corporations, look at the great railway corporations; I venture to say that in the Canadian Pacific Railway offices in Montreal there are about ten employees who get over $20,000 a year each. These are very large salaries; still, the men who are at the head of the Canadian Pacific Railway and at the head of the Grand Trunk Railway are men who earn them. They would not pay these high salaries unless they were earned. I believe it would pay this country better if we would make up our minds to get the best possible labour that money can secure. I do not hesitate to say that here. I have increased the salaries in my department. I feel that I am employing a number of men, who, if they were outside of the Public Works, if they had not started life in the public service, would be able to earn $10,000 and perhaps $15,000 in a large city. Take Montreal or Toronto; it is easy to see architects in Montreal who earn $10,000 or $15,000, and engineers who earn $10,000 or $15,000 a year. These men are in the public service to-day and they are very able employees indeed. We cannot all earn the same salaries as we cannot all of us be members of parliament. It is out of the question to believe that every person can earn the same salary. Our hon. friends who have stated that employees are not paid enough who get $1.50 a day must not forget one thing; I believe I am not wrong in saying that the ordinary labouring man in Montreal or Toronto does not earn, averaging the year, more than $400. The man who gets into the public service is, as a rule, sure of being employed every day of the year and I can assure my hon. friends that ministers of the Crown have no trouble at all in finding people at the rate of salaries paid now. I have no trouble whatever. The trouble is that I cannot employ all the men who are anxious to sacrifice themselves on the altar of their country at these low salaries. They are employed every day. Railway employees, I fully grant, have perhaps harder labour, but all the same, they are very glad to work at such employment. I am receiving letters every day in the week by dozens and hundreds from people who are anxious to go into the public service even on a railway and at the low salaries that are paid now. At the same time I grant that some of the salaries are not high enough, but I take this opportunity of saying that if we have good employees we should not hesitate to pay them. We are not paying enough to-day to some of our high officials.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The reason the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is troubled with too many applications is because he is generous to his workmen. He pays them according to their value and therefore he gets the best class of people to work for him. My idea is

that you will only get labour out of a man according to the wages you pay him, and that if you increase the wages of a man you will get more work than you would get out of a man you employed at a low rate of wages. I think also that if the wages of the men on the Intercolonial Railway were raised to a proper amount you might perhaps reduce the number of men that would be employed, and you would find that four men properly paid would do the work that six men are employed now to do. I think that people should be paid according to their value and that it would also be desirable that none should be employed on public works except men who are qualified to do the best work at a fair rate of wages.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say, in regard to the observations of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) that while it is quite true that you may be able to get men at small wages; still, you must bear in mind that there are men in the country who, being under the necessity of supporting their families, will accept a wage which they think inadequate, and therefore, it is not perhaps quite fair to put it in the light in which the hon. Minister of Public Works is inclined to put it. I do not know that the resolution is very happily worded. It says :

> That considering the general prosperity of Canada the minimum wage to be paid trackmen and other labourers on the government system of railways should be at least $1.50 per day.

I would certainly think that whether Canada was prosperous or not the labouring man was entitled to have a fair living wage. There is no doubt that the cost of living has advanced very largely during the past five or six years. That is a circumstance which ought fairly be taken into consideration in dealing with the wages of workmen not only on the Intercolonial Railway, but in all the departments of the public service, including the Post Office Department and Public Works Department. It is true that the men who work on the Intercolonial Railway, the trackmen particularly, have a very responsible position indeed, and lead a very arduous life. That is a consideration which demands the attention of the House, or rather the attention of the Department of Railways and Canals in dealing with so important a subject. It seems a little strange that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan) did not have something of this kind in his mind when he was so ready in the past to vote for transactions such as the acquisition of the Drummond County Railway and the bargain that was made with the Grand Trunk Railway. We know that a very large price—very much more than the cost of that railway—was paid for it, and that a bargain which I think was not very much in the interest of the country was made with the Grand Trunk Railway. Now, we have a deficit on the Intercolonial Railway; possibly to some extent as the result of that. The deficit on that railway it is true may not be due wholly to these circumstances, and it is without doubt due to the fact that the Intercolonial Railway is not administered on the same business principles which characterize the administration of railways owned by great corporations in this country and in the United States. If supplies for the Intercolonial Railway were purchased in the same way as they are made by other railway corporations there would be no deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, and these labourers might be paid the wage which is demanded by this resolution without a single dollar of additional burden on the taxpayers of this country. It would, therefore, be well for my hon. friend from Cumberland and for other gentleman like him who profess to be so solicitous on this subject, to take matters of that kind into consideration so that we may not have this very large deficit on the Intercolonial Railway to be put forward—as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) states it is—by the Minister of Railways as a ground for refusing to these men the wage which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House think is fairly their due. Another consideration which might well attract the attention of the House, is the absence from this debate of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) as well as the absence of the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Mulock). Where is the Minister of Labour to-night, who is so solicitous about fixing a fair wage in contracts made with the government of this country ? Why has not my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) employed the services of the Minister of Labour to induce the Minister of Railways to do justice to these labourers ?

Mr. LOGAN. I know that the leader of the opposition would not make these remarks if he knew that the Minister of Labour has been quite ill and has been confined to his house for the past week.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I regret very much the illness of the minister, which I was not aware of, but my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) had ample opportunity this session to bring up this matter when the Minister of Labour was able to be present and in the House.

Mr. LOGAN. I never had an opportunity of bringing it up when the Minister of Labour was in the House. I never had an opportunity until this time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That seems to indicate that the Minister of Labour has not been in the House very often during this session, because this motion has been standing on the Order Paper for the last five or six weeks. Whether or not that be the case, why has not the hon. gentleman

sought the intervention of the Minister of Labour in this connection. That hon. minister prides himself very much it is said; takes very much credit to himself, I know, for the fact that he has established a fair rate of wages in respect to contracts which are granted by the government. Why have not the services of that hon. gentleman been employed with the Minister of Railways? This government takes so much pains with contracts of this kind, that it publishes its announcements in respect to them in the 'Labour Gazette,' yet it is not able to deal effectively, according to my hon. friend from Cumberland, with a subject which has so much importance for a great many people in this country as that which he has brought to the attention of the House to-night. The principle of the resolution which my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) has moved is a commendable one. I do not know myself as to the exact figure, but I do believe that having regard to the increased cost of living in this country, it is only right and proper that the wages of these men should be taken into consideration and such an increase made as the existing conditions demand.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I have a few observations to offer on the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Logan). Let me say that it meets with my entire approval. In my constituency there are quite a number of men who are employed on the Intercolonial Railway, and my colleague (Mr. Kendall) and I have brought this matter to the attention of the Railway Department with a view of having their wages increased. The freight handlers and the trackmen particularly are in my judgment receiving insufficient pay. I endorse all that has been said to that effect. Let me say in reply to the leader of the opposition, that while the state of affairs at present on the Intercolonial Railway is not satisfactory to myself or to many hon. members of this House, yet the existing state of affairs on the Intercolonial Railway is very much better than that which prevailed when the Conservatives were managing that railway. I remember very well that when the Intercolonial Railway was being constructed in Cape Breton under the late government, the men were very glad to get 95 cents per day, and the then government never made any effort to secure for them an increase in that miserable rate of pay. While the pay these men receive at the present time is not sufficient to enable them to live as they ought to live, yet we have the consolation to know that it is better than the pay they received when the late government was in power. I shall not discuss to-night with the leader of the opposition the question of the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. He need not be reminded; the House need not be reminded, and the country need not be reminded, that we had more deficits on the Intercolonial Railway previous to 1896 than since that time. We have had fewer deficits since 1896 than we had before, notwithstanding the fact that wages on the Intercolonial Railway are now much higher than they were before. I rose simply for the purpose of giving my approval to the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Logan), which I hope the government will entertain.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has alluded to the fact that the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Postmaster General are not present on this occasion. It is very much to be regretted, I agree with him; but my hon. friend will agree with me also that members of parliament are sometimes absent from parliament for other duties, or for other reasons, good or bad. If the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Postmaster General are not here, they cannot be accused of being absent from any neglect of their duties. They have not been dining or banqueting at other cities. It so happens that they are absent for very cogent reasons which we all deplore. It is well known that the Minister of Railways and Canals has not been in good health this session, and the Postmaster General is laid up with a severe attack which I am sorry to say may prevent his attendance at the House for some time to come. But I hope to relieve the apprehension of the leader of the opposition in regard to this matter. The Postmaster General did not expect that the subject of the wages paid to the packers and sorters would come up for discussion to-day, for the reason that he has a Bill on the Order paper on that very subject to which the amendment of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) would be more germane than it is to this motion. As to the salaries of the men who are the subject of the present motion, the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway, I am happy to say to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and happy also to inform my hon. friend (Mr. Logan) who has moved the motion, that this very question is at this moment engaging the attention of the government. Less than ten days ago a delegation of the Association of Trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway had an interview with the government in which they asked not for such a substantial increase in their wages as the motion proposes, but that the government would hear them and discuss with them the question of an increase in their wages. They made a very fair suggestion, but upon it being represented to them that at this time the minister was too busy to give the matter the attention which it deserved, but that he would discuss it with them after the session, they have agreed to defer it until then, when an interview will take place between them and the Department of Railways and Canals

on the subject. Under such circumstances, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that his motion might very well be withdrawn, because he will be glad to know, I am sure, that the step which has been taken is satisfactory to the trackmen themselves. With regard to the salaries paid to the men employed on the Intercolonial Railway, I am sure that my hon. friend the mover of this motion and all those who have supported it will admit that the present government have not done badly at all with their employees. All the salaries have been increased since 1896. Even the trackmen, who form the subject of this motion, received an increase two or three years ago. They receive now $1.20 a day. It is not a very large wage, I admit, and there seems to be a general consensus of opinion that it should be increased. The discussion that has taken place here will no doubt serve a good purpose when the time comes for the discussion of the matter between the men and the Minister of Railways and Canals. The minister will be very much assisted by the discussion that has taken place to-day and the general expression of opinion that has been conveyed from all sides of the House that the men who give their time and services to the country ought to receive adequate compensation. My hon. friend who has moved this motion has sought to make a comparison between the salaries paid on the Canadian Pacific Railway and those paid on the Intercolonial Railway. He has stated, and stated truly, that the wages paid on the Canadian Pacific Railway are somewhat higher than the present wages paid on the Intercolonial Railway. I do not know, however, that this is an argument, and I do not chose to discuss the subject on that basis at all. It is very difficult if not impossible, to lay down a uniform rate of wages to be paid to trackmen. It must depend very largely on the locality. There are sections of the country where $1.20 represents much more than it does in cities like Montreal and Ottawa. The men understand that themselves, and are prepared to discuss this view with the government in the conference that is to take place between them, and the administration a few days hence. I hope therefore upon the assurance I have given that the matter will be considered and adjusted, that my hon. friend from Cumberland will agree to withdraw his motion, and I hope my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier will do the same with his amendment.

Mr. LOGAN. As the Premier states that he is at the present time in negotiation with the Trackmen's Association, of course I do not desire to do anything that is going to injure the chances of the men to have this matter thoroughly discussed, and their wages increased all along the line if possible. I trust the negotiations which are going on at the present time between the Trackmen's Association and the government will lead to the conclusion that the Intercolonial Railway trackmen should be paid the rate of wages which I have suggested in this motion. The rate of $1.50 a day is not proposed as a hard and fast wage to be paid all over the system of railways; but it is proposed as the minimum wage to be paid to workingmen. I base my case on the simple ground that any man who is fit to be a trackman of the Intercolonial Railway or fit to be a handler of freight, or to be entrusted with hundreds of thousands of dollars of the property of Canada, who is not worth $1.50 a day, should not be on the Intercolonial Railway or any other railway in Canada. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island has said that there are men who are worth one dollar per day while others are worth $1.50, but the question I am discussing now is the fixing of a minimum rate, and I am afraid that my hon. friend does not quite understand the responsibilities of the trackmen upon great systems of railways. Before a man can be a trackman, he must , in the first place, go on the road as a sort of apprentice.

An hon. MEMBER. I wish they were paid $5 instead.

Mr. LOGAN. As I have already stated, I brought this matter, during four or five years, before the railway department and before the general manager, and as a last resort, I have brought it up in this House. A man has to be an apprentice for several months, and then, if found competent by the trackmaster, he is given a permanent position on the Intercolonial Railway and takes all the responsibility of the work. He has to keep that road in good condition, and is liable to be called out at any time, at any hour of the night or day, even on Sundays. He must be there on all occasions to protect the track and has to work nine and ten and sometimes twelve hours a day. The greater the storms in winter and the hotter the sun in summer, the harder he has to work, and yet we only pay him the miserable sum of $1.20 per day. The hon. leader of the opposition has tried to draw a red herring across the track by seeking to cast reflections on the Minister of Labour and the work of the Labour Department. But that hon. gentleman dare not stand up here and move that the Labour Bureau, established by the Postmaster General be abolished. He knows just as well as I do, that the establishment of that department was a step in the right direction. He knows well that the Minister of Labour has done more for the labouring men of Canada than all the Cabinet Ministers of the Conservative administration were able to do from 1867 down to the advent of the present government. He is perfectly well aware that in the old days, when government work was done down in Nova Scotia, navvies and dagoes were brought in to work for a pittance of

from 60 to 75 cents per day, and our own labouring men had to walk the streets or accept the miserable wages in competition with foreigners. But to-day these workingmen have to be paid the current wages of the locality, and consequently the workingmen men of Canada are given the preference, and these workingmen appreciate what has been done for them by this government. Instead of hon. gentlemen carping and complaining, it seems to me that they ought to support the Minister of Railways in doing more for labouring men than was done for them in the past, by increasing their wages and enabling them to have more home comforts than they formerly enjoyed. I regret that the minister is not here, but I know that his ill health prevents him from attending our evening sessions, but I trust that the negotiations betwen the trackmen and the Minister of Railways and the First Minister and other members of the government will result in an increase of their wages. The hon. Minister of Public Works deserves great credit for the manner in which he treats the labouring men who are working under him. I have no fault to find with him, and I believe that when the trackmen's case is placed before the Minister of Railways by the Trackmen's Association, and he is fully seized of the labours and responsibilities of these men, both of which are increased in these days by the faster and heavier trains employed, he will, with that sense of fairness he has shown the other employees on the Intercolonial, increase their wages by fixing a minimum of at least $1.50 per day.

If I can have the consent of the seconder of my motion, I would be disposed to accept the assurances of the First Minister that the case of these men, whose claims I am urging, will receive very consideration.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). If the mover of this resolution will get no more satisfaction out of it for the class of men whose claims he is advocating than the letter carriers obtained out of the promise of the First Minister in their case, I am afraid that he will find that he has taken up the time of this House in vain. A year ago, when I had the pleasure of attending a deputation of the letter carriers who waited on the government, we were told by the ministers then present that their grievances would be considered and justice done to them, but from that day to this nothing has been accomplished, and I am very much afraid that the same result will follow this resolution which the First Minister has asked to be withdrawn.

Mr. MONK. I regret very much that it is impossible for me to withdraw the amendment. I think that this is the right time to take the sense of the House upon this important question. I quite agree with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) that the pay of $1.50 a day is quite inadequate, and even if he were disposed to withdraw his resolution, I certainly do not feel warranted in withdrawing the amendment. Whatever doubt there may exist, as the hon. member for Prince Edward Island has said, as to whether some men may be really worth more than $1 a day or not, there can be no doubt that the men employed on the Lachine canal are worth more than that sum, and as regards the employees of the post office in the cities of Montreal and Toronto, and in every city where there is a street delivery, the wages paid the letter carriers are a subject of scandal throughout the country. If I were to consent to the withdrawal of the amendment, which brings those two classes under the consideration of the House, I would be doing something which it would be very difficult to explain. We are not enacting a law, we are merely expressing an opinion, and if the government are going to consider the question of wages on the Intercolonial Railway, and if the Postmaster General has a Bill dealing with the question of the letter carriers, stampers, and sorters in Montreal and Toronto, it is well that the House should be now given the opportunity of expressing its views as to the course of conduct which we think ought to guide the government in the consideration of these questions.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I entirely dissent from the view expressed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that this is the proper moment in which to deal with the question. The resolution and the amendment before the House present two classes of workingmen as deserving of special consideration—those employed on the government railways and those employed in the post office. The First Minister has called attention to the fact that the claims of both these classes are engaging the attention of the government, and that one of them is to be dealt with by a Bill which will be laid before the House by the Postmaster General. Therefore the House will still have ample opportunity of dealing with the claims of the letter carriers in a most effective way when the Bill is submitted to us. There is therefore no need for the House to pass an opinion with regard to the wages of the post office officials. As to the other class, the First Minister has said that an arrangement has been made for a conference to be held at the close of the session between the representatives of these men and the Minister of Railways. My sympathies go out entirely to the workingmen, after the statements that have been made to-night. I do not say that it would be wise to lay down a universal rule. The resolution does not confine itself to the trackmen, but goes further and says that all other labourers shall receive not less than $1.50 a day.

That is open to some discussion. As a general rule, I would say that able-bodied men doing any intelligent work in Canada should be able to earn $1.50 a day. But let us not conceal from ourselves the fact that many workingmen receive less in private life. I know that there are among our government officials persons who are earning less money, and nobody seems particularly concerned about them. Some are messengers, whose work requires that they shall be very intelligent men, do not receive $1.50 a day. When you consider that the labourer who receives $1.50 a day only works for a portion of his time, you see that he is not so well paid on the whole as others who may get a less rate per day, but who have the advantage of steady employment, as is the case with the men employed in the government service. I am resisting this motion, not for any lack of sympathy for the men concerned, because my sympathies go out entirely to them. I have no doubt that the discussion this evening will have the useful purpose of assisting the ministers concerned in fixing a rate of wages which will be more satisfactory than that of the past. But I believe it is not wise that the House should commit itself in this hasty way in these matters, when they are engaging the attention of the ministers who have the management of these particular branches of the public service. I think we would be unwise to proceed to a division on this motion. I move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). In view of the statement made by the Prime Minister, I am willing, as seconder of the motion, that it should be withdrawn.

House divided on amendment (Hon. Mr. Fielding).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Bazinet,	Lavergne,
Béland.	Legris,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Macdonald,
Bourbonnais,	Mackie,
Brown,	MacKinnon,
Bureau,	MacLaren (Huntingdon)
Calvert,	McCreary,
Campbell,	McGugan,
Carbonneau,	McIsaac,
Carroll,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Malouin,
Delisle,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Demers (St. John),	Matheson,
Dugas,	Monet,
Emmerson,	Paterson,
Farquharson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fielding,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Flint,	Russell,
Fortier,	Scott,
Geoffrion,	Sifton,
Girard,	Stewart,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tarte,
Kendall,	Tobin,
Lang,	Tucker,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon.—54.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Léonard,
Blain,	Monk,
Borden (Halifax),	Morin,
Boyd,	Osler,
Calvin,	Puttee,
Earle,	Richardson,
Fowler,	Roche (Marquette),
Gallery,	Taylor,
Kaulbach,	Tolton,
Kidd,	Vrooman.—23.
Lancaster,	

Amendment agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Copies of all tenders received by the Post Office Department in June, 1901, for carrying mail between Hamilton and Guelph.—Mr. Smith (Wentworth) by Mr. Taylor.

Copy of the petition sent to the government asking for the dismissal of Mr. H. Therein, postmaster at Grandes Piles, in the province of Quebec; and copies of all correspondence between the government and all persons interested in the subject of such dismissal.—Mr. Ball, by Mr. Taylor.

Return showing names of parties who took part in the battle of the 'Windmill,' near Prescott, Ontario, and who have since received pensions ; and for what reasons. Also, the names of those who are at present receiving pensions on account of said battle.—Mr. Reid (Grenville), by Mr. Taylor.

Copies of the petitions from the electors of the counties of St. John, of Iberville, and of Missisquoi, during the year 1901, objecting to the construction of a new dam at the foot of Ste. Therese Island, in the Richelieu River ; copies of the Chambly Manufacturing Company's petition and plans ; copies of the engineers' reports and of the Order in Council, dated the 30th January, 1902.—Mr. Demers (St. John and Iberville).

Return showing the number of locomotives, coaches and cars of the several kinds on the stock list of the Intercolonial Railway, and the Prince Edward Island Railway, respectively, the designating number of each, the date when it was first received into service, its present condition, whether it is now in active service, and if not, the date on which it was last in service. —Mr. Barker.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 12.55 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 29, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 144) to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 127) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.—Mr. McCarthy.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOUR DISPUTES.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 146) for the settlement of railway labour disputes. He said: The object of this Bill is to prevent lockouts and strikes upon railways by providing a more satisfactory way than those violent measures afford for the settlement of such disputes, and of differences as from time to time arise between railway companies and their employees. Although this is hardly the occasion for any lengthened observations, still as the measure is somewhat novel, perhaps a few words now would not be out of place. I would say that the proposition is in fact one for compulsory arbitration between railway companies and their employees in regard to the various subjects of controversy that from time to time arise between those parties. The measure is confined entirely to the railway world, it does not deal with any other than railway industries, and therefore it is not a precedent for the treatment of disputes between other classes. Railway companies, it is to be remembered, occupy a unique position. Whilst strikes and lockouts upon railways affect the companies and their employees, there is a third interest to be considered, the public interest, perhaps the greatest of all, and that paramount interest appears to give jurisdiction on this occasion for the House to adopt what is apparently an extreme means in order to ward off the evil consequences flowing from railway strikes and lockouts. It is unnecessary to point out what those consequences are, they are apparent to all. When a strike takes place upon a railway the road falls into disrepair, the traffic is less safe, the travelling public and the train hands alike suffer and run greater risks. Delays in transportation of goods are more frequent, and at times the strike culminates in a cessation of the operations of the railway.

Railways are the creatures of parliament, they are created in the public interest, and for that reason they are given rights paramount to those of the individual. They are created to serve the public, in the first place, and it is the duty of the people's representatives to see that the object of parliament in granting charters is not defeated, either by the company or by their employees. Last winter there was a wheat blockade in the North-west Territories. We are told that, partial as was the interruption of the railway on that occasion, it caused a very considerable public loss. What would have been the consequences to Canada, if the Canadian Pacific Railway, instead of a partial failure of service on that occasion, had been unable to turn a wheel for a week? It would have wrought, doubtless, widespread disaster to our country, yet such a contingency is always possible so long as there is no satisfactory tribunal for promoting friendly relations between companies and their men, and settling the labour disputes that are always arising between railway companies and their employees. Sooner or later strikes and lockouts lead to arbitration. Why not sooner rather than later? This measure proposes to substitute the provisions of this Bill, when it becomes an Act, for the present procedure of a strike or a lockout. The measure provides for the establishment of a tribunal equipped with ample powers for the settlement of all these questions. It is proposed to apply its provisions not merely to railways operating under Dominion, but also to those operating under provincial charters, and it will also be made applicable to the Intercolonial Railway and to any railways owned by provinces, with the consent of the governments of those provinces. It will apply to a railway operated by steam, electricity or any other motor power. The range of subjects that may be referred is only limited by the variety of the subjects of dispute arising between railway companies and their employees. The measure declares that strikes and lockouts shall be illegal, and it provides penalties for the contravention of these provisions. For the settlement of disputes there will be provincial boards of arbitration to deal with these questions if they are of a provincial character, but if they are more far-reaching than provincial, then, they will be dealt with by a Dominion board. The different provincial boards will be equipped with a clerk, who will be the medium of communication between the parties to the controversy and the board, and who will perform the clerical duties proper to his position. Each provincial board will be composed of three arbitrators, one to be chosen by the railway companies of the province, or operating within the province, according to a scale of voting that is provided in the Act, another to be

chosen by the men, and the third arbitrator to be chosen by these two, or failing their making a choice, then by the Governor in Council. For the purposes of this measure the North-west Territories are deemed to be a part of the province of Manitoba, and there being seven provinces, there will be seven local boards. The railway companies will elect one arbitrator to each of these seven boards, the employees will elect another arbitrator to each provincial board, and these two will elect a third, or in default the Governor in Council will appoint the third arbitrator. Thus you will have seven arbitrators representiag the railway companies, seven employees' arbitrators, and seven arbitrators appointed by the government. In the event of the subject of dispute being more than a local one, it will be dealt with by the Dominion board. The Dominion board will consist of five members, two to be chosen out of the seven elected by the railway companies, two out of the seven elected by the employees, and the fifth to be chosen by the four, or failing their making a choice, then, by the Governor in Council. It will be the duty of this board, in the first instance, to be conciliatory and to endeavour to arrange a settlement of all matters in dispute. Failing in their efforts in that direction, the board is clothed with ample powers to proceed as arbitrators and to determine the questions referred to it and make an award. The award of the chairman and one other member of the board, being a provincial board, will be the award of the board. The award of the chairman and two other members, in the case of the Dominion board, will be the award of the board. The award of the board will be current for such time, not exceeding a year, as the award states, with a provision, however, that either party to the dispute may terminate it within a lesser period, but nevertheless, the award, when made, will continue in effect until another award has been made to take its place. It will not be permitted to any of the parties to the dispute to appear by counsel or professional gentlemen before the arbitrators unless by consent of both parties and of the arbitrators themselves. The award itself will not be cognizable in any court, and it shall not be removable to a court by certorari or in any other way for the purpose of amendment or of being quashed. In reference to the mode of election of provincial boards, the following is the proposal: There will be, at Ottawa, an officer, to be called the registrar, whose duty it will be from time to time to prepare the election registers. The duration of a provincial board will be three years, the elections being triennial, unless a vacancy shall occur, in which case there is provision for a by-election. A voters' list will be made up for the railways, and another for the employees, each railway operating within the province, being given as many votes in the election of its arbitrator as it has employees within the province. In regard to the employees, each employee in the province will have one vote. There will be two distant registers, the railways voting as one class and electing their representative on the board, and the men voting as one class and electing their representative on the board. They will vote by voting papers to be transmitted to the registrar, and these papers will be opened on a day named. There is provision for nomination and the usual machinery for the holding of such an election. In the event of a railway company, or other party, refusing to abide by the award, the measure provides penalties, and the last clause declares that these provisions shall apply to the government of Canada in respect to the Intercolonial Railway and to consenting provincial governments in respect to any railways which they may own and operate, and that the award shall be binding on the respective governments.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that the railway company shall have as many votes as they have employees. How will they vote ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is as between the different railway companies, giving them their relative voting power.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, just so. It may appear to be an inartistic method, but if any hon. gentleman can advise any better method, it will be welcome. I may say that it is not the intention of the government to pass this measure this session. It is presented to parliament and to the country now in order that it may receive consideration at the hands of the public, of the railway companies, and of their employees during the recess, and the government will welcome any suggestions calculated to perfect the measure, so that it may more effectually accomplish the object in view, namely, the peaceful settlement of labour disputes without any interruption to the operation of these railways and in a measure satisfactory to the great interests involved—to the interests of the railway companies and of the men.

Mr. A. W. PUTTEE (Winnipeg). As regards the scope of the Bill, do I understand that it will apply to all railways chartered by this parliament; to all railways of a local character; and to electric street railways of a municipal character ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. It will apply to all railways in Canada whether incorporated by the Dominion parliament, or by provincial legislatures, or otherwise; in-

cluding the Dominion government railways and also including any railways owned by provincial governments, should such provincial governments give their consent. It is not felt that we would have the right to make a mandatory order against a provincial government without its consent. The Bill will include tramways, electric railways, and so on.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (East York). I would suggest that the Bill include telegraph companies as well. I throw out that suggestion to the minister.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any legislation in any country in the world similar to this ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS. There is a compulsory arbitration Act in force in New Zealand, and it was adopted by the Commonwealth of Australia.

Mr. INGRAM. I know of the Australian legislation, but is this law similar to that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Ross) refers to the legislation recently passed by the legislature of New South Wales. That was a law dealing with labour questions between man and man, and I believe the last clause of that measure makes it to some extent applicable to government railways. But it is to be borne in mind that both in New Zealand and Australia the railways are owned by the governments, so that the legislation there is scarcely a precedent for us here. I am not aware of any legislation of this precise nature, although there are features of this measure borrowed from the New Zealand measure, and some parts of the machinery are taken from legislation in our own country.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention to have a sufficient number of copies of this Bill printed, so as to enable it to be distributed amongst the various bodies interested?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that the printing is controlled by the Printing Committee, but the government would be only too pleased to see a sufficient number of copies printed to meet all possible requirements. I should have added, that this measure will be in charge of the Minister of Labour, and the Bill gives him power to make rules for the better carrying out of the object in view.

Mr. PUTTEE. If I understood the minister aright, there would be only one board in each province which would deal with matters in every city of that province that has an electric street railway. That I presume will take that class of industry altogether out of the operation of the Conciliation Act. I may say that I consider this Bill to be a very important measure indeed. It seems to me that this is perhaps the most serious attempt along this line of industrial legislation that has ever been introduced into this parliament. I think we can congratulate ourselves, as well as the Minister of Labour, that all interests likely to be affected by this legislation are now in a position to fairly consider the measure; and that there is no antagonism at present between the parties in this country who will come under the scope of this Act. We may congratulate ourselves that there is also in Canada a decided leaning towards the progress of conciliation and arbitration, and that seeing that the Bill is not going to be pressed this session, we may in the meantime have the Bill fully considered by those parties who are interested. In 1900, when the Conciliation Act was introduced, I then was bold enough to say that I did not agree to the principle of voluntary conciliation; that I did not think we were justified in going to the trouble of passing a voluntary Conciliation Act of that kind. I went on record as being absolutely in favour of giving the principle of compulsory arbitration a trial. Since that time I have freely acknowledged that there has been some good accomplished by the Conciliation Act, and for my part, I have always been ready to assist it. I am pleased to say that the Conciliation Act has done some good, but at the same time I have not in any way revised my opinion that is is the most ineffective method we could take to deal with the very numerous cases of labour disturbances of one kind or another, that are bound to occur in this country as well as in other countries. I believe that a proper understanding and a proper application of the principle of compulsory arbitration, will affect a greater number of these cases than can any other system. The weakness of our present Act was apparent last year, when two of the greatest disturbances we have had in the country occurred; one on the Canadian Pacific Railway, extending from coast to coast, and the other in the mines of the mountain country of British Columbia. As a matter of fact, strikes are by no means always traceable to the employees, although that phase of the question is not given much attention. There is more than a suspicion that strikes are some times brought about on account of the needs or interests of the stock market for instance, and this has been charged to be the case in reference to some of the disturbances that have occurred in British Columbia. Our present Conciliation Act cannot even get started to investigate such matters. If I understand aright the proposition that has been put forward this afternoon, as far as the transportation companies are concerned they will mechanically come under the operation of this Bill should it ever become law. The minister has said that it involves the policy of compulsory arbitration. I did not expect that it went

so far as that. I gladly welcome that however, but at the same time that very principle raises the question immediately, of the amount of caution that must be given to the consideration of this law. There must be nothing added to arbitration that will strengthen the fears of those who think that arbitration is only an extension of the method of going forward in the direction of striking a dead level in the matter of men's employment; or, that the law can be used in any way as an utter bar to progress along the lines that organized labour seeks to adhere to. The organization of labour is not now simply based on restlessness. Organization is now gone into on a business basis. Men give up their time and their money to it. They hire others from their own ranks to give their whole time and attention to the advancement of their interests and they expect to reap the benefit of that. They expect through their organization, through everything they can command to coordinate their interests, that they are going to get what every business man expects to get from his business—a return for the effort put forth; and in no way must the impression go out that the operation of this measure is going to bar the legitimate progress which the labour organization seeks for. As a matter of fact, it need not; but at the same time the opponents of the method now adopted by organized labour may seek to spread the impresion that it aims only to maintain the dead level. If this Bill should finally become law, its scope will be wider than I had dared to expect the Minister of Labour would put before parliament, because I was told two years ago that these matters were beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament; but if it shall extend to street railways, the scope of the measure will be sufficiently wide to enable us to see how this principle does operate; and I, for one, hope it will be found so satisfactory that we may then feel warranted in extending the operation of the principle to other industries.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Vancouver). Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for the members of this House to form anything like an intelligent view of the proposition before them, not having seen the Bill. The only acquaintance we have with the principle at all is obtained from the explanation that has been given by the minister this afternoon. If I understand him aright, the great principle of the Bill is to make strikes impossible on railways. That principle of compulsory arbitration is an experiment in this country, one which has never yet been introduced in any degree in the Dominion of Canada—in fact, I may say on the American continent; but the principle of compulsory arbitration for the settlement of labour disputes is a very common principle in New Zealand and other of the Australian colonies, and a very successful principle at that. I think the minister has acted wisely in not seeking to apply such an important experiment to all the industries of the country. I am not certain that even the organized labour men of the country would support the general principle of a national compulsory arbitration. But I think he has acted very wisely in seeking to apply the principle to the operations of railways. A labour dispute on a railway is not like a labour dispute in any other business. We may have, for instance, a strike in a factory, the evils of which are practically confined to the people who live and work in that factory. We may have a strike in a coal mine or in any other kind of mine, the evils of which would be practically confined to the operations of that mine. But in the case of a labour dispute in connection with a railway, we are reminded that the most important factor affected by the outcome of the trouble is the great travelling public. Therefore the minister has acted wisely, when introducing experimental legislation of this kind, in attaching it to that industry which stands not only in greater need, but in absolute need of compulsory arbitration. If the public are to be safeguarded in travelling upon railways, it must be made impossible to have labour disputes on railways. The safety of the public is dependent on a good understanding being maintained between employers and employees on railways, and the only good reason that can be given for the application of the principle of compulsion in the settlement of disputes between the two parties is that there is a greater party than either which is seriously affected by the operation of a strike. And, Sir, all legislation practically, I may be permitted to say, rests on the principle of compulsion. In almost every instance its purpose is to protect the great public against the peculiar and special interests of private individuals or corporations; and I know no case in which the principle of compulsory arbitration can be applied so successfully as in the operation of railways. I think the minister has acted wisely, too, in permitting this Bill to be printed and circulated through the country for the consideration of the people affected by it. I do not think it would be a proper thing to apply an experiment of this kind without affording the parties affected by it an opportunity of looking into the matter and expressing their opinions upon it. In fact, I think that would be a good rule to follow in connection with all measures of vast importance—that they should be submitted for the consideration especially of the parties whose interests are likely to be affected by them. That is particularly desirable in a case of this kind, so that the men on the railways and the companies will have an opportunity of looking into this measure fully, and the members of this House will know by next session exactly what the interested parties think of

it, and will then be in a far better position to deal with it. I believe that if this Bill is circulated throughout the country, it will be demonstrated that the employees on railways almost to a man will endorse the principle of compulsory arbitration. In my experience, in nine cases out of ten, the labour men all over the country are willing to submit their grievances to arbitration. As a matter of fact, the most important incorporated unions on the American continent have provisions in their constitutions seeking to bring about the settlement of disputes by arbitration. The whole difficulty about voluntary arbitration in the past has been the objections which corporations have had to the principle. I contend that this is where the government ought to step in, in the interest of the public. It must be admitted by the members of this House that a serious strike on any railway endangers the life of the great public. We must remember this, too, that a strike in a mine may stop the operation of the mine ; but the only people affected by it are the people directly employed. But a railway must operate. If the employees refuse to work, or if the employers refuse to concede what they think is their proper claim, the railway must operate all the same ; and there is where the necessity exists for provisions whereby serious troubles on railways may be averted. I think the minister has introduced a principle which will be endorsed by the labour men all over this country, and I hope he will take every means of circulating this Bill among the interested parties.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it intended that this Bill shall be brought to a second reading so that there may be a discussion on it, or is it intended simply to print it ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It will be printed of course, and the government will endeavour to give an opportunity for discussion on the second reading ; but it is not intended to press it this session.

Mr. SPROULE. It is intended that a discussion shall take place on the second reading this session

The PRIME MINISTER. I cannot say that the second reading will be taken this sesion.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean, will there de a discusion on it without carrying the second reading ?

The PRIME MINISTER. It is not intended to carry the second reading. We want to have an early prorogration, but if we have the time we will discuss this measure on the second reading.

Mr. CLARKE. It is not intended that we should hear any more about it this session.

The PRIME MINISTER. Perhaps we may, but I cannot say positively.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON—ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE.

The resolution respecting the appointment of an assistant commissioner of the North-west Mounted Police for the Yukon Territory, at $1,600 per annum, (the Prime Minister) read the second time, and agreed to.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 147) to amend the North-west Mounted Police Act of 1894.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IMMIGRATION ACT.

Bill (No. 112) to amend the Immigration Act read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The transportation companies have called attention to the fact that there are cases in which it is necessary to land immigrants for medical treatment, and they fear that the clause of this Bill will prevent this being done. I propose therefore to add the following words :

Such prohibition may be absolute or may be accompanied by permission to land for medical treatment, but only for a determined period as may be provided by the order or proclamation.

The effect of this amendment would be that while we take power to prevent landing of immigrants by order absolutely, we may also permit their landing for the purposes of medical treatment. It might be desirable to remove the immigrants from the ship for medical treatment.

Mr. WILSON. I do not know whether the hon. minister has had any communication with the American authorities or not with reference to their mode of treating those people. I understand that when a sick immigrant lands at an American port he may be taken to the hospital or any other place. If it then be found that he cannot be treated successfully, he is taken back to the steamer and the steamship company is obliged to take care of him.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This does not relieve the steamship companies.

Mr. WILSON. I think the most feasible plan would be to enter into an arrangement with the United States, under which the American officials could examine all parties going to their ports and we would examine all coming to ours, and those not fit to land should not be allowed to land. In that way we would get rid of undesirable immigrants, such as we have in this country now, and get rid of them at very little cost. The United States are spending on our frontier at least $100,000 per year to keep undesirable immigrants out, and I do not see why we should not enter into an arrangement with them. We do not want undesirable immigrants any more than they do, although we appear to have been anxious rather for numbers than for the best kind. We want immigrants who will make good citizens, but unfortunately we are losing a very large number of our own people who are going to the United States and elsewhere and we are getting in their place most undesirable people from the older countries—people not allowed to enter the United States. And once these people are in, we have no means of getting rid of them.

Mr. McCREARY. When the hon. member for Lennox tries to convey the impression that we are getting a lot of undesirable immigrants, such as would not be allowed to enter the United States, he will find, if he will take the trouble to look into the United States reports, that such is not the case. We get no immigrants who would not be allowed to enter the United States. The class of immigrants with which the United States have trouble is not the Austrians, Germans, Russians or Swedes, but those who come from the towns and cities of Italy and who flock to the cities of the United States. You never see those people go on to the agricultural lands either of Canada or the United States. They go into the manufacturing centres.

They go to the manufacturing states of the Union. That class of immigration is what has given trouble in the United States, but we have not been bothered with it. Now, while I say that, I will admit that a very small percentage of Galicians, Austrians, Poles and Germans have had some diseases, but it is a very small percentage. Still, I think that the minister, when drafting this measure, might as well have gone a little further; he might as well have gone as far, almost, as the United States has gone, by providing that not only can an immigrant be stopped at the port of entry, but that he can be deported within a year after arrival if he develops, for instance, insanity and it could be proven that he was insane before he came here. We have had four or five cases of that kind that have been brought to my notice. Fortunately, we were able to get the railway companies to take them out without compulsion. But we had to send a man to the sea-board with the insane, and that cost us some money at least. Then, convicts—we get a small percentage of these. I think that eight or ten came before the police court in Winnipeg who had served terms in the countries from which they came. I think that five of them came from Denmark. Then, there may be contagious diseases that will not develop at the port of entry—say small-pox that may have been contracted before reaching Canada, but that may not develop until the immigrants have gone far on their way. We know that in 1883 a large number of immigrants, three or four hundred of them, who came from Europe destined to the United States, and reached Winnipeg before the disease developed, cost for quarantine about $14,000. In 1898 a large number came here who must have had small-pox, but the disease was not sufficiently developed to be detected at the port of entry. It is a question whether the municipality that had to undergo the expense ought not to be remunerated for its outlay. Then, I see no provision in the Bill to compel the railway companies to carry back these immigrants. Most of the immigrants at present coming in come a long distance west, and the government should not be put to the expense of removing these undesirable immigrants. The law of the state of Minnesota and of other states of the Union provides that the railway companies that brought them to the state is to carry them out, and that law, if I am not mistaken, was made a federal law within the last two years. I believe that this measure, when put upon the statute-book, will have a desirable effect, but, in my opinion, it does not go far enough to touch the root of the difficulty.

Mr. MACLEAN. I have a letter dealing with the general immigration policy of the government, which I would like to read. It is from the Toronto Trades and Labour Council, and is as follows :—

W. F. Maclean, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

(Re Immigration Policy.)

Dear Sir,—I have been instructed by this council to call your attention to the sum of $445,000, which has been placed in the estimates for this year for the assistance of immigration.

A memorial was sent in to you some time ago by this council, pointing out the reasons why we objected unanimously and most strenuously to the expenditure of public money for this purpose. The members of this council wish me to express their regret that so far their communication has received no consideration in this matter.

The reports show that there has been expended for the assistance of immigration during the last ten years $2,400,173. Must not the effect of this policy be to intensify the competition on to which labour is at present subject?

Is there any other class in the community which is treated in this way ?

The excuse has been made that assistance is given only to those who intend to settle on the land ; but how can that make the slightest difference? The intention of the government will no more determine the ultimate destination of the settlers, than it will affect the flow of the tides. To say that labour in the rural districts will not compete with the wage earner is just as foolish as to say that water will not find its level. All the facts of the case are against such a contention During the last hundred years the movement on this continent from the rural district to the cities has been so marked that whereas the civic population a century ago was only three per cent of the whole, at the present time it is upwards of thirty per cent.

While the general population on this continent has doubled every twenty-five years, the civic population has doubled every ten years. How, therefore, can any government say that the immigration will not drift into the cities, as it has been doing all along ? Suppose the assistance was confined to those who will take up agricultural land would that be the slightest justification for this policy ? When we ask the question, who is it bears the burden of taxation ? Is it the man who works all day, or is it some other man who collects his thousands of dollars yearly from ground rents or who draws his immense dividends from some coal mines ? There can be no question as to the correct answer. Industry and industry alone must bear the burden all the time. Then when we ask the further question, who reaps the benefit from this policy, what must be the answer ? Increased population does not increase the price of goods, nor does it increase the rate of wages ; but it does increase the price of land. Already the price of land in Winnipeg, which had almost no value thirty years ago, is now a thousand dollars per foot frontage on the best sites. In this city the best lots have increased fifty-fold in seventy years. Are we not fully warranted in stating that the immigration policy taxes industry to enable the land owner to subject the toilers to still greater exactions ?

Has the government ever used one dollar of taxes to enable the workingmen to buy their goods cheaper, or to reduce the exactions of the land owners? Never, but while it places a tariff to shield the employers from foreign competition and whilst it brings increased rents to the land owners, to the working classes there is not merely unrestricted competition, but that competition intensified by assisted immigration.

The effect of this policy must be to keep wages down to the lowest figures.

We regret that we are thus compelled to draw your attention to this disregard of our request, so reasonable and so just.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,

D. W. KENNEDY,
Secretary,
59 Edward Street.

I only received this letter to-day. While it is not quite germane to the particular branch of the question now before the House, it does deal with the government's general immigration policy, and I trust the minister will give some consideration to this statement made by the Trades and Labour Council of the city of Toronto.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not wish to speak again on the general question, but to say a word about the document that has just been read. The inconsistency of the statement made is shown by the reference to the values of land in the city of Winnipeg thirty years ago. There happened to be no city of Winnipeg thirty years ago. I believe it was incorporated in 1874. Before that time, it was only an Indian settlement, and its lands had no value at all. This letter involves a contention that I have often discussed with the labour unions. They wish us to believe that in bringing immigrants and settling them on the land, developing the prairie country and raising forty, fifty or sixty million of bushels of wheat a year, we do not increase the price of labour. I think that is one of the most ridiculous things that could be stated before this House. For instance, take the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1890 and 1891, how much of their rolling stock was standing idle in their round-houses? In some seasons practically 50 per cent of that rolling stock is idle, and, of course, the crews of the engines are thrown out of work. In seasons when there is a large crop, not only are none of these men idle, but a large number of extra men are employed. We need only look at the facts to see at once the fallacy of this argument.

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to see this Bill introduced, very glad to support its provisions, and only sorry that it does not go a great deal further. When we say that we are dealing with the question of increasing our population, we are not dealing with the whole question, for there is not merely the question of increase, but the question of improvement before us. When we deal with the immigration question without considering it from the standpoint of the possibility and necessity of efforts being made to improve the population as we increase it, we are not dealing with the subject as its importance requires. It seems to me strange that it should be required, at this date, to provide checks on the entrance of diseased immigrants to our country. If such checks have not existed in the past, they certainly cannot be provided too soon, nor can they be made too complete.

But from my standpoint the diseases existing amongst immigrants are but a trifling consideration in comparison with the general character of the immigrants. I cannot understand the frame of mind which looks carelessly upon the introduction into the very life of our country of a population without regard to whether such population will raise or lower the general standard of our people. Let the people who come in be the healthiest in the world, if their disposition,

and ambition, and inclination are not such as will help us to realize our ideals, then their presence is objectionable and a detriment to us. I am not claiming that we are the best people in the world ; that our civilization is the highest form of civilization ; but I do claim that our present civilization suits us, and it is that which we have set ourselves to improve. Our social system, our political system, our religious system are those which we have inherited and under which we are trying to improve ourselves. Then if it is worth while to organize all these systems for the purpose of improving ourselves in this country, it is surely worth while to take means that our efforts shall not be to a certain extent rendered useless by the introduction of an element into our population which will have a contrary effect. It is not necessary to say that such people are not as good as we are. Possibly a Chinaman is a better man than an Englishman, let the Englishman answer for that himself; a Japanese may be a better man or a Russian may be a better man than the Englishman ; I say nothing about that, he may be a much better man, but he is not one of us, and inasmuch as he is not one of us he is not helping us to develop along those lines that Providence has chosen for us, or that we have chosen for ourselves. His presence is a hindrance and not a help.

This country is of immense extent, it is of equally immense possibilities. The population of Canada at the present time occupies but a very small part of our total area, and turns to account but a very small part of our total resources. We have five millions of people in a country capable of supporting easily fifty millions. It does not need any demonstration on my part to show that if the increase of population which will necessarily take place in the development of those resources, is of a character and constitution essentially different from our own, not only will they build up a different civilization whenever they establish themselves, but they will infallibly control our civilization in this part of the country. One to ten, the odds are too many. The western prairies are the seat and cradle of the future population of this Dominion. They are the seat of power and control, and as that population is, so will this Dominion be. If you will fill those prairies with people of different ideas, different aspirations and different views from our own, you are simply placing yourselves under a yoke, you are swerving your country from that destiny which your fathers intended it, and which you fondly hoped you were achieving. It is I say, under the present circumstances of this Dominion, a matter of the highest necessity that the population we introduce into this country should be like minded with ourselves, so far as that is possible, if we are to achieve greatness as we understand greatness, if we are to achieve civilization as we understand civilization, if we are to achieve liberty in government as we understand liberty in government.

Some years ago we believed, or some of us believed, that those vast areas of fertile country in the west must for ever remain unpeopled, or become inhabited with such people as we could gather from any corner of the world. But nobody thinks that today. At present people are thronging into those territories by thousands, people equal to ourselves in intelligence, in energy, in ambition, in civilization, like-minded with ourselves in almost every particular. There is no danger that these prairies will not be occupied by people such as we will be proud to work with in building up our civilization. There is, however, one danger, and only one, and that is that they may be occupied by other and inferior people who will keep out those whom we desire to help us in establishing and improving our institutions. I say that every undesirable settler who enters the North-west, who is, we will say, inferior to ourselves in his knowledge of government, in his ideas of liberty, is a detriment to this country, inasmuch as to a certain extent he displaces another man whose ideas are similar to our own.

I believe in immigration, and in a vigorous immigration policy. But I also believe that when we are spending money to bring immigrants into our country the first consideration should be the intellectual as well as the physical quality of those immigrants. I would like to say that our immigration policy as directed to the United States has been a pronounced success, and I am glad to believe that it will continue to be so. I am sorry to say that as directed to the British islands, to the mother country, or to the mother countries, if you like, it has not been a pronounced success. I think I am safe in saying that up to date it has been a dismal failure. I have heard it said that we need not look to the British islands for immigrants to people our country ; that the supply was practically exhausted. If that is the case, it is a melancholy condition. It is a marvellous thing if those two islands, which have carried liberty and civilization, and conquest, if you like, around the world, are as to population in a state of decadence, and that we cannot look for any further immigration from that quarter. But, if we look at the records, we find that people are still flowing out of those apparently, except Canada. I am given to understand that a new system is being adopted in regard to immigration from the British isles. I am not familiar with the details of that system, but I will say that there is no possibility of adopting any system which could be less effective than that which has prevailed during the past years. I am satisfied that any system that is adopted will be an improvement. Now, I would like to say that in my estimation, if we, as

Canadians, wish to get the fullest benefit from the settlement of the North-west Territories, it is necessary that that settlement should be, as much as possible of people not only much like ourselves, but altogether like ourselves, not only in ideas of civilization, but also in political traditions; in other words, that we should draw upon the British islands as much as possible for our immigration for that country and that every effort should be made to attract immigration from the British isles.

Let me say further that it appears to me to have been a mistake in the past to have spent so much money as we have in paying bonuses to steamship companies for the conveyance of immigrants and for this reason: We made the steamship companies, by that means our immigration agencies, and it did not make any difference to the steamship companies what the character of the immigrant was, who he was, or where he was from, so long as they got the bonus. It seems to me, from my point of view, that this is a most undesirable system and a most undesirable expenditure, and I would ask that it be not continued. Understand me, I do not object to large expenditures for immigration, but I want these expenditures to be made with a view of securing the better people and not the worse. To depend on the steamship company is to put a premium upon the worse rather than upon the better.

I would like to say still further and to urge upon the House at large, upon hon. members who come from all parts of this Dominion, that the immigrant who is of the most benefit to this country in every way is the man of our own blood, namely, the native-born Canadian, who, finding it necessary to shift his ground, must go either to the United States or to the Canadian North-west.

Mr. McCREARY. What about New Ontario?

Mr OLIVER. Well, those who represent New Ontario can talk for New Ontario. I say that in my estimation it is a mistake, and the worst kind of mistake to consider that it is not a question of interest to this country or to this parliament whether our people go to the North-west Territories or not. I have heard it said here, and in the country that we want our people to stay at home. Of course we want our people to stay at home, but unless we nail them down they will not stay at home if the conditions are not suitable. It is because of the disposition and the determination to better themselves that they are so valuable as settlers wherever they may go, and they make such a success. I cannot look upon the matter quietly when I see from the census returns that we have 1,000,000 native-born Canadians in the United States, while we have in Manitoba and the North-west Territories considerably less than half a million of people of all nationalities. There must necessarily be in the United States four native-born Canadians for every one that is in the North-west Territories. I put it to this House and to the government that this country has made a more substantial loss in all that constitutes value by the transference of the energy and wealth of our people to the United States rather than to the North-west Territories than it has from any other cause. There is no other cause that has tended so much to the comparatively slow progress of this Dominion as the fact that our life blood has been drained across the line. While we have been trying to develop our own country with other people, the United States has been developed, to a large extent, by our people. It is a matter of the utmost interest to every man in every province of this Dominion that the people of Canada should be retained in Canada, and if they cannot be retained in one part they should be retained in another, if possible. That there should be no lack of effort put forth to secure the settlement of our own surplus population where we have surplus land to dispose of amply sufficient for all of them.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to say a few words in reference to this matter. I do not know whether any provision has been made by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) in this Bill, or whether provision is contained in the statute already in existence, to compel railway and steamship companies to bear all the expense attendant upon the return of undesirable immigrants brought by them to the country. My attention has been drawn to chapter 65 of the Revised Statutes of 1886, which deals with immigration and immigrants. Subsection 2 of section 17 provides for a bond to be entered into by the steamship companies for the return of lunatics, or for the indemnifying of a province or municipality in case a lunatic is permitted to remain in the country. Section 18 makes provision as follows:

> The proper immigration agent may, with the consent of the Minister of Agriculture, make arrangements with the master, owner or charterer of the vessel carrying the lunatic, idiotic, deaf and dumb, blind or infirm person with respect to whom a bond has been given, or money paid in lieu thereof, or with the master, owner or charterer of any other vessel, for the re-conveyance of such person to the port from which he was carried to Canada.

Section 23 deals with pauper immigration:

> The Governor General may, by proclamation, whenever he deems it necessary, prohibit the landing of pauper or destitute immigrants in all ports or any port in Canada, until such sums of money as are found necessary are provided and paid into the hands of one of the Canadian immigration agents, that the master of the vessel carrying such immigrants, for their temporary support and transport to their place of destination.

And so on. I believe a proclamation was issued a year or two ago against the ad-

mission into Canada of pauper immigrants. It would seem to me, from what I have seen in the papers since, that the proclamation is practically a dead letter, and that Canada is still being made a dumping ground for a very undesirable class of immigrants.

I noticed in the Montreal 'Herald,' just about a year ago, an article referring to the arrival of a very large number of destitue Italians at Montreal. The Montreal 'Herald' is not a paper that would knowingly or wilfully make a statement derogatory to the government. The 'Herald,' of the 6th of April, 1901, had an article entitled: 'Influx of Italians to Montreal.' 'About 2,000 now here.' 'Many of them penniless and unable to find work.' It seems to me that if the provisions of the proclamation issued by the government had been enforced, it would have been impossible for these people to have been permitted to have come into Montreal, and to be a tax upon the good people of that city and other parts of the Dominion. I am not opposed, Mr. Chairman, to any able-bodied immigrant coming to Canada. I rather think that we ought to endeavour to promote a vigorous immigration policy, but of course limiting the immigrants to the right class—of good character and not destitute. So far, the policy inaugurated by hon. gentlemen opposite has not been as successful as we would like to see it in that respect. It is a lamentable fact, a fact which has been substantiated in this House, that a large number of diseased immigrants have been brought into Canada, are now in Canada, and are being maintained at the expense of the Canadian people. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), in the recent debate on immigration, read copious extracts from a statement sent to him by one of the officials of the United States government, stationed in Canada for the purpose of examining immigrants who arrive here destined for the United States, and of determining whether they shall be permitted to enter that country or not. It seems to me a most deplorable condition of things that we should have a staff of thirty-five or forty United States officials stationed in Canada, sorting out and examining the immigrants who land at Canadian ports en route to the United States, and determining who shall be given certificates to enable them to enter the United States, and who shall not. That is a condition of things that should be put a stop to. It can be stopped in two ways; either by having a more careful examination of emigrants before they leave the ports in Europe whence they sail, or, having our own agents take charge of them when they land here, and preventing those who are undesirable in any way from staying in this country. The clauses of the Immigration Act which I read, seem to me to give the government power to prohibit the introduction of diseased pauper immigrants into Canada. But in the Bill which the hon. minister (Mr. Sifton) has introduced, I do not find that any provision has been made to compel the railway companies and the steamship companies to assume the expense which the people of Canada are put to in order to deport these undesirable immigrants to the country whence they came. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) read from a circular which has been sent to every member of the House—a protest from the Toronto Trades and Labour Council against indiscriminate immigration. That is not the first document of the kind which has been submitted to members of parliament during the present session. There was a document issued at the beginning of the session, away back in the middle of February, and which I believe was sent to every member of this House. That document declares very strongly against indiscriminate immigration. It says:

> The council—Toronto Trades and Labour Council—does not raise the slightest objection, or refuse the fullest welcome to suitable immigrants who come of their own accord, but they do most emphatically object to the taxation of labour in order to flood the labour market against the wage earner, and to favour the protected capitalists. While the tariff even favours the employer 50 per cent, the immigration policy cuts down the wage of labour, we know not how much per cent.

If that statement is true with regard to healthy immigrants, it has much more force in the case of undesirable immigrants; diseased immigrants who are permitted to come to Canada—immigrants who are not able to earn their own living and who become a tax on the people of this country. The Montreal 'Star,' on the 22nd of March, had a number of sketches of the types of immigrants who have been landing in Canada during the past two or three months. It had also what purports to be an interview with this very same Mr. Watchorn, the special United States immigration inspector in Canada, and the statement that this gentleman makes shows that a not very desirable class of immigrants is coming into Canada. This article is headed: 'Menace to the health of Montreal.' 'How the city is being made a dumping ground for immigrants rejected by the United States inspector.' 'Disease and dirt being scattered broadcast amongst them.' 'How the American inspectors carry on their work.' The introductory paragraphs of this article are as follows:

> Ninety-eight per cent of the European immigrants who are prohibited from entering the United States by the American officials in Montreal and at other points of entry along the border, are suffering from infectious diseases which are the direct result of filth and lack of sanitary methods. Such is the startling statement made by Mr. Robert Watchorn, the special immigration inspector, who has charge of all the immigrant inspectors from Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, to Montreal, including Port Huron,

Detroit, Niagara Falls, Black Rock, Buffalo and Vanceboro, Maine.

How long has the work being going on ?

Officially, since the first of last September.

And what has been the result since the first of September ?

That about 500 persons have been rejected as unfit, either physically, mentally, morally or financially, to enter the United States.

And these were all rejected right here in Montreal ?

Yes, in Montreal.

To say nothing of the other points of entry where no doubt similar rejections were made ?

Exactly.

What would be the percentage of refusals at Detroit, the Soo, Port Huron, Niagara Falls, Black Rock, St. John and Vanceboro ?

I should say that all these points combined would have about as many as Montreal.

That would be one thousand, and these figures would corroborate the statement made by Mr. Watchorn in a letter to the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) in which he stated that since the inspection commenced in September last, 1,000 diseased immigrants, disqualified immigrants, whose destination was the United States, were prohibited from entering that country, and many of them unhappily and unfortunately have been permitted to remain in Canada. So far as I understand this Bill, the minister has not made any provision for the deportation of these people, many of whom are still in the country; nor is there any provision to compel the railway and steamship companies to bear all the expense in connection with their deportation.

My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) referred to the decreasing number of immigrants of British origin, who are coming into Canada. From the reports which I have seen in the papers during the last three or four weeks, I am led to believe there will be a larger number of British immigrants coming into Canada during the present season, than for many years past, and I am glad to see that statement made. The hon. member for Alberta said that it was alleged that the stream of immigration from the British Isles has fallen off. That is not the case. If the official statistics of the United States can be relied upon, during the past ten years over three-quarters of a million of immigrants of British birth left the old country and have found a home in the United States. During the past thirty years more than three millions of our kith and kin have left the United Kingdom and have gone to the United States. Greater efforts it seems to me, should be made, and I hope they will be more successful, to induce a larger number of Irish, English and Scotch to make their homes in Canada, and to try to turn the tide of immigration from the United States towards Canada. I believe that in proportion to the total number of immigrants coming into this country, we are receiving too large a percentage of foreign-born. In 1891, of our total immigration we received 70 per cent of British origin and about 30 per cent of foreign origin, whereas in the last five years the tables have been turned, the proportion being about 30 per cent British and 70 per cent foreign. That, in my humble judgment, is not a satisfactory state of affairs, and proper steps should be taken to induce a larger percentage of people to come from the old land and settle here and help to build up this country. To show that this undesirable class of immigrants is still trying to find its way through Canada to the United States, and is still being turned back at the frontier, I will read a clipping which I have taken from the Toronto 'Evening Star' of March 22nd. The Toronto 'Evening Star' is a very able and enterprising journal, and is not by any means hostile to the government of the day. That journal has a despatch from its Montreal correspondent, dated March 22nd, headed : 'Turned back from border—United States will not admit a woman and her children whose eyes are sore ;' showing how closely United States immigration agents are watching immigrants, as people who have sore eyes are intercepted at the border and sent back. This is the despatch :

Montreal, March 22.—Mr. Joseph Francis, immigration inspector of the United States government at Niagara, formerly chairman of the United States Immigration Board in this city, was here this week with a family of rejected immigrants, who attempted to get through to Philadelphia by way of Niagara Falls.

The family in question—a woman and four children—arrived in St. John, N.B., suffering from trachoma, a peculiar and highly infectious form of eye disease, which leads to blindness. Their destination was Philadelphia, but being unable to pass the medical inspector there, she came up to Montreal, and being refused here, she went on to Toronto, representing that she was going to join a cousin there, the cousin in that case representing the relationship of a compatriot, and not of blood. On the second day after her arrival she secured a ticket for Philadelphia and went on by way of Niagara Falls. There she came under the inspection of Mr. Francis, who passed her on to a medical practitioner, who pronounced her to be in an advanced stage of trachoma, and likely to be blind within a year. One of her eyes is permanently closed, and when moving she stoops and leans forward in the manner common to the partially blind. The children have all been smitten with the disease, but if properly attended to they may be cured.

This woman, according to this statement, came to New Brunswick as an immigrant, intending to go to the United States. The official in New Brunswick who examined her refused to give her the necessary certificate to enable her to pass into that country. Notwithstanding that, she came on to Montreal and from Montreal to Toronto, and at Toronto purchased a ticket in the hope of being able to evade the authorities and pass into the United States by way of Niagara Falls. The vigilance of the officers at Niagara Falls prevented her accomplishing

her purpose, and she was turned back; and that woman, unless some provision is made by either the United Sates authorities or the Canadian authorities for paying her passage back and the passage of her family, not having herself the means of returning to her native country, will be obliged to remain in Canada, and, unfortunately for herself and her children, will become a burden on the people of this country. This condition of things, in my opinion, calls for the most drastic remedy. The most perfect provision should be made to stop for all time diseased and pauper immigrants coming into this country. I am not sure whether the Bill of the hon. minister makes the necessary provision, because I see nothing in the Bill which enables the government to collect from the steamship companies the cost of deporting these people and the moneys it will expend in providing inspectors to do this work. In that respect we might take a leaf out of the book of the United States government. I believe that they collect a tax from the steamship companies, which has been found amply sufficient to cover the cost of a thorough inspection of all immigrants who go into that country without the people of the United States having to bear a single dollar of the expense of that service. The time has come when a similar provision should be adopted here; and if this Bill is wanting in any of its provisions, the minister should amend it so as to make it as clear and explicit as it can be made. The trades and labour organizations of the Dominion, as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out, are objecting strenuously to the expenditures made by this government on account of immigration. In one paragraph of their circular, they say:

> For many years enormous sums, at times exceeding $400,000 in a single year, have been expended for the purpose of aiding the importation of cheap labour into this country.

Further they say:

> Agents have been sent to the poorest countries in the world to flood our labour market with a host of men, women and children, anxious to secure work and glad to accept work at almost any price. And these emigrants are induced to come here even at times when thousands of labourers are tramping the streets in idleness, vainly looking for employment.

I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior to say whether he himself examines the literature which is distributed by immigration agents throughout the United Kingdom and Europe before it is issued by the department, or whether he keeps any file or record of that literature; because it is stated from time to time by the representatives of the trades organizations that the most glaring misstatements are made by immigration agents appointed by the government, and that as a result of the distribution of these misstatements many people are induced to come to Canada, who, when they come, find that things are not as rosy as they were painted, and that they are unable to get on as well as they expected, or to find employment as readily as they were told they could. If that is the case, when these people come they get dissatisfied, and are liable to make statements which do damage to the country. I would like to ask the minister if he himself assumes the responsibility for the literature distributed by the immigration agents throughout the old country, because if the allegations made by the trade organizations are correct, many of these statements are entirely unwarranted and misleading.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The House spent a whole day a short time ago in discussing the question of immigration, and most of the remarks which have been made by hon. gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon will be found answered or dealt with in the discussion which took place on that occasion. That may be said, almost without qualification, of the remarks which have been made by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. The points he brought up were practically all answered in the discussion which took place here on a former occasion, and I would only be unnecessarily detaining the House by going over the same ground again. He will find that I dealt fully with the allegations regarding the wholesale dumping of diseased immigrants at our ocean ports, and showed conclusively that these allegations were wholly unfounded. There has been nothing of the kind to such an extent as even to justify any reference to it in this House. What has occurred has been of a most trifling character, such as is bound to occur under any administration.

Just a word with regard to the position of affairs at the ocean ports. The hon. member for Lennox urges that we should make some arrangement with the United States. There is no necessity for any arrangement, so far as the examination of immigrants is concerned. We are quite competent to attend to that without any arrangement. We have consented to the American officers making examinations at our ports of immigrants in transit to the United States, but as these are practically all examined by our officers, the examination is to all intents and purposes complete.

Mr. CLARKE. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to draw his attention to a statement in the Toronto 'Star' which would seem to show that the immigrants mentioned in that statement, and their families, were permitted to leave New Brunswick and find their way to Ontario. The examination could not have been very rigid or that could not have happened.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say anything in regard to a spe-

cial case reported in a newspaper. In the first place, I do not know that the facts are as stated, and in the second place, the case was never brought to my attention. But at present, at Quebec, St. John and Halifax, we have a very complete and thorough system of examinations, and this Bill is brought in for the purpose of remedying a defect in the law. I am advised by the law officers of the government that we have not the power to prevent people of the particular class referred to in this Bill from landing, or to compel them to leave Canada once they have landed. If the hon. member for Toronto would refer to my remarks in the debate on immigration, he will find that I showed by the figures I gave, that there were no people of this class now in Canada, with the exception of four or five who were at St. John, waiting an opportunity to get away, and who in all probability have gone. The government desires simply to be in a position to enforce that which every one admits we ought to enforce. The only point made against the Bill is that suggested by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary). He says that we should take power to deport immigrants from inland portions of the country. We have not yet seen the necessity of doing this, because cases of no importance or difficulty have yet arisen. There can be no special objection to our taking such power, but it has not been thought necessary because no difficulty has arisen.

As regards the literature circulated in the United States and other foreign countries, it is wholly impossible for me to examine all the immigration literature prepared for the department. The superintendent, Mr. Pedley, is directly responsible for the preparation of all literature issued from Canada and sent to the United States. The literature circulated in Great Britain and on the continent has heretofore been almost entirely prepared by or through our office in London, but that system is now changed, and it is our intention that it shall be prepared here, and the superintendent of immigration will examine all the literature himself and be directly responsible to me. I do not believe that there is any substantial ground for the statement that any of our immigration literature has the effect of leading people to suppose that they can get employment readily in Canada. I am aware that some gentlemen connected with the trades and labour councils of different places are in the habit of making broad statements of that kind. But I have not been able to get any evidence from these gentlemen to indicate that they have any ground for making such statement. Under any system whatever of immigration, encouraged and stimulated by advertising and employment of agents, there will always be numbers of people admitted who will not be perhaps the most desirable class, and a certain number will perhaps not belong to the class the agent thought they did belong to. And a certain number will come in who, perhaps, will not follow the occupation which it was anticipated they would. No department that has ever existed could carry out a system of encouraging immigration without having these results follow to some extent. As to the statement that there is any encouragement, directly or avowedly given to persons to come in for the purpose of finding employment, that is entirely incorrect. I have discussed that question at different times in the House. Cases have been cited of persons who have alleged that they were encouraged to come in under these circumstances. I have always replied that the instructions to the officers of the department were most explicit, definite and positive, and that in every possible way we have tried to prevent any one being encouraged to come to Canada, except those who were desirous of following agricultural pursuits. These things cannot be carried out with absolute perfection, but that is the purpose of the department. Clear instructions are given to that effect, and everything done that is possible to carry out the policy I have indicated. Now, as to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Toronto, that we should levy a poll-tax upon steamship companies to pay expenses in connection with this work, I may say that I consider that suggestion wholly impracticable at the present time. If any attempt were made in that direction, we should put the steamship companies who are carrying a portion of the immigrants to Canada out of the business, and, instead of getting 11,000 or 12,000 British immigrants, as we get at the present time, we should get few or none. We have to adapt ourselves to the circumstances as they exist. The circumstances of the United States are wholly different from our own. In the United States they do not wish immigration, they would prefer it if nobody came from outside to settle in that country. Their population is felt to be large enough. The natural increase of their 75,000,000 of people will soon render the position in the United States difficult for the statesmen of that country to handle it. Anything that they can do to discourage immigration they do—in fact, they do some things that they themselves would hardly approve of on principle to discourage the bringing the people from outside. We are in a wholly different position and are seeking immigration. Of course, we do not wish those of an undesirable class; but, in seeking to make distinctions, we must not adopt a policy that would close up entirely the source of supply. Speaking of the question of the nationality of our immigrants, I do not admit that my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) is correct when he says that the policy, so far as the United Kingdom is concerned, could not

have been a greater failure than it has been. I explained in Committee of Supply, when the estimates were under discussion, my reasons for believing that the practice of the department in Great Britain had not been, perhaps, as successful as it might have been, and pointed out that improvements might be made by changing some of the methods that have been followed. I also explained the changes which had been made with a view to improvement. But because I took steps to effect improvement, I do not admit that that shows that the work had been an absolute failure. Far from it. For instance, during the last calendar year, when something like 49,000 to 50,000 immigrants were received in Canada, about 18,000 came from the United States, practically all British-born, and between 11,000 and 12,000 from the British Islands. So, while the statement of the hon. member for Toronto is technically correct, that nearly 70 per cent of the total immigration was foreign-born, yet, it must be remembered that, for the purpose of making that calculation intelligible, it must be considered that the people from the United States are foreign-born, whereas, they are not so. Not only are they of Anglo-Saxon blood——

Mr. CLARKE. We had to accept the figures given by the department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman knows what the figures mean.

Mr. CLARKE. We could hardly be expected to go behind the figures given in the report.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The figures show that about 18,000 came from the United States, and something over 11,000 from Great Britain and Ireland. So, out of 50,000, about 30,000 were practically persons of British blood. I have simply pointed out this fact for the purpose of correcting what otherwise might be an erroneous statement.

Now, just a word about the position taken by the Trades and Labour Council of Toronto, and one or two other labour bodies. I think I received a copy of the communication read by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), at any rate I received a communication the same in substance. We might as well have a clear understanding upon this question, and I might as well say now that I wholly and entirely disagree with the sentiments and ideas expressed in that document. In my judgment there is no class of people, at the present time that are profiting more largely by the money being expended for immigration than the mechanics and labouring men of the province of Ontario. If my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) will go from town to town in his own province and ascertain from the men who are carrying on operations in the various factories and are giving employment to people in the manufacturing towns, where the orders are coming from that are keeping these factories busy, he will find that the orders that they are depending upon most largely are those from Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That is the country to which they are looking almost exclusively for the increase in volume of their business and the widening of its scope. The hon. gentleman will find this to be the case in almost every line of ordinary manufacture, and it is the mechanics and operators who work in these factories who are benefited most largely at the present time, and who will most largely benefit in the future, from our immigration policy and from the placing on the lands of Manitoba and the North-west Territories of a producing population. I am not going into a lengthy discussion of immigration at the present time. As I say, that was fully discussed the other day, when the immigration question was up before the House, and we shall have the subject of the Committee of Supply before the session is over, when, if hon. gentlemen desire it, it can be discussed still further.

Mr. WILSON. Did the hon. gentleman deal with Mr. Watchorn's statement ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, fully.

Mr. WILSON. I was not well that evening and could not be here——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. gentleman will read the 'Hansard' report of my remarks, he will see that I dealt with it and answered it fully. I also answered the statement that a large number of diseased foreigners were in the hospitals in Montreal, and I showed by the statements made by the superintendents in charge of these institutions that there was no foundation for the statements that were made, and that no facts existed that could have afforded any excuse for it.

Now I do not know that there is anything further, except the one point referred to by my hon. friend from West Toronto when he quoted the article from the Montreal 'Herald.' I am not able quite to understand what point the hon. gentleman desired to make against the government or its policy——

Mr. CLARKE. The article was a pretty lengthy one, and I did not wish to take up the time of the committee by reading the whole of it. But I will get it again and read it in full, that it may be on record.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But what does the hon. gentleman suggest ?

Mr. CLARKE. The article is to the effect that there are large numbers of destitute immigrants coming out to Canada who become a burden upon the philanthropic people of the Dominion, and that these immigrants have been induced to come here by

misrepresentation, misrepresentations so great, if I recollect the article correctly, that the Italian consul had cabled to the home authorities with respect to it. In order to be absolutely correct, however, I will get the statement of the 'Herald' and read it. They were an undesirable——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They were Italians, were they ?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not say that the Italians are an undesirable class, but that these people were undesirable coming out in the condition of destitution they did. And, it would appear, they came out because of misrepresentations made to induce them to come out.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There could not be a better illustration of the totally foundationless nature of the attacks made upon the department than the statement that has just been made. We do not carry on any work in Italy. No Italians have been induced by the Immigration department, by any representations, direct or indirect, to come to Canada. We have never had an agent in Italy, and, since I have had charge of the department at any rate, have not printed a word in Italian to induce any Italians to come here. If Italians have come here, they have come without inducement or effort on the part of the government or the department. But I wish to get the hon. gentleman to make himself clear about one point. It is easy enough for the hon. gentleman to say that some people have come who are not desirable people, who have made trouble in Canada, and who have become a charge upon the community. Does the hon. gentleman desire that the government of this country should be charged by statute, that they should be given the power of deciding whether people are desirable or not, and to keep out whoever they like ?

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that the object of the Bill which the hon. gentleman has presented to the House, and that we are now discussing, is to give the government greater powers of determining who they shall admit and who they shall not admit into Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 'Persons who are suffering from any dangerous or infectious disease or malady.' Not paupers, not criminals, not lunatics, not persons suffering from any disease. Would the hon. gentleman say that we ought to pass a law that will give us power to discriminate, as against people not embraced in those classes, to say who we think it is desirable to admit into this country ?

Mr. CLARKE. There has not been a word said on this side of the House that would justify the hon. gentleman in making such a suggestion. We desire, as he desires, I presume, to see eligible immigrants coming into Canada; we do not desire to see diseased immigrants coming in here. We do not desire to see this country receiving immigrants who are not thought worthy of being admitted into or of becoming citizens of the United States ; and we object strenuously to a condition of things under which forty-four United States officials are stationed in Canada to select the immigrants that may go into that country, to determine which of them shall be admitted into the States and which shall not. We object to those who are not admitted to the United States, who are not thought fit to become citizens of that country, through disease or other cause—we object to them being left in Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman continues, by implication, to misrepresent the facts of the case.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not mean to do so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is an entire misrepresentation in the statement which the hon. gentleman makes. The hon. gentleman says he objects to the fact that there are forty-four officials of the United States determining what emigrants are going to be allowed to remain in Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. No, but what are to be allowed to go into the States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then the hon. gentleman will have to correct himself.

Mr. CLARKE. I am in the judgment of the committee. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not hear me, or I did not make myself clear. I say it is a disgraceful condition of affairs that forty-four United States officials shall be permitted to examine immigrants who are coming into Canada and whose destination is the United States, to determine which of them shall be permitted to enter the United States and which shall not.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then I may say to the hon. gentleman that I do not see any particular scandal or disgrace in it at all. But the fact is that the United States officials decide who are to go into the United States, and our officials decide who are to come into Canada. The United States officials are permitted to decide who are going into the United States. If there was a movement of immigration from the United States ports into Canada there would be no objection whatever on the part of the United States government to our placing officials at ports in their territories for the purpose of examining immigrants coming into Canada—there would be no objection whatever on the part of any government on ordinarily friendly terms with us to such a course being taken. But the hon. gentleman, in his first remarks, as I understood him, said that these United

States officials decided who should come into Canada. That is a point which I wish to make clear. Whether the hon. gentleman intended to make it or not, I want to make it clear that such is not the fact, that our own officials decide, after inspection, upon the immigrants that are admitted, and they alone are responsible if any persons are permitted to get past the line and come into Canada and remain, who ought not to be allowed to come in and remain here. He stated the law was objectionable, that the law was defective, because it did not give us sufficient power. But the hon. gentleman has not yet put himself clearly upon record as to what he means by attacking the position of the government, in quoting this article from the Montreal 'Herald.' What I say is that parliament has never clothed the government with power to say that any persons should not come into this country who are in possession of all their faculities, who are not diseased, who are not criminal, and who do not come within the class of paupers, who do not come within any of the classes specified in this Act. They have provided that we might exclude paupers, criminals, persons of unsound mind; and now we ask to be permitted to exclude other persons who have any dangerous or infectious disease. But parliament has never clothed the government with the power of saying to a man at our boundary line, who is sound in wind and limb, perfect physically and morally—parliament has never authorized the government to prevent such persons from crossing the boundary line. The hon. gentleman would like to get away from the point, but he has got to do one thing or the other.

Mr. CLARKE. I am going to read this whole article.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman reads an article for the purpose of creating an impression. I want him to understand that the law must be either one way or the other. If Italians come to our boundary line, and if they are going to be excluded, they must be excluded by force of law, there must be some law authorizing it to be done. I say the law does not authorize it to be done, this government has no right to do it, and the hon. gentleman has no right to attempt to create prejudice against the government because these people came in. The hon. gentleman is trying to create a prejudice against the government because these Italians came in, because it was stated in the press that they were persons who were unable to take care of themselves, and would be a charge upon the community, or something to that effect. But I say that people will come to Canada, and some of them may be unable to take care of themselves. It would be impossible for any government under any system which parliament would sanction to prevent that occurring from time to time. So far, however, as relates to Italians being induced to come to Canada by any representations of the government, that has not taken place since I have been in office. We have carried on no work whatever in Italy, so far as I know we published no immigration literature in the Italian language, nor attempted to get the Italian people to come here. I do not know that it is necessary for me to make any further remarks on that point. As I said, the whole question was thoroughly threshed out on the immigration estimates in supply, and nearly every point that has been raised now was discussed then.

Mr. CLARKE. In order that there may be no misunderstanding at all as to what the article contains, I will read it so that it may be put upon the 'Hansard':

Influx of Italians to Montreal.

About 2,000 now here. Many of them penniless and unable to find work.

Many of our citizens more especially those whose business calls them to the vicinity of the depots, must have noticed the long strings of Italians carrying every variety of satchel, plodding along the streets. In fact they have become so common a sight that it is not surprising to learn that over two thousand of them have reached the city or that for a large proportion of them work has to be found to prevent their becoming a charge upon the municipality.

Many of these of course, have friends in this country, who can take care of them upon arrival. But there are also many who have neither connections nor the proper amount of money to keep them while searching for work, and who have been induced to come out here by the emigration agencies who hold out to them all kinds of specious promises for work upon arrival and represent Canada as a land of promise. It is to this class that the acting Italian Consul-General, Mr. Jerome Internoscia, alludes in his cable to the Italian government, asking them to take steps to check the flood of penniless Italian emigrants to this country and to permit none to embark who are not equipped with sufficient funds to maintain themselves for at least a month after their arrival.

Those who have already arrived can be taken care of. The labour agencies have taken them in charge and promised to look after them. The acting consul-general states that the two thousand who have already arrived have been housed and are safe from any immediate necessity. But he fears a further inundation. And hence he has officially reported to the Italian government asking for their assistance in seeing that none but desirable emigrants be permitted to leave that country for Canada.

Now, Sir, there is the statement. If anything I have said is not justified in the opinion of the committee, after I have read this article, I am willing to abide by the judgment of the committee. But the hon. gentleman admitted a few minutes ago that the government had not spent a dollar in distributing literature in the Italian language in Italy, that they had not spent any money in inducing Italian immigrants to come to Canada. Yet if this article can be relied

upon the consul of the Italian government stationed at Montreal states that a large number of destitute Italian immigrants have been brought out here under specious promises, or under misrepresentations which the authorities have not carried out. If these people were in the condition they were alleged to be in, and if the proclamation which was issued to prevent pauper immigrants from coming into Canada had been enforced, how came it that they were permitted to land in Canada ? The hon. Minister of the Interior says that he made a full statement in answer to the statement made by Mr. Watchorn, the special officer of the United States sent to Canada to look after immigration coming by way of this country. I did not happen to be in the House at the time, and of course, I must accept the hon. minister's statement, but I want to draw the attention of the committee to the fact that under his own signature, Mr. Watchorn makes a statement, and the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) saw him sign that statement, that since September last, 1,000 undesirable, objectionable, diseased immigrants were prohibited from entering the United States who were booked through Canada for that country.

Now, in an interview with the Montreal 'Star,' Mr. Watchorn said that the district of Montreal contained about half the people, numbering 500, who were rejected. The statement made by the official agent of the United States seems to be corroborated by the statement which he gave to my hon. friend. I do not know what I have said this afternoon, during the course of this debate, that induced the hon. minister to say that I was trying to back out of an untenable position. I am not backing out of anything and I do not propose to back out, because I believe that every statement I have made this afternoon is justifiable ; but if any hon. gentleman on either side of the House can demonstrate to me that I have made an unjustifiable statement, or a statement that is not correct, I will be very glad to retract it. My desire is not to embarrass the government, but to point out to them that greater precautions should be exercised in preventing undesirable immigrants from coming into Canada, and I have pointed to the fact that the vice-consul of Italy in Montreal had to cable to his own government regarding the inadvisability of sending more people of this class to Canada; and to the further fact that the United States authorities had to appoint a corps of officers to prevent undesirable immigrants from finding their way to the United States by way of Canada. I drew the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) to this matter at an early period in the session. I asked the hon. gentleman if the statements contained in the report of the United States commissioner of immigration were correct or not, and 'Hansard' records the answer which was given. I have no desire to embarrass the government at all ; but, as the working people of the city which I have the honour to represent are objecting to this immigration, to the class of immigrants that are coming in, and to the large amounts the government are spending on immigration, it is my duty to draw the attention of the committee and of the government to it, and to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior to make an improvement in the system of inspection in regard to immigrants coming into Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not necessary for me to repeat what I have already said, but I wish to make the statement again that whether it be stated in the Montreal 'Herald' or not, these Italians were not brought to Canada by the government, or by the authority of the government. Let that be clearly and definitely understood. I do not care what the vice-consul for Italy may have done. What I say is that this government did not bring these people out. In the next place, I wish to be understood as making a clear and explicit denial of the correctness of the statement made by Mr. Watchorn. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will turn up the remarks that were made by me when the immigration estimates were before the Committee of Supply, he will see that I made a clear and explicit statement on that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understood the point made by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) it was that whether these immigrants were induced to come by the government or not, they were practically paupers, and they were allowed to land.

Mr. CLARKE. Hear, hear. That is the point exactly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the whole gravamen of the charge made by my hon. friend, and the hon. Minister of the Interior has not dealt with it at all.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If the hon. member (Mr. Clarke) would state that he understood that a number of Italians had been allowed to come in and would ask me as to whether that was the fact or not, I would have to tell the hon. gentleman that I did not know, that I would have to look into it, because as it had never been brought to my attention, I would not be able to say. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is absolutely impossible for any minister to read all the newspapers in the country and every article which they contain, and to know whether such a case as this happened or not. There may be no truth in that statement. I have seen statements in the papers which were wholly manufactured, that were without foundation in fact, or that were exaggerated. If the matter had been called to my attention, I would at once have had an investigation made in order to see if a remedy could not be ap-

plied. As to the future, though I cannot agree with every criticism that is addressed to the department over which I preside, I think hon. members will do me the justice to acknowledge that when suggestions have been made out of which I could derive any benefit in the administration of the department, I have never hesitated to adopt these suggestions, and it was because of the fact that I have been very much impressed with the necessity of a stricter enforcement of the exclusion clauses and a stricter exercise of the powers of exclusion in certain cases that this Bill has been brought before the House. I purpose taking the greatest possible care and it shall be my endeavour to protect the country from the effects of undesirable immigration in the sense in which I have expressed it under the provisions of this Bill, and also under the provisions of the statute as it stands at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the hon. Minister of the Interior did not appreciate the point that my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) was making and therefore I made the suggestion to him. I did not suggest that my hon. friend expected the hon. minister, on the spur of the moment, to be able to tell him all the facts, but I quite conceive that it was within his duty, as these statements had been made publicly in the newspapers and had been brought to his attention of his constituents, and also because the statements had been made in a newspaper very friendly to the government, to bring this matter to the attention of the committee, and to ask that it should be looked into at the hon. minister's earliest convenience?

Mr. CLARKE. The statement has been made by the hon. minister that so far as the government of Canada are concerned, they had no agents in Italy. These immigrants must have been brought out here by some person—by a steamship company.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They may have come across on——

Mr. CLARKE. They did not swim across. They must have been brought across on board of a steamer, and the steamship company would get the usual bonus for bringing immigrants over, I presume.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. CLARKE. Have they got nothing?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When I say no, the hon. gentleman will understand that I do not know just exactly when this particular circumstance occurred. I remember it, but I do not particularly remember the people to whom the hon. gentleman is referring. But I think I am safe in saying we have not paid any bonuses upon any considerable number of Italians at all; in fact, I do not know that we have paid bonuses for any Italians. I doubt that we have. I would not like to make a positive statement, but if any Italians have been paid for, there certainly was no considerable number of them. They most likely have been included with other immigrants. They must have come around by Germany and been included with other immigrants.

Mr. CLARKE. Were the Italians excluded from the benefits of this bonus?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not remember that they were distinctly excluded. I remember a question incidentally asked when the matter of paying bonuses for Italian immigrants came up, and without expressing any opinion as to the desirability of bringing in Italian immigrants, I said: We will not extend our work to that country or pay any bonus.

Mr. CLARKE. Two years ago I drew the attention of the House to a statement made by the Vienna correspondent of the London 'Times' and reproduced in the Edinburgh 'Scotsman,' that a large number of immigrants from Roumania were about to start for Canada. I drew the attention of the hon. minister to this statement, and I was informed that the government had no knowledge of this intended emigration. Within two months afterwards these people arrived in Canada. The department did not seem to be apprised of their coming. I want to point out that, in face of the proclamation issued against pauper immigrants, so lax is the administration of the department that according to the statements from which I have quoted, these immigrants who were in destitute circumstances, were induced by steamship companies to come here, and there was practically no inspection, and no barrier to their entering the Dominion. That proves that the department has not that control over immigrants which, in my judgment, is necessary in the public interest.

Mr. WILSON. A year ago a number of immigrants came to Quebec and they were not allowed to land, but the steamer brought them to Montreal and they were permitted to land there on the special order of Mr. Pedley.

Mr. CLARKE. The same lot?

Mr. WILSON. I dare say it was the same lot. He got from a society in Montreal some guarantee that they would look after them, and so they were allowed to land under the special permission of the superintendent of immigration. These are the things we complain of, and these are the things that should be stopped.

Mr. OSLER. It would appear that our laws for prohibiting paupers and diseased immigrants from entering Canada, are not as strict as are the laws in force in the

United States. It is clear that the United States officers reject very great numbers that we accept. I contend that the immigrant who is not good enough for the United States is not good enough for Canada ; I do not care how he comes here. I contend that the evidence is plain, that we have not a proper supervision over immigrants. The very fact that the Americans have 44 officials in Canada inspecting immigrants whose destination is the United States, is of itself sufficient to show that the Canadian inspection is very lax. The minister (Hon. Mr. Sifton) stated in reply to my colleague (Mr. Clarke) : That if he charged $1 a head poll tax the steamship companies would at once take their immigrants to the United States. That is a very nice admission coming from the Minister of Immigration. It shows that it is not the money that Canada spends, that brings these immigrants to Canada, but that it is the steamship companies who are bringing them here for the sake of the passage money. If one dollar poll tax is going to exclude immigrants, I wonder what is the use of our expending large sums of money on immigration. Let us rather, at once pay subsidies to the steamship companies to bring in whom they like. If we assume that these 2,000 destitute Italians came in here without the bounty, they are at all events included in the number of immigrants that the minister takes credit for having brought here on account of the money expended. The impression left on my mind by this debate is, that the regulations for the inspection of immigrants coming into Canada are decidedly loose, and that people are being admitted here who are excluded from the United States ; people who tend to deteriorate the quality of our population. There was recently a very strong expression of opinion in this House against permitting scrub horses to be imported into the west to deteriorate the stock in that country. Shall we be less particular as to the kind of men we bring into this country to mix with our population, than we are as to the kind of animals we allow to be imported ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I made no statement which would lead the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) to infer that the steamship companies exclusively brought immigrants to Canada.

Mr. OSLER. The minister said that if we imposed a poll tax of one dollar a head the steamship companies would take the immigrants to the United States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I stated that if we put a poll tax against these steamship agents, that would prevent them bringing these immigrants to Canada. That does not imply that the steamship companies alone are bringing immigrants to Canada. We pay a bonus to the steamship agents for the purpose of putting Canada in the same position as countries which are competing with us, and if we excited the hostility of the steamship companies, the agents of these companies would endeavour to neutralize the efforts of our own officers, and the result might be that we would get no immigrants. That is not saying that the expenditure of our own money is having no effect. It is simply saying that if we make the steamship agents hostile, they would devote themselves to counteracting the efforts of the officers whom we are employing. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) says that an immigrant who is not fit to go to the United States is not fit to come into Canada, and he appeared to be under the impression that he was expressing a very lofty sentiment. Well, I express the sentiment, that the government of Canada is at least just as competent through its officers to decide who is to come into Canada, as the officers of the United States government are competent to decide for them. I am not in favour of leaving it to the officers of the United States government to decide who is to come into Canada. If that be the policy which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) advocates, I dissent from it, and I cannot hold out any hope that I am likely to adopt his view. The actual fact is that the whole thing is a tempest in a tea pot. There is actually nothing in it ; it amounts to nothing. If the hon. gentleman will read the remarks I made, he will see that practically the whole thing reduced itself to something like 33 or 34 people out of almost a year's work, and that there was the merest trifle of difference between the work of the American officers and our officers. There were some 23 or 24 people who were permitted to go into the North-west simply because the United States officers rejected them upon grounds which one of our inspectors did not consider sufficient, namely, because there was some trifling disease amongst the children. Outside of that, to all intents and purposes the result of the examination has been the same.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister would do what the country requires that he should do, he would take power similar to that which is in the United States law to send back unsuitable immigrants. He tells us that the number of unsuitable immigrants rejected by the United States was insignificant, but that is not the information which the United States officers say that there were over 1,000 rejected, part of one year, but the minister says there were but an insignificant few. We have, however, very good reason to believe that the statements made in the public press and by the United States immigration officials are correct.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I decline entirely to be judged in this House by a statement published in the Montreal 'Star' by an American immigration officer. There is a committee of this House which has jurisdiction to inquire into all matters

relating to immigration. The question of immigration was before that committee for a long time this session, and if hon. gentlemen opposite desire to investigate the facts and have evidence produced on which a minister would be quite willing to be judged and which would be satisfactory to the House, they had the opportunity of doing it. But I refuse to be judged by that statement, especially when it is shown to be entirely false by the investigation which has taken place since. I also refuse to be judged by newspaper statements which hon. gentlemen opposite produce and for the accuracy of which they decline to vouch.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman allow us to have an investigation and to have witnesses summoned before the Committee on Agriculture to prove the statements we make in this House ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to ask me that question. I have never sought to prevent any witnesses being called. I have never, directly or indirectly, in any shape or way, interfered or sought to interfere with the calling of any witness whom any member of the opposition desired to call before the Committee on Agriculture. I have never attended a meeting of the committee or had anything to do with it further than to tell the officers of the department to go there when summoned and do everything they could to give the committee the information it desired.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. minister does not understand the question of my hon. friend from Lennox. What he desired to ask was : as Mr. Watchorn's statement has been made since the investigation before the Committee on Agriculture was closed, would the hon. gentleman see that no objection was made to investigating that statement if it was desired ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman wishes to know if the friends of the government would object to the reopening of the investigation. We have not the slightest objection in the world.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the hon. gentleman say he declines to be held responsible for ? It is a matter of indifference to the people of this country whether he declines to be held responsible or not—the people of this country will hold him responsible. It is not a matter that is optional with him; it is a matter that is optional with them. He says he declines to be judged by a newspaper statement. This is not a newspaper statement, but the statement of an official of the American government, which we believe to be reliable. But the hon. Minister of the Interior, who is charged with the responsibility of preventing undesirable people coming and settling in the country, allows them to come in, and then says, I decline to be held responsible for it. I think the people of the country will form their own opinion with regard to that, regardless of the hon. gentleman's wishes in the matter. The hon. gentleman says we are quite as capable of judging from the evidence as the Americans. We are, but if we never act upon that judgment, what good is it ? And that is the position of the hon. gentleman; he has never acted on that judgment. He has sent his agents scouring around the world to get immigrants, whether they are suitable or unsuitable. Last year he spent $444,000 on immigration, and got 49,000 immigrants. Can he tell us how many of these immigrants were such as the people of the United States considered it necessary to send from their country ? Not by any means. We are quite satisfied that there are some thousands of them, because we have had information that the people of Montreal last year had to support these people for months in order to keep them from starvation. Then, other immigrants have come in who have been diseased. The minister says he had not the power to keep them out. He is taking the power now. He says the number is infinitesimal. Then, why does he require an Act to get the power ? I have always thought that although we require immigrants, the number we bring in is not a matter of so much importance as to know that those that do come are suitable to the country. That, I think, is the first requirement. It is not a fact, so far as the information disclosed enables us to judge, that the number brought in by the present government are all suitable. A large number are not suitable, because of diseases and weaknesses incident to human nature. I think that in future the great source from which we will draw our immigrants will be the overflow of population from the United States. They will be very suitable settlers for this country, and whether we send agents or not, they will come in in thousands to buy lands. This migration started many years ago under the late government, and it has been going on with increasing force ever since, and will continue whether we spend large sums to promote it or not. We have often heard of what the present government have done for the country, how many immigrants they have brought in. They have not by any means brought in as many proportionate to the expenditure as their predecessors did. If they had done so last year, instead of bringing in 49,000 they would have brought over 61,000; or if they had only spent proportionately as much money for the number they brought in as their predecessors spent, instead of spending $444,000, they would only have spent $360,000. So that there is nothing to boast of in their immigration policy, but there is much to be condemned. I believe the steamship companies are paid their bonuses every

time, regardless of the class of people they bring to the country. We cannot awake too soon to the situation, when we see the number of people our American friends are sending back. Instead of the number being infinitesimal, as the minister says, I am inclined to think the people of the country will regard it as a very much more serious matter; and they will hold him responsible for doing less than his duty when he has not taken steps sooner to keep that undesirable class out of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. I want to draw attention to a statement made in the letter signed by Robert Watchorn, special immigrant inspector, which has been sent to my hon. friend from Lennox. I think the hon. gentleman ought to be thankful to the opposition for drawing his attention to what they believe to be weak points in our immigration policy. I want to draw the attention of the minister and the committee to a specific statement regarding our statistics of immigration. Mr. Watchorn, the United States officer, writes as follows to the hon. member for Lennox :

> You will observe on page 34 of the Commissioner General's report that the increase of immigration from Canada to the United States from 1896 to 1900 has been very heavy and is in fact very much in excess of what these figures indicate. I think your official reports will bear out the statement that for the year ending June 30th, 1901, approximately 50,000 alien immigrants arrived at Canadian seaports, 24,000 of them destined for the United States, which leaves the inference to be drawn that 26,000 remained in Canada, but these figures are totally misleading.

This is a statement made by Mr. Robert Watchorn, the special immigration inspector for the United States. He declares that these figures are totally misleading and gives as his reasons :

> Because of the 26,000 credited to Canada for the time specified, no less than 300 per month were given certificates of admission to the United States in Montreal alone, within less than 30 days of their arrival at the Canadian port.

Yet we are told that we are getting these immigrants in by the ten thousand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. How does that effect the point under discussion ?

Mr. CLARKE. We are bonusing the steamship companies and employing immigration agents to bring these foreigners to Canada, and the hon gentleman points with pride and satisfaction to the increased number coming here ; but if this statement be correct these people only come to Canada because of the great facilities provided to bring them here, and then leave for the United States. They only stay long enough in Canada to get certificates from the American officials which will enable them to go to the United States. Is not that statement worth looking into in order to ascertain whether it is well founded or not? And the hon. minister ought to consider himself indebted to the opposition for drawing his attention to it. The statements I have quoted are very frequently to be found in the newspapers. I am not responsible for them, but would be derelict in my duty if I did not draw the attention of the minister to such statements when they are brought under my notice. I would ask his attention to the statement I have just read, which was evidently made in good faith, and would urge him to investigate and give us the result of his inquiry before the session closes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The trouble with my hon. friend is that he finds a statement somewhere and then draws an inference which it does not justify. He has found the statement made by a United States officer, in which that officer starts out by saying that the official reports of his own department are wholly misleading and incorrect.

Mr. CLARKE. Of the hon. gentleman's department.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, he starts out by saying that the official reports of his own department is wholly incorrect.

Mr. CLARKE. No, he is referring to the hon. gentleman's department. He addressed this letter to the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) and in it he says : 'I have your official reports.' I take that to mean the hon. minister's reports. And he proceeds to say that the reports will bear out the statement which I have just read.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I thought from what the hon. gentleman said that he was referring to the reports of the United States Department. But the inference which the hon. gentleman draws is that we are paying bonuses to steamship companies for immigrants who come to Montreal and then immediately go to the United States. It does not require any investigation to show that that statement is altogether inaccurate. I know it to be utterly unfounded. There is no part of our work which is more carefully supervised than that which relates to the payment of bonuses of that nature. No bonus is paid except to those who take up land and become permanent settlers.

Mr. CLARKE. Does the hon. gentleman say that no investigation is required into the statement made by this American officer?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I say that there is no investigation required into the inference which the hon. gentleman attempts to draw, namely, that we are paying bonuses to persons who land at Montreal and then go to the United States.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a fact that the United States officer has declared that from the Montreal district alone they issue 300 certificates per month to people who have come to Canada, and who, within thirty days after their arrival, get these certificates and go to the United States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We do not pay any bonuses to these people, and we cannot prevent people who land in Montreal or any other Canadian port from going into the United States if they choose.

Mr. CLARKE. But while our returns show that 26,000 aliens came to Canada, the American officer says that such return is entirely misleading, because within thirty days they go to the United States.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister has pointed out that the policy of the United States is to restrict immigration, and therefore they do not grant bonuses to bring immigrants to their shores. We have the opposite policy and do grant bonuses. What system is there by which we know that these men for whom we pay bonuses do not afterwards, almost immediately, go to the United States—say within three months or six months of a year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No bonuses are paid except on the report of an officer in the North-west that the person has become an actual settler. In the case of bonuses upon persons who come from the continent of Europe these bonuses are now paid to what is called the North Atlantic Transportation Company, who are the booking agents. We have a special arrangement with them under which we require that the persons who come through their agency shall each have a certain amount of money, and shall pass the inspection of the department at the port of entry. When these persons become settlers and are so reported upon by the officers of the department in the west, the names are sent on to the department here, the list is checked by the officers and sent on to the office in London and is checked over there. When it is found correct, a cheque for the amount due is sent to the company.

Mr. SPROULE. How long must these immigrants be in the country before the steamship companies are entitled to the bonus ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no fixed period. But when we get the report from the officer that the person has actually become a settler, we pay the bonus.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it only from the west you get information with regard to immigrants brought in for whom you pay a bonus ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If they settle on land anywhere in the Dominion we take means to get a report from some officer of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. But suppose they settle in Ontario, or become labourers in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If they become labourers in Ontario, we do not pay any bonus.

Mr. SPROULE. But if they settled on land in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then, we would take means to get a report upon them.

Mr. SPROULE. Who do you ask for a report in the case of their settling in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We would have to get a report. As a matter of fact, the only place where any of the people have gone upon whom we have paid bonuses, except in the west, is in the northern part of Ontario, along the Canadian Pacific Railway, and in the Rainy River district. We do occasionally get a report and pay a bonus upon these.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that quite a number went into the Lake St. John district and the Mattawa district. From whom does the department get information in cases of settlers in those districts ? Has it special agents whose duty it is to collect that information ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If necessary we would send an officer out there. In most cases, the people go out in charge of an officer, and we would have somebody there to correspond with and from whom to get a report.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the steamship company asked a bonus on 4,000 people settled in Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They would have to send in the names of every person, and every person would have to be located. We do not pay a bonus on a man unless we locate him.

Mr. SPROULE. You have agents hunting up these people all the time ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They have to be located. Of course we cannot put a ball and chain upon them, but we must know who and where they are.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does the department pay per capita for immigrants from the United States ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not recollect at the moment. But my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) has investigated this matter pretty fully, and I have no doubt he could tell.

Mr. WILSON. Three dollars a head.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, I believe we pay $3 for each adult, and so much for each member of the family.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that this be amended by inserting after the word 'Act' in the fifteenth line the following :

Or any Order in Council or proclamation lawfully issued thereunder ; or any person landed for medical treatment who remains in Canada in contravention of such order or proclamation.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask just one question. Is it the intention of the minister to make the steamship companies pay the expense of bringing these immigrants back to the ship's side ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, they do that now.

Mr. CLARKE. No expense to the country ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, and amendments read, and concurred in.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

GAME PRESERVATION ACT.

Bill (No. 117) further to amend the unorganized territories Game Preservation Act. (the Minister of the Interior) read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there any other buffalo in the North-west than wood buffalo ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The only buffalo there are known as wood buffalo.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENTS.

Bill (No. 120) to amend the Dominion Lands Act (the Minister of the Interior) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I explained when this Bill was introduced that its purpose was to make the sales and homestead entries subject to the right of the territorial government to open a road across the lands. At the present time the territorial government is called upon to open a considerable number of new roads, and in some places, owing to the fact that the road allowances cut across ravines it is very expensive to build a road. In many cases they find it necessary to open new roads in lieu of the road allowances. The purpose of the Bill is to make entries and sales subject to the right of the territorial government to have a right of way free of charge over those lands. The territorial government find it a considerable burden to have to settle for right of way for every road that they desire to open up. It is no hardship at all to require persons who buy or enter for homesteads to take them subject to this right. The Bill provides that the amount so taken shall not be more than five per cent of the total. Hon. members will find that the Bill is so drawn that in the eighth line of the first section the words 'heretofore or' would make the land entered for homesteads heretofore subject to this right. That however is not my intention. I do not desire to interfere with any rights now vested, or to interfere with lands for which the homestead entries have already been granted. I move therefore that the words 'heretofore or' in the eighth line be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The law clerk has suggested two or three verbal changes, in accordance with which I move that in line thirteen, before the word 'surveyed' the word 'so' be inserted. It will read then : 'Provided that the aggregate area of the highways to be so surveyed.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the provision has been submitted to the government of the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is done at their request.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The last two lines provide that no such highway shall be of greater width than sixty-six feet. It occurred to me that there might be a possible construction of that which would be awkward. There is no intention to prevent the highway from being wider than sixty-six feet. The intention is, I suppose, that the land may be taken without compensation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The intention is of course that the land taken shall be only sixty-six feet in width. I thought possibly another construction might be put upon it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That might be possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It might be expedient in some cases to have the highway wider than sixty-six feet.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would not have any material effect any way.

2. Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to any grant as to which there is now in existence any contract, agreement or undertaking to or with which a reservation and exception would be repugnant or inconsistent, nor to any grant containing an express declaration that it is exempt from the provisions of the said section.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that this section be amended by inserting after the word 'which' in the third line, the word 'such' and after the word 'exception' in the third line, the words 'as aforesaid.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand the force of this section :

Section 1, of this Act shall not apply to any grant as to which there is now in existence any contract, agreement or undertaking.

Perhaps I do not correctly understand the scope of the legislation, but I think the provision contained here relates to contracts, agreements, and so forth, in the future and not to anything now in existence.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This clause is only put in as a matter of caution. It was suggested by the Department of Justice that there might be lands in respect to which contracts had been made and in which third parties were interested in some way. This provides for a contingency which is not likely to arise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think this section was put in because you have the word 'heretofore' in the first section. If you strike that word out this does not seem to me to have much relevancy.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What the hon. gentleman means is that this applies to nothing except subsequent contracts, because there could not be any contracts, agreements or undertakings now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and it is unnecessary if you strike the word 'heretofore' out of the first section.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will reserve that matter, and take it up again so as to be sure. It sometimes happens that in dealing with legislation in respect to land, there may be something in the mind of the law clerk when he is drafting the Bill that I may forget when we come to deal with the Bill in the House. At the present moment I think the hon. gentleman's suggestion is right, but I do not like to strike out the section without being sure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The last part of the section is necessary, but I should think not the first part.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will let that section stand and come back to it.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The latter portion of the clause is only intended to cover a case in which the declaration is omitted. If a patent should be issued without the express statement that it is subject to this right it would make no difference. The provision in the first part of the section is of course practically directory to the officers of the department, and in pursuance of that it will be the duty of the officers of the department to see that this provision shall be put in every patent. But, suppose it should not be put in the patent, as might happen by mistake, it would not be desirable that this omission should relieve the grant referred to from being subject to this reservation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course the hon. gentleman is responsible for this legislation and I am not, and I do not want to intrude my own ideas on him, but I would think it would be very much simpler to say that the section shall apply unless it is otherwise provided on the face of the grant. When you say that there shall be a declaration upon the face of every grant that section 1 applies to it, and when you also say that it shall make not the slightest difference if the declaration is not there it seems to me likely to result in rather a confused condition of affairs.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A great deal of legislation in respect to Dominion lands is of a character that is directory to the officers of the department, and I think that it is desirable that this clause should be included in the Bill, so as to make it obligatory upon the officers of the department to see that the patent shall contain that declaration. It seems to me, at the same time, however, that if through the neglect or omission of an officer of the department, it would not be desirable to relieve the land from this reservation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman is satisfied with it I will make no objection.

On section 4,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There have been two or three words left out in the printing of the original draft. I beg to move :

That the section be amended by inserting the word 'of' immediately after the words 'section 1' in the thirtieth line and by inserting the words 'as the case may be' after the word 'territories' in the thirty-fifth line—

So that it will read :

The Lieut.-Governor in Council of the province of Manitoba, or of the North-west Territories, as the case may be, may order the

survey and location upon and across any lands comprised in a grant which is subject to the provisions of the said section 1, of any public highway as aforesaid ; and upon its survey and location pursuant to such order, such highway may be opened and used as a public highway, and shall, as well as the land comprised therein, be vested in, and subject to the direction, management and control of, the government of the province or the territories as the case may be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is a section which deals with the title of the highway after it is expropriated. Would it not be better to say that the title is vested in His Majesty ? If you want to bring an action alleging title it would be a little awkward to have to allege that it was in the government of the province, because that is an expression that is perhaps not technically used in the case of alleging title. I merely suggest that after the words 'vested in' you insert the words 'His Majesty', then will follow the other words :

And subject to the direction, management and control of the government of the province or of the territories.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Both expressions are indifferently used in legislation referring to this subject. The words 'government of the province' are defined by the Interpretation Act to mean the representative of the Crown acting in the interests of the province or of the territory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if you like.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that the committee rise and report progress. I want to look carefully into section 2.

Progress reported.

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES ACTS.

Bill (No. 121) further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories (the Minister of the Interior) read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). There has been a question as to whether the legislature of the territories can enact laws with regard to the road allowances which we have handed over to them. Sometimes when they want to open a road they can make a bargain with a farmer to go through his land provided they give him a portion of the old road allowance in return for what he cedes. This is to allow the North-west Territories legislature to transfer the old road allowance.

Bill reported, read a third time, and passed.

ROCKY MOUNTAINS PARK ACT.

Bill (No. 133) to amend the Rocky Mountains Park Act—1887, (the Minister of the Interior), read a second time ; and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This section gives authority to the Minister of the Interior to make regulations with regard to the disposal of timber. It is not desirable to dispose of any timber, and I move that this section be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MONK. There is to be no expropriation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the area of the park as extended ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 4,900 square miles.

Mr. SPROULE. That will be a good sized park. It will be an immense reservoir for game keepers and government employees of all kinds.

Bill reported, read a third time, and passed.

REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons (the Minister of the Interior) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does my hon. friend want the different sections to be read ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not yet had an opportunity of looking over the Bill.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We might go through the sections. I may say that the principle of the Bill is that there shall be one member. I am going to move a section providing the time when the election shall be held. The qualifications and the other provisions are the same as those in the North-west Territories Representation Act. We might go through the different sections without formally reading them, and then let the Bill stand so as to give the hon. gentleman an opportunity of looking over it, and take it up again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be perfectly satisfactory.

On section 7,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I desire to add a section, between section 6 and section 7, as follows :

The first election of a member to represent the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons

shall be held on or before the 1st day of January, 1903.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is a provision here which does not reflect great credit upon the two clergymen whom we have in this House. In subsection 'd' you mention, among those who may not be elected, 'ministers, priests or ecclesiastics of any religious faith or worship.' Has the experience of the hon. minister with reference to those clergymen who have been elected to this House from that western country not been such as to inspire confidence in that class as members ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is only for returning officers. The hon. gentleman surely did not think we were prohibiting clergymen from beeing elected to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. That was my impression. I do not see any more reason why they should not be returning officers.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The idea is that they do not desire to be appointed to that office, and it would not be a proper thing to compel them to accept it if they did not wish it.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. minister consulted them ? How does he know whether they desire it or not ? Why not leave it an open question, and if they do not desire it, they will not be appointed ?

Progress reported.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 124) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1898, (the Minister of Finance) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The object of this Bill is, as I mentioned when I moved it, to enable the government, in case of the death of an officer in the civil service, and there being a small sum of money payable to him under the Civil Service Retirement Act, to pay the money to such member of the family or person concerned as the Governor in Council may determine, instead of obliging the parties to take out letters of administration. Often the sums of money involved are so small that the expense of administration is out of all proportion.

Mr. MONK. Why not make it payable to the legal representatives ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. For the reason which I have just given which, I suppose my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) did not hear—to save the expense of letters of administration. We have similar provisions in another portion of the Act; when an officer retires and is unable for any cause to manage his own affairs, the government may pay the money to some person on his behalf.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems like a very desirable provision in one aspect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think it can hardly be questioned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It has occurred to me whether, if an individual happened to die indebted, the person who received the money ought not to be required to account to the administrators. That might complicate the matter, and, on the whole, perhaps this is desirable.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have had similar provision in the case of other persons. For instance, if an hon. member of this House dies during the session, instead of having the money payable to him as member of the House pass through the general estate, we generally provide that it shall be paid to such member of the family as the Treasury Board may indicate, giving the money to the family instead of the creditors, who, whatever their claims may be, have no such claim as the members of the family.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the particular sum of money is not something to which the party is entitled by virtue of the statute, no question will arise. That is the case in the instance the hon. minister has just mentioned. I am not familiar with the statute, and am not aware of the rights of the party under it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Parliament creates that right and can administer it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, parliament can administer it, and parliament can also get things very much mixed up. However, I have no objection to the measure.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 113) further to amend the Yukon Territory Act and the Acts in amendment thereof (the Minister of Justice), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This would dispense with one police magistrate ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Yes. By the first clause we give to the judges the jurisdiction of the police magistrate, and so we can dispense with one police magistrate.

On section 4, subsection 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This gives an appeal to the Supreme Court ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. At present, there is an appeal from the finding of the Gold Commissioner to the two judges of the Yukon Territory. But there is no appeal from that court in these important matters, and it was found extremely important that there should be an appeal to the Supreme Court in mining cases as in ordinary civil cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Territorial Court in banc is the Court of Appeal from the Gold Commissioner, and this provides that there shall be an appeal from that court to the Supreme Court of Canada ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—DELAY IN PAYMENT OF WORKMEN.

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

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). Before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring a matter to the attention of the Minister of Public Works, and I am sorry the Minister of Labour is not present to hear what I have to say. A letter has just been placed in my hands, dated Ottawa, April 29th :

> Dear Sir,—For God's sake ask the Minister of Public Works when the labourers will be paid. We have not been paid for the month of March yet.

He goes on to say that they are obliged to pay 60 per cent interest on their money, and last year they were four months without being paid. This is a state of affairs which I am sure the Minister of Labour would not permit if he was acquainted with it. In most all the manufacturing establishments of this country they pay their labourers weekly, and I do not know why the government, who pay monthly, should not pay promptly, and not allow the poor labouring men, probably working at $1.20 a day, to run two or three months behind when they have to pay 5 per cent a month on money to pay their rent with.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I think there is only one branch in the Department of Public Works where the men have not been paid promptly, and that is the Rideau Hall branch. The Minister of Public Works is not all powerful in that branch of his department. I think I am right in saying that is the only branch where the employees have not been paid up to date. There are only six or seven of those employees, and if they are too much dissatisfied with the delay and think they can do better elsewhere, there would be no trouble at all in replacing them. I have old employees who have been ten or fifteen years there, and they are very glad indeed to remain. This 60 per cent interest is on the exaggerated lines the hon. gentleman has been indulging in ever since I have had the pleasure of his acquaintance.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is not generous, to say the least, towards those employees for the Minister of Public Works to say that he could replace them at any time. There is no doubt they are in need of money badly, otherwise they would not write as they have. I presume the party who writes the letter is afraid to sign his name for fear of just such consequences as the minister has mentioned. I think the minister should not forget that people receiving a small salary are often in an embarrassed situation, and it is important that they should be paid as promptly as possible.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. People who write anonymous letters are not generally to be trusted. I have found that out every day, as hon. gentlemen have found it out. Employees in the public service who write in that way should be summarily dismissed. If they complained to me I would be very glad to hear them and do what I can for them. I am always easy of access.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. gentleman admit himself that these men have not been paid for a long time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I admit that the seven or eight employees at Rideau Hall have not been paid, on account of circumstances that the hon. gentleman understands very well. We cannot exceed the expenditure voted for this year.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you spent all the money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When we discuss the Rideau Hall items, I will be glad to make a full statement of the case, and to prove that in the past a good deal more money was spent than was voted. We are always afraid to ask for more than the amount necessary. This is a great public establishment, the expenditure on which it is difficult to control.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I think the rule as to anonymous letters suffers an exception in this case, because these parties are probably afraid to reveal their name. But in this case the fact alleged in the anonymous letter is admitted. I have not heard the Minister of Public Works explain why these men have not been paid. Has the credit for that particular object been exhausted ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been exhausted on account of circumstances that the hon. gentleman knows very well. When their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York visited Ottawa we were obliged to spend at Rideau Hall a great deal more money than we had taken an appropriation for.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the hon. gentleman is right in taking that position. Surely if workmen have not been paid, and complain through us to this House, we are not only justified but in duty bound to bring their complaint to the notice of the House. In regard to the particular items mentioned by the minister, it seems to me we have voted every cent of the money required for the expenditure occasioned by the visit of their Royal Highnesses.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will now make a statement which I promise absolutely to keep good, and that is that when we fall short in an appropriation, I will dismiss every man employed in that branch.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the minister need fly into a rage because this subject is mentioned to him in a very calm way. If any one desired to criticise the hon. gentleman it would be very easy to do so. I do not suppose these workmen ought particularly to stand the brunt of the expense of the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to this country. It would have been a very simple thing for the hon. gentleman to come down to the House nearly three months ago, and to have asked for an appropriation to meet that expense and to avoid any difficulty of this kind. It may be that the hon. gentleman in the press of his very numerous engagements, overlooked it. We would be willing to extend to him every consideration, but to become enraged because these men are anxious to get their pay seems to be a very petty piece of business on the part of the hon. gentleman, and one which I would hardly expect from a man of his calibre on most occasions. I trust that the hon. gentleman will see that these men are paid.

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

Department of Railways and Canals, including G. A. Bell at $950, and S. R. Loftus at $950, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $43,100.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item is $1,000 larger than the appropriation last year, due to statutory increases with the exception of two special increases of $50 each.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This item refers to the salaries of the staff of the department here in Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the inside service.

Mr. MONK. What is the object of the provision 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act'?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are giving two allowances of $50 extra to two of the clerks in the department beyond the statutory increase of $50. Of course, we cannot do that without making an exception and withdrawing it from the operation of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MONK. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who has a department where there are many positions offering, to the fact that a considerable number of those who have returned from South Africa are disabled and many of them without positions. I have one at present in my mind who belongs to my own county, who, as a commercial traveller was doing very well, who went to South Africa and lost a leg and who, since his return, of course, is incapacitated for his usual occupation. He, as well as many others, who have returned under analagous circumstances, is rather disinclined to apply for any position to the government. However, I think he did so on one occasion and was informed that not having conformed to the law as respects examination he could not receive a position. I would recommend to the government if possible to entertain any applications coming from disabled soldiers. I think they are entitled to a great deal of consideration and when they do make application I think the fact that they have been through active service and been disabled should entitle them to the particular consideration of the government, as respects the disposition of the law requiring an examination for entrance to the civil service. I think if we had some assurance from the government that the cases of these returned soldiers would receive special attention, probably several of them who are unwilling to undergo the humiliation of a refusal would be tempted to make application. Every day the government is in a position to place civil servants and I think the cases of those who have been disabled in active service in South Africa, and there are quite a few in the country, deserve special consideration from the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There have been two or three instances in which it has been possible for me to consider the circumstances to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) alludes in

connection with the railway service. I am not aware of any applications having been made to the department here, but if such applications were made and the applicants had not passed the examination, of course, there would be a difficulty about entertaining the applications favourably. The Auditor General would require that they should pass the examination. We might have a vacancy which would be available but we could not put a man in unless he had passed the examination required by law.

Intercolonial Railway—Steel rails and fastenings, $600,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item, Mr. Chairman, is to enable us to continue the laying of heavy rails. During the last fiscal year we laid 24½ miles and out of the appropriation for the current year we have laid between 62 and 63 miles.

Mr. BARKER. I desire to ask the hon. minister whether there is included in this item anything for the cost of the rails and the cost of fastenings. I would like also to know how many tons of rails the hon. minister estimates for, and at what price per ton ? I would like to know in the first place if there is anything included for the cost of rails and fastenings.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The rails and fastenings are both included and we provide for 25,000 tons.

Mr. OSLER. At what price ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated price of the rails is $28, and the fastenings $50.

Mr. OSLER. Have these rails been bought under the Clergue contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The rails we have so far during the current year were not obtained under the Clergue contract.

Mr. HUGHES. What is the weight of the rail.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 80 pounds. We expect to get 10,000 tons from Mr. Clergue.

Mr. OSLER. Last year it was intimated that Mr. Clergue would supply these rails whether he manufactured them or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The government did not get the rails from Mr. Clergue in any way. We called for tenders from the English suppliers and their agents and we received the rails from them.

Mr. OSLER. None of the rails under the Clergue contract have yet been supplied.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. OSLER. What steps has the minister taken to fix the price of the rails if he purchases them through Mr. Clergue under the terms of the contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As specified in the contract we will pay the ruling price in the English market. We have not yet settled on the price for the next year. I judge it will be some where in the neighbourhood of the price I have mentioned. The rail supply of the United States is entirely under the control of a trust or combine and they have fixed the price at $28. The English market may show a more favourable figure, but at all events we have the markets of the world opened to us.

Mr. OSLER. Mr. Clergue is the only one you can buy from, and how are you to arrive at the English price.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The iron founders and rail producers have publications which announce, if not daily at all events weekly, what the market price is. If the hon. gentleman goes to the library and looks at the English hardware journals he will find the quotations from week to week.

Mr. OSLER. Surely the minister does not assume that anybody who is buying rails would take the quotations in any of the trade journals as the price he would pay for them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not see why not.

Mr. OSLER. Because these are only nominal quotations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I mean the record of the actual sales.

Mr. OSLER. Oh, no. No one who is buying rails would take these quotations without testing the market to see whether he could not purchase for less. I venture to say that in nine cases out of ten, unless on a rising market, these nominal quotations would not give you an accurate idea of the price. No one would think of buying on these quotations.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman seems to forget that there are records of actual sales which take place from day to day. Of course it would be very proper to verify these by asking for quotations. I suppose the price will remain somewhat stationary because it has been maintained uniform for some months by the rail combine in the United States.

Mr. OSLER. That is quite true. The rail market undoubtedly is very strong and it may be within a month or two rails will jump a dollar or two dollars a ton. What I want to know is how the minister pro-

poses to arrive at the price with Mr. Clergue. Mr. Clergue may come to the minister at a date when these rails are at the highest price and ask to have the price fixed. Unless there is an agreement by both parties as to the date the minister is at a great disadvantage. The chances are that between now and the first of July there may be a spurt in the price of rails for a week or two, if some one gives a large order for immediate delivery. As I pointed out last year, the weakness of the contract is that Mr. Clergue might come to the minister at a date when the price is high and ask to have a price fixed. The minister should agree with Mr. Clergue as to the date on which the price shall be fixed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In a contract covering a term of years we could scarcely agree as to a date, and we might stand a chance of losing rather than gaining by doing so. What I have in my mind to do is this: almost immediately after the vote is passed and parliament has prorogued, we will ascertain what the price is on the English market and then call on Mr. Clergue to renew the contract or to enter into an arrangement for the year to come, because we require to have the rails delivered very promptly. I want to lay as many as we can this year. It will therefore be necessary for us to have an early arrangement with Mr. Clergue. We have to take our chance as to whether the price will be in our favour or not.

Mr. OSLER. The minister proposes to fix the price as soon as this vote is passed?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As soon as possible after the close of the session.

Mr. OSLER. You are going to accept the delivery of the rails from Mr. Clergue as soon as he is able to deliver them?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. OSLER. Are you going to fix the price before you take the delivery of any rails at all?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, before we take any on account of the coming year.

Mr. MONK. In respect to that Clergue contract, I would like to ask the minister if he considers that it is still in force?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. My recollection of it is a little dim since last year, but I think Mr. Clergue was to have begun the execution of the contract this year, and he has failed to do so. Did he ever sign a contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. And he has failed to carry it out. I would like to know how the government stands in respect to Mr. Clergue? Is the contract still in force? Has Mr. Clergue been put in default of furnishing the rails which he should have furnished and which he failed to furnish? Has the government taken any steps to free itself from the contract, which I think was open to considerable doubt as to the time the price of the rails was to be fixed? Also while on my feet, who furnished the rails which were supplied to the Intercolonial Railway last year, and at what price?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As to the first question, the contract between us and Mr. Clergue has not been cancelled. Mr. Clergue encountered difficulties in establishing his plant, which prevented him from delivering last fall the proportion of the rails which the contract called for, and it may be said in a sense therefore that he was in default. But as the contract was entered into for the purpose of encouraging the establishing of a steel rail plant in Canada, I for one, would not think I was called upon to treat the contract in the severe and rigid way in which we would need to treat it if we declared the whole agreement at an end.

Mr. MONK. I do not advocate that. I merely wanted to know if some changes had been made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No changes have been made. The agreement has been executed, and is in existence just as it was presented to parliament last year. We did stipulate with Mr. Clergue that he should consent, without abrogating the contract, to our securing elsewhere the quantity of rails we required to lay in before winter closed in upon us. He agreed to that. He promises to furnish 10,000 tons this year within the time they are required, and he has already commenced to turn rails out at his mill. Last year we got 15,000 elsewhere. From Charles Campbell & Company, through James Watson & Company, of Glasgow, we got 7,000 tons at $25.79, delivered at Mulgrave or Pictou as we required, and 3,000 tons delivered at Montreal at $24.90, and 2,000 tons delivered at Pictou at $25.70. From the Barrow Hematite Steel Company we got 3,000 tons at $25.65.

Mr. MONK. Were these rails furnished by Mr. Clergue under his contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, he had nothing to do with them.

Mr. OSLER. The rails the minister bought last year cost the country about $25.50, or $25.75. If I recollect rightly, the minister was to pay Mr. Clergue $32.60 for the rails he was to buy last year, so that the

country made, on the rails purchased last year, as we contended, about $7 a ton. Is Mr. Clergue still to furnish 25,000 tons a year for 5 years, or do the rails purchased elsewhere last year come off the total quantity of 125,000 tons provided for in the contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is my understanding.

Mr. OSLER. It should not be the understanding of the minister. It should be the knowledge of the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what I say. The 15,000 tons were obtained elsewhere with his consent.

Mr. OSLER. That reduced Mr. Clergue's contract from 125,000 tons to 110,000 tons. There are 10,000 tons of rails which Mr. Clergue should have delivered last year, which were not delivered, and which are to be delivered this year. Is Mr. Clergue to receive $32.60 a ton for these ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should say so under that contract.

Mr. OSLER. It would be a good thing for the country if Mr. Clergue defaulted some more.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not attach any importance to the establishment of the industry.

Mr. OSLER. Does the price of $32.60 hold for the first 25,000 tons Mr. Clergue delivers ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It holds for the 10,000 tons only. That is my view.

Mr. OSLER. Is it Mr. Clergue's view ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not asked him. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. HEYD. Is there a supposed uniformity in all these steel rails made by the different makers, so that when a price is quoted, it is understood to be for the same quality of goods ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Oh, yes; we have a specification to which we require the rails to conform. The margin of difference in the price arises partly from the difference in freight to the places where the rails are delivered. I want to say to the hon. member who has just spoken that it is very difficult for the government to judge what it would be possible for them to do to meet the views of our hon. friends opposite in respect to the encouragement of Canadian industry. We are charged with perpetrating a very great wrong if we go to a foreign country to buy an article, when we can buy it very much cheaper there than at home; and if we buy an article at home, we are told that we could have got it very much cheaper abroad. This makes it a little difficult for us to pursue a course which will commend itself to all our hon. friends opposite.

Mr. OSLER. I wish at once to make it plain that there is not one member on this side who would criticise the government for any possible agreement it might make, which would in any way encourage the manufacture of steel rails or any other commodity in Canada, but we are fairly entitled to criticise the contract which the hon. minister entered into last year. We contended last year that it was a most ridiculous and injudicious one. The hon. minister himself did not know whether he had signed it or not. In fact he said the contract had not been signed, and it turned out to have been signed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was the other way.

Mr. OSLER. That is immaterial. He had forgotten whether he had signed it or not, although it was a contract involving millions of dollars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought I had signed it, and it turned out that I had not.

Mr. OSLER. It is quite immaterial.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of course, quite immaterial.

Mr. OSLER. It was a contract for 125,000 tons, and the minister forgot whether he had signed it or not. We contended that it could not be fulfilled. Up to the last moment the minister contended that it could, and would be fulfilled.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. OSLER. Up to the last moment he expressed the greatest confidence that Mr. Clergue would be able to deliver the rails. He was to begin by the 1st of August.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. OSLER. While we are glad to encourage the manufacture of steel rails and to help on Mr. Clergue or any company that will come to Canada to prosecute that industry, we would like to know how the contract has worked out. 15,000 tons of rails were purchased by the government, but not delivered by Mr. Clergue. That made a saving of $7 per ton. The hon. minister is asked whether that 15,000 tons is to be deducted from the gross amount of Mr. Clergue's contract, and he is uncertain about it. He is asked whether the first delivery of 25,000 tons shall be at the rate of $32.60 per ton, and he says he thinks so, but

is apparently uncertain. He has not even referred the matter to the Legal Department to find out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is desirous, no doubt, of stating the facts most accurately, but he has not succeeded in doing so, for he says that the contract was entered into last year, and that we have in consequence made a loss.

Mr. OSLER. A profit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A profit to the extent of 15,000 tons. He needs to be reminded that the contract was not made last year but two years ago, and made at a time when Mr. Clergue was prepared to undertake to establish a steel rail industry in Canada, but in order to secure the necessary capital for the purpose he required some evidence to show that there would be, at all events, a substantial quantity of rails actually guaranteed, as it were, or for which a market would be available. We may have been wrong as to the desirability of establishing a manufacture of rails in Canada, but if we were it was an error in judgment and an error on the right side; and it was an error which, notwithstanding the extreme condemnation our proposition received from the other side, met with very general acceptance in the country. The prices that were fixed in that contract were the prices current at the time.

Mr. TAYLOR. When was it made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The agreement was entered into, and the Order in Council authorizing the execution of the contract made in the month of August 1900.

Mr. TAYLOR. Just before the elections.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My hon. friend has elections on his mind and cannot shake them off. I do not see any reason why because an election is pending, the whole business of the country should be suspended. But my suspicious friends opposite connect the idea of an election with every transaction, even when that transaction takes place a year before or a year after. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has been busy trying to prove that although certain things took place two or three months after the election, they took place in view of that election. Well, we are conscious of absolute rectitude and can afford to treat with a great deal of indifference the criticisms of my hon. friends. We were serving the interests of the public, and I believe it will be found to have worked out to the advantage of the Dominion. The establishment of these mills at Sault Ste. Marie will be recognized as one of the best things which the government has been instrumental in securing. When my hon. friend talks about a difference of $7, I hope he will realize that it is very well to talk of what the prices were a year or two years after the arrangement was made, when we know that these things are liable to variation. My hon. friend will not be vocal in praising my first purchase of rails. I made a purchase of 20,000 tons. It is true they were purchased in the United States. We could make a better arrangement in the United States than in England, as we ascertained when we called for tenders. We bought the rails at a price, to be delivered some months afterwards, and when the time for delivery came, we could have made $5 or $6 a ton, the price having gone up. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to realize that a government, like a private individual, must take these risks. The rails must be bought in quantities before they can be used, and one must take the chances of what the market will be at the time of delivery.

Mr. OSLER. My recollection is that, last year we showed that the price was $25 a ton at the time——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sure you did not.

Mr. OSLER. We will look at the record in 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman gave some figures about prices after the arrangement was made.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) last session dealt with the prices at the time of the contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will look at the prices at the time when the Order in Council was passed, he will see that he is mistaken. The arrangement made with Mr. Clergue was committed to the form of an Order in Council, and, when that was passed, Mr. Clergue was advised of the fact. The contract was not signed—it was not even drawn up—for some time afterwards. But that did not make any difference for we were bound, and so was Mr. Clergue, and we did not think it necessary to rush the preparation of the papers.

Mr. OSLER. I think we can prove pretty conclusively that the price of rails was $25 a ton at that time.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think the hon. gentleman will not be able to confirm that concerning the time when the negotiations took place and the arrangement was made. That was early in July, I think.

Mr. OSLER. To avoid possible future claims from Mr. Clergue, I think it would be well for the minister to have an interpretation of the contract now. For, unless he knows more about it than he did last year, there is a very good chance of his

ideas being wrong. The contract, as I recollect it, might be fairly construed, as a contract for 125,000 tons. I think that the minister should see to it that there is no uncertainty about this matter. I do not find the statement in 'Hansard' with respect to prices that I expected to find.

Mr. MACLEAN. The case as I recollect it, was something like this: In 1900 the government made some secret arrangement with Mr. Clergue. The arrangement was based upon protectionist principle, but it was made at a time when they were appealing to the people as a free trade government. We on this side who are protectionists do not object to a protectionist measure on the part of the government, but we do object to their unbusinesslike way of carrying it out. The hon. minister cannot give an explanation now, that makes the matter clear. He will not justify this contract on the ground of encouraging a home industry but has got it all muddled up. He cannot give a clear-cut interpretation of what the arrangement really is. According to my recollection, we were promised last year that we were to get a new rail made of nickle steel. I would like to know if the rails that are being delivered are of this superior character?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am sorry that I am not endowed with the capacity for elucidation possessed by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). But I fear that the committee will have to take me as I am. I can assure the hon. gentleman that there was no secrecy about the arrangement. I think we were all rather proud of it. I know I felt that it was not by any means an arrangement that required to be apologized for. I took occasion to speak of it upon the platform, and I understood that some of my colleagues did so also. And we did not put it upon protectionist ground either. This is not a question of protection at all.

Mr. BARKER. The Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson) defended it on that ground.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) mentioned it in the campaign, I do not know on what grounds he commended it. But the bargain was a very good one, because we bought at the price which was ruling when we made the agreement, though the price did subsequently fall. When my hon. friend speaks of $25 a ton he speaks of what took place months after the arrangement was made. But we could not go back on the arrangement because of the fall in the market. As an honourable man, my hon. friend would not have done so had he been at the head of the department. Mr. Clergue had made it a condition of getting the rail mill in operation, and my hon. friend would be one of the last men in parliament who would go back on a fair, clear understanding. Yet the hon. gentleman criticises us because we did not do a thing which he himself would regard as dishonourable. I think that is carrying a political critical view of things rather far.

Mr. OSLER. I do not think any member on this side of the House for a moment suggests that the government should go back on their bargain with Mr. Clergue. We are criticising the minister for the bargain he made, and that is our right to do. It is not fair that the Minister of Railways and Canals should put into our mouths statements that we want to repudiate a bargain that the country made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If that is the case, why does he quote prices that did not rule until long after the bargain was made? He goes back to the time when we made the arrangement with Mr. Clergue. I recollect that the Order in Council did not pass until some time after this arrangement was made, but the arrangement existed all the same. Why does the hon. gentleman quote prices that ruled subsequently?

Mr. OSLER. My recollection is that there was a combination of the American manufacturers, and a nominal rise in prices to $31 and $32 a ton. At the time that the minister made his bargain the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railway companies bought rails at $25 a ton

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mackenzie & Mann told me they paid as high prices as we paid.

Mr. OSLER. I am not talking about Mackenzie & Mann. The minister at the time taunted me in the House with making a statement without a knowledge of the facts. I gave the facts, and the figures, and the dates, at the time that contract was made, running over nearly a month.

Mr. HEYD. Did not the minister also state that contract was brought before the House, that one of the reasons why the government made it was to induce the Clergue industry to start a steel rail plant in this country? And would they have started that steel rail plant had not this contract been given?

Mr. MACLEAN. It is a fact that the Order in Council was a secret order made in August, 1900, and the existence of that Order in Council was not made public until the discussion in this House last year. The minister stated that the reason he made this contract was that he wished to encourage home industries, but at the time he did not take the public into his confidence, and when he went to the country he said that he was not doing anything at the time. It was only brought out twelve or fourteen months after he made this contract, as he said, with that public object in view.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman is altogether mistaken. In speaking at Sault Ste. Marie during that campaign, I myself, stated publicly that we had come to an agreement with Mr. Clergue. I made the same statement in the city of Montreal on two or three occasions. The fact was made known during the campaign itself.

Mr. MONK. I am disposed to let by-gones be by-gones with regard to that contract. But I think it was demonstrated at the time that we were paying $32.60 a ton, a great deal more than we should have paid, even conceding the point, which I am disposed to concede, that we should encourage home industries, and that, other things being equal, we should pay dearer at home for rails rather than go abroad for them. But the point I was trying to elucidate was this: What steps did we take when we found out that Mr. Clergue could not carry out his contract? Did we consult the Department of Justice to find out whether we could get out of that part of the contract by which we were bound to pay $32.60 for those rails—an exorbitant price when you consider that both the province of Ontario and the Dominion of Canada were paying a bounty to Mr. Clergue? Now, the minister demonstrated the fact that we were offering to pay too high a price upon the purchase of rails last year. We have not bought from Mr. Clergue, and we have realized an economy of over $100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We would have realized an economy by not buying anything from him.

Mr. MONK. As Mr. Clergue was in default in fulfilling the terms of our contract with him, it seems to me we were free to discuss the question of price with him again; yet at this moment the Minister of Railways and Canals comes back and asks us for $600,000, the most of it for new rails; and as I understand the contract, Mr. Clergue can come to us to-morrow and tender the rails we require at that exorbitant price of $32.60. That is the position as I understand it. It is regrettable that the Minister of Railways and Canals did not avail himself of Mr. Clergue's inability last year to supply us with rails, to discuss a new conditions of the contract, and to make new terms which would be less onerous to this country.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me one of the plainest business propositions that when Mr. Clergue agreed to supply last year 25,000 tons at a particular price and failed to deliver them, we are not bound to take any of that quantity this year. Surely any business man knows that. He agreed to deliver 25,000 tons at a certain price last year, and another 25,000 tons this year at the market price of this year. The government had to buy 15,000 tons elsewhere last year, and now the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Clergue will be allowed to deliver 10,000 tons this year at the price of last year's contract, which is away above the present price. The minister entered into that contract and agreed to give $32.60, although the market price at the time he made the contract was $25.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg your pardon.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) stated it in this House, and quoted prices that he obtained from the Canadian Pacific Railway at the very time when the Minister of Railways and Canals made that contract for $32.60 a ton. What was the answer of the Minister of Railways and Canals? Why, this was done to encourage manufactures in Canada. The government was to give $7 a ton more than the market price at that time. The hon. gentleman forgot, as I pointed out to him last year, that in addition to the $32.60 per ton, the country was giving a bonus of between $6 and $7 on the manufacture of the steel in this country. According to that, Mr. Clergue was to get $32.60 from the Minister of Railways and Canals and between $6 and $7 as a bonus from the Dominion and the province of Ontario. That was the position. We were to give about $39 a ton for these rails when they could have been bought for $25. All these facts I think are clearly found in the 'Hansard.' The Minister of Railways and Canals had a different statement to make to us every time this question was up. Now what was the original story? I recollect it as well as if it was yesterday. The hon. gentleman began his negotiations first when this House was sitting. His excuse for not laying the negotiations before the House was that it was towards the end of the session, the House was busy, and he did not wish to lay them before the House. At that time the price at which Mr. Clergue offered to supply these rails was $32 per ton, but, after the House prorogued, Mr. Clergue and the hon. minister met, and although he admitted that there had been no change in the market price of rails, the hon. minister increased the price to $32.60 per ton.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was for delivering them down on the road.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman was asked if there had been any change in the market price of rails between the time he received the offer from Mr. Clergue during the sittings of the House and after the meeting with Mr. Clergue in June and he said that he had allowed him 60 cents per ton extra because Mr. Clergue thought he ought to have it. That is what the hon. minister said. In that way the hon. minister in a moment agreed to give $15,000 more for the 25,000 tons of rails than Mr. Clergue had

offered to supply them for. Then, later than August, very close to the end of parliament —I think it was as late as October—an Order in Council was passed authorizing a contract for 25,000 tons at $32.60 a ton and for 100,000 tons more, at the market price, for the following four years. The hon. gentleman had agreed to pay the very large price of $32.60 per ton for 25,000 tons and Mr. Clergue was not able to deliver one ton. It is quite true that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment), who intervened in the debate last year, stood up in the House and told us that he had just been up at the Soo and that everything was in readiness to deliver the rails and that delivery would begin in August. We have heard to-day that you are not a bit further advanced. The hon. gentleman had to buy 15,000 tons and he was able to get them at $26 a ton instead of being obliged to pay $32.60. He seems to think that he is to dole out the money of this country at will. The gentleman who failed to comply with his contract and who has not delivered one ton of the 25,000 tons is to be treated as if he had complied with his contract, and he is to get $32.60 a ton now when the hon. gentleman admits that he is able to buy rails at between $25 and $26 a ton. I wonder if the hon. gentleman thinks, that, in his own behalf, he would pay, or that on behalf of any other person, he would be justified in paying out money in this way. What does the hon. gentleman say? He wants a vote from this House for 25,000 tons of rails. He says he is going to pay $32.60 per ton for 10,000 and $28 per ton for the remainder. That would amount to $746,000 for rails alone, and the same item of the estimates includes fastenings at $50 a ton. How is the hon. gentleman going to pay for these 25,000 tons of rails which come to $746,000, besides a lot of fastenings when he is only asking for $600,000. That shows that these estimates are perfect nonsense. Where is the reason in submitting such an estimate as that to anyone who understands business and who knows what he is talking about? The hon. gentleman stands up and tells us that he proposes to buy 25,000 tons of rails this year, that he is going to pay $32.60 per ton for 10,000 and $28 per ton for 15,000 tons and he only asks $600,000 to pay for them. How he is going to pay for these rails out of this $600,000 and pay for the fastenings as well, is something that I think requires a little more explanation.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I was unfortunately not in the House when the discussion upon this subject opened. As to what is the proper price to be paid for rails during the current year, that is a subject on which I do not care to offer any opinion, not having been present when the discussion began, but I dissent entirely from the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) as to the arrangement which was made last year. It was not such an arrangement as the hon. gentleman described.

Mr. BARKER. I am speaking from the debate.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Like the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I have to confess that my recollection of this matter is a little dim, because I have not had occasion of late to deal with the subject. My recollection is that at an early stage of the season—I forget at what particular date—Mr. Clergue discussed with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair), on behalf of the government, the question of assisting the starting of this Canadian enterprise by giving an order for rails. It was discussed with various members of the government, but chiefly with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals as his department was more particularly concerned, and it was agreed that an order should be given to Mr. Clergue for a quantity of rails at the then market price, whatever that market price was. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) shakes his head, but I want to insist in this respect that my recollection is right. It was agreed that the rails should be taken at the market price when the arrangement was made and Mr. Clergue was so informed and it was so understood. But, it so happened that that was not expressed in a report of the hon. minister until a little later, and that the report of the minister was not expressed in an Order in Council until a little later. Hon. gentlemen make their comparisons as to the price of rails at the date of the passing of the Order in Council, and say that the price was too high, because, in the meantime rails had dropped in price. But it is necessary to remember that the price agreed upon, or the price at which the rails were contracted for, was the price of the market at the time the arrangement was made. It was a fair price, and the fact that rails subsequently dropped in price is something that might occur in any transaction.

Mr. BARKER. There was no drop between June when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals made a contract at $32.60 and the time at which the Order in Council was passed.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My impression is that the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken on that point. What the government meant to do and what it understood it was doing was to give Mr. Clergue the benefit of an order at the market price at the time, which was a fixed price—of course you could ascertain the existing market price—and to bargain that for a period in the future he should have further orders at the market price prevailing at the time of manufacture. As to the bounty my hon. friend mixes that up very unfairly

with the arrangement. The bounty has nothing to do with it. If Mr. Clergue makes steel ingots he will get any bounty that is given by the government for the manufacture of steel ingots. He gets the bounty whether he makes rails or not. If the hon. Minister of Railways were buying steel rails he would have no difficulty in buying them from Mr. Clergue or anybody else at the market price and the bounty would have nothing to do with it whatever. So far as the hon. gentleman imports the bounty into the matter, it is unfair because it has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BARKER. What I contend is that the bounty satisfies all questions that have been raised as to encouraging manufacture in this country.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, the bounty satisfies that portion of it and after giving the bounty we are entitled to buy the rails at the market price.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been granting a bounty on iron and steel for a number of years but we have not had a rail manufactured in Canada up to the present time, unless Mr. Clergue is now turning them out. Therefore, as the bounty on iron and steel has not created the industry of manufacturing steel rails, something more is necessary. We have been paying an iron and steel bounty for the last ten or fifteen years and we have not yet had a rail made in Canada. It is an advanced process of manufacture. Therefore, the object of this government in making the contract was not merely to continue something that had already existed under the bounty, but to create another stage of manufacture, to carry the process further, and to bring about the manufacture of steel rails. I think that was a fair statement. My hon. friend will see that when he says the bounty was enough to create the industry of rail manufacturing, experience has shown that he is mistaken.

Mr. BARKER. Does the Minister of Finance pretend that the Minister of Railways and Canals has the right to increase the price of rails in order to encourage their manufacture. Is that within the functions of the minister.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I contend that the minister had no right to do so and did not do so. Mr. Clergue was the only intending manufacturer of steel rails in Canada, and we agreed with Mr. Clergue, irrespective of the bounty, to buy a quantity of rails at the market price at the time the arrangement was made. That was the basis of the contract, and that is what the Minister of Railways and Canals says he intended to do, and that is what he did do. The fact that the rails afterwards dropped in price proves nothing. In all commercial transactions the man who buys takes the risk of the price dropping, and if it does drop he may be sorry he bought so much, but that is a risk common to every one.

Mr. OSLER. From 'Hansard,' Vol. 2, 1901, page 3,572, I find the following :

Mr. OSLER. The last time this item was discussed, the Minister of Railways laid what we all supposed was the contract on the Table. He defended that contract from one end of it to the other as a contract in the interests of the country. He said the price was good and favourable, that it was the lowest price at which the rails could be purchased. He stated that the general opinion was that rails were not on a falling market, but on a rising market. Now, as it happens, at that time there had been a large sale of English rails, English manufacturers had not been able to overtake the demand, and consequently they were not selling further rails. In the States production had overtaken the demand, consequently the rails were steadily falling. In the States rails had fallen within two months from $35 to $26 a ton, at the date on which the minister made this contract, he paid $7 a ton more than the price for which he could have got rails. Now, as Liberal-Conservatives and as protectionists, there is no reasonable limit to which we on this side of the House would not go to establish and protect a steel industry in this country. The difference between the two parties is that the Liberal-Conservatives would have made this contract openly, and adopted it as part of their policy. The government made this contract secretly, they covered up their contract and did not want the country to know it. There is the clearly defined difference between the two parties. Now let me show you that our contention was right as to the prices, and that the minister made his contract in a falling market. The price of manufactured pig iron in Canada during July, and up to the 28th of August, delivered at the Hamilton furnace, was $23 a ton; from the 28th of August to the 20th of September, it was $20 a ton ; from the 20th of September onwards to October, and to the end of the year, it was $18 a ton ; and to-day it is about $17 a ton. So there is a difference as between $23 and $17 a ton for the raw material. The price of rails in England kept up for some time, but no English rails were sold on this continent because American rails were bought, the price being so much lower.

There is my direct statement as to the price of these rails on a certain date.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When was that.

Mr. OSLER. The date on which the contract was made. There was a discussion on this subject later on and from the 'Hansard' of May 15th page 5,235, I quote the following :

Mr. OSLER. That is quite natural. You could not make a contract to-day for rails for present delivery.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For delivery in the autumn, in this season.

Mr. OSLER. Certainly, no one will make a contract now, or in the beginning of June, for rails to be supplied in July, August or September. But when we were discussing the matter the contract could have been made for much less.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am glad to get that acknowledgment from the hon. gentleman, because not only he, but a dozen members on the other side pointed to the present price and said we were paying $7 more than we should.

Mr. OSLER. But the minister will find that all the statements were regarding a contract made in October, the prices were then stated on this side of the House, and it was shown that he made the contract for $7 a ton more than rails could be bought for then. You cannot go into the market to-day and buy rails for delivery a month or two months hence; it would be an absurdity.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I ask the hon. gentleman to turn up what he himself said on that subject in this House, and he will find that the criticism he made upon this transaction was to the effect that you could buy rails in the United States to-day for $26 per ton.

Mr. OSLER. At the time the contract was made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the time the hon. gentleman made the statement he said the price was $26 a ton. He is not willing to go back to a date at the time when this arrangement was made with Mr. Clergue in the month of August. He has to come down to the month of November before he will find the price quoted in the United States below the price I have named. He will find, if he chooses to look at the published reports in the trade papers, what steel rails were quoted for at those dates. To-day, he has to pay $28 a ton, and I do not believe he could get delivery in any part of this season. I do not care what portion of the season he chooses. Up to the close of navigation he cannot get a contract for delivery at the works of any of the companies at less than $28 a ton. I do not think he can get it at $28 a ton, because an offer made to the Grand Trunk Railway Company for 50,000 tons at $28 a ton ten days ago was withdrawn because the price is going up.

Mr. OSLER. Two days before I made the statement in this House I had seen a contract made by the Canadian Pacific Railway at $25 a ton for steel rails delivered in Montreal this year.

I distinctly stated, and I state again, that at the time the minister made that contract he made it at $7 a ton more than the price of rails in the United States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) is entirely mistaken. If he means to refer to the date the contract was drawn and sent forward for execution it might be the case, or even when the Order in Council was passed, but my recollection entirely agrees with the Minister of Finance. That the agreement in effect was made anterior to the drawing up of the Order in Council, and even somewhat anterior to the sending of the report to council.

Mr. OSLER. When was the agreement made.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it was made in June, but at all events when my recollection was fresh on the matter I stated to the House when the agreement was made. My hon. friend confirms the very fact which I am trying to impress upon the committee when he reads the statement that there was a variation in the price of rails which were $35 a ton and in two months fell to $26. I say that the price was not $35 at the time this arrangement was entered into with Mr. Clergue, but I do say that the sterling price in the English market was over six pounds and under six pounds ten shillings. I brought it into parliament last year but of course hon. gentlemen would not look at it. They were bound to condemn whatever the effects might be, it was their business to do so I suppose; probably it is a legitimate part of the game. If hon. gentlemen opposite can succeed in convincing people that there was something crooked in the transaction they are entitled to it. I read from the 'Trade Review' and the journal quotations as to the sale of rails on the English market which the hon. gentleman admits himself stood firm for a long time, and that these prices were not lower at the time this arrangement was made than the prices we paid. If the hon. gentleman cares to look up 'Hansard' he will find that.

Mr. OSLER. The price of rails on the English market was seven or eight dollars a ton more than in the United States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the English market we agreed to be bound by all through as the fairest market.

Mr. OSLER. My goodness; why in the world should the minister bind himself by a market that was $7 a ton higher than the United States market. He might as well say that he would be bound by the price in the Chinese market. I made the statement here and I was not contradicted by the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not contradicting the hon. gentleman now, but I say that the hon. gentleman is taking the wrong date.

Mr. OSLER. I am taking absolutely the date that the contract was made and that is a fact to my own knowledge. I am taking the date on which the minister said the contract was made, and I have quoted statements which were made in this House, and not denied by the minister or any one else.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not deny them now.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister state why he wants to pay this year $32.60 per ton for 10,000 tons, which Mr. Clergue is obliged to deliver at the market price in England to-day ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not say that the government had decided to pay any such price. I have stated what I thought would be fair and reasonable, and I still think so, seeing the object we had in view in starting the industry. But whatever price will be paid is a matter that will have to be considered and decided in council.

Mr. OSLER. Well, that is accepting the statement I made that the minister does not know anything about it, and that the matter is still under discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it gives the hon. gentleman any comfort at all, I will make him a present of it.

Mr. OSLER. That is just what we want to get—that the matter is still to be decided in council, and that Mr. Clergue will get the best end of the stick, as he has done so far.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose I might treat that contract as absolutely thrown over, and say to Mr. Clergue that he could do as he liked ; but that is something which I cannot do, which I have no power to do as one individual member of the cabinet; and the matter will no doubt be disposed of by the government at the proper time when the question arises. It has not arisen yet.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman is aware that this one item makes a difference of $70,000; so that I think it demands a little attention from the minister and the government. I still call the minister's attention to the fact that he is buying for this year 25,000 tons of rails, which, according to his estimate, will cost $746,000. He is also asking for a large number of fastenings which will cost $50 a ton, and he is only asking $660,000 for both. I ask him how many tons of rails and how many tons of fastenings he is getting ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimate is 25,000 tons of rails at $28 a ton, and 4,020 tons of fastenings, at $50 a ton, and the cost of relaying the rails.

Mr. BARKER. That is labour. This item is for steel rails and fastenings, and I want to know what they are going to cost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The statement is $901,000.

Mr. BARKER. That includes maintenance items, whereas this is a capital expenditure. How much under capital does he propose to pay for steel rails and fastenings ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say the estimate is $901,000 for the rails and fastenings, and we credit the old rails at $15 a ton and the fastenings at $20 a ton, amounting to $361,075. Take that from $901,000 and you get the $600,000.

Mr. BARKER. That brings up the question we discussed the other day, and I propose to move that this capital expenditure be brought down to a proper footing. I have contended in this House that the ordinary rule as to charges for capital should govern the book-keeping of the hon. gentleman. The rule is that he can charge to capital account only the increased weight of the rails he lays on the track. The hon. gentleman is laying, I understand, an 80-pound rail, and taking up a 67-pound rail. If so, he is entitled to charge to capital account only 13 pounds of steel. The rest is a maintenance item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose the hon. gentleman hardly expects to invite a repetition of the discussion we had on this question. The hon. gentleman who was Minister of Railways preceding myself admits that it is simply rubbish to talk about capital in connection with this matter. You have to put down rails, you will not have the earnings to do it out of, and how does it become any more capital charged in this way than it would if charged in any other way, when it has to be paid either out of the surplus income of the year or out of bonds if there is not a surplus ? How are we to get the appropriation ? We have to put down the rails. I would not mislead parliament by saying that we are going to have surplus enough to meet that out of the earnings. If I do not ask it out of capital, how am I going to get it ? It simply means that you cannot do what is necessary to be done on the Intercolonial Railway at all unless you do it in this way.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister says that the hon. ex-Minister of Railways said it was all nonsense. I say he never said anything of the kind. He agrees entirely with the contention I make, that the only charge to capital that the hon. gentleman can rightly make is the increased weight of the rail he puts on the track. The hon. gentleman asks what difference does it make ? The difference is that when he makes the proper charge for revenue, we know whether he is operating the road at a profit or not. We want to know that the hon. gentleman keeps his account correctly, that is all. The hon. gentleman has actually been charging to capital account the labour of replacing the rails on the track. Surely that must stop if we are ever to know whether the hon. gentleman is working the road at a profit or not. He has

told us that he is charging some amount, $50,000 for labour in this item. Last year he charged $200 a mile for the labour of putting down new rails in the place of old. But that is a maintenance charge, just as much a working expense as the wages of conductors and foremen. He asked what difference it makes, as he has not the revenue. Well, he had not the revenue to pay the $488,000 last year which he was short. What did he do ? He had to admit it was a deficit and added it to the debt of the country. He can do the same with this item and show us what the deficit really is.

I move that item No. 122 'steel rails and fastenings, $600,000' be reduced to $200,000. That is more than the amount which he is entitled to charge against capital. The balance of the $600,000 he can charge against maintenance, after deducting the value of the old rails taken up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not underestimate the importance of having a true line of division between revenue and capital account, but I venture to say the public at large will not attach the same importance to it as my hon. friend does. The public will take the rather practical view of the matter that the expenses of the railway whether we call them capital or income account, have to be met by a general charge on the public treasury, and whether you charge the item in one or another column is not a matter of very great importance, so far as the public is concerned. They have a habit of dealing with what Mr. Mantilini calls 'the demnition total.' And if the money is faithfully expended if there be no charge of malfeasance and the works are useful, the public at large are not deeply concerned as to whether a particular item is charged to capital or income.

Mr. BARKER. Why not be correct if it makes no difference ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It would be quite impossible, in the case of a railway under the circumstances of the Intercolonial Railway to carry out in every respect the views my hon. friend has expressed. As a matter of book-keeping it is desirable that there should be a broad distinction between revenue and capital, and I suppose that in the case of private companies it is essential the line of distinction should be clearly drawn. No doubt a company would every year lay aside a certain portion of its earnings in order to create a fund for the purpose of maintaining the road, and then, when it became necessary to renew the rails or do anything of that nature, there would be a fund available, which could be drawn on without touching the capital. But there is no such condition on the Intercolonial Railway. Without attempting to find fault with the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, as a matter of fact, when the present Minister of Railways took office, the railway was in a somewhat run down condition. At all events it was not up to date. It was not up to the conditions of a modern railway. It was just about then that the conditions of railroads on the continent of America began to experience a very material change. It was discovered that it was necessary to have better roadbeds, heavier rails and better grades and curvatures, larger engines—entirely different conditions from those which formerly prevailed. The Minister of Railways had to do one of two things. Either let the railway go down and fall back in the race, or meet these new conditions by providing the money. Since there was no fund available, my hon. friend had to draw his provision from capital or not at all. I do not see any means of getting over that. Is my hon. friend to be told that the large expenditures rendered necessary in order to improve the road and buy new engines and all that were to be paid out of the earnings ? My hon. friend knows that that is impossible. There is no other fund created, no reserve fund on which he could draw, and he had to get this money and charge it up to capital or go without it.

Mr. OSLER. It is rather surprising to hear the Minister of Finance tell us that it is quite immaterial whether you charge expenditure against revenue or against capital.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman might as well be accurate, I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. OSLER. I think that what the Minister of Finance said was that the money had to be provided, and it made no difference whether you charged it to capital or revenue. Let us see where the difference is. I say it is vital. This is a public work belonging to the people, and the Minister of Railways is just as much bound to show to the public exactly what it costs to operate and own that railway as are the directorate of any private company to show their shareholders the exact profit or losses. If we were to accept the theory of the Minister of Finance, we could make that railway show a profit of a million or two million dollars, by simply charging sufficient expenditure against capital account to produce that result. That would not make any difference to the treasury in the end, but the country is entitled to know exactly what really is the result of operating the road. I quite agree that when there is a very rapid increase of business, which causes additional expenditure, you must charge a portion of the expenditure to capital, but it is absolutely fallacious to cook the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway and make it appear that road is being operated at a profit, when instead it is being operated at an enormous loss.

The accounts last year showed that the loss on the Intercolonial Railway was about half a million dollars, whereas, if the accounts had been kept properly they would have shown a loss of twice, or, perhaps, three times that amount. I say that, in the interest of the country the accounts should be kept properly, so that the people may know exactly what it costs to own and run the railway. Let us not make the mistake of believing we are operating the road on a paying basis when, as a matter of fact, we are adding to the debt of the country by millions of dollars. Operating it for the benefit of the country we may operate it indirectly at a profit, but we ought to know what it costs us in the ordinary railway sense to own and operate the road. I am surprised that anybody, above all the hon. Minister of Finance, should advocate any other course.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I presume that my hon. friend, as a public man, has been watching for many years the manner in which the Intercolonial Railway has been managed in this regard. I presume that when his friends were in power, he saw that appropriations were being asked for on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, year after year, for the same class of expenditures as we are asking for to-day.

Mr. BARKER. Not for steel rails.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot see that there is so great a difference in this respect between steel rails and rolling stock that one rule should be applied to one and a different rule to the other. My hon. friends never thought that the books were being kept wrong by their friends. They have only discovered that the books are wrong with the change of government, and now what they approved of for many a year they condemn. One cannot resist the conclusion that, with hon. gentlemen opposite, it makes a great difference whose animal is being gored. What was right for them is wrong for me. I would like to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) how an expenditure of say $4,000,000 required in the interests of the railway should be secured? Would he be prepared to justify me in making an appropriation of $4,000,000 more on revenue account? We have obtained a grant of $5,000,000 for operating expenses. If I came to parliament and asked for $9,000,000 for operating expenses, would the hon. gentleman approve it? If I told him I was going to buy locomotives and cars and put down more rails, would he regard that as a justification? By no means. He would condemn it in unmeasured terms and would say that we had no business to ask for money for these purposes under the head of operating expenses. And I quite agree with him. As we have not the money on hand, where is it to come from? It can only be by an appropriation on capital account. The other night the hon. ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) not seeing where his argument was landing him, told us with the utmost seriousness that the capital expenditure by this government on the Intercolonial Railway was $22,000,000. In this he was actually giving a complete answer to my hon. friend's arguments, though without intending it. What was his (Hon. Mr. Haggart's) contention? He said that we had spent $22,000,000 on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. On a previous occasion he had said that we had spent $23,000,000 in this way. And how did he make it out? Why, by adding the deficits to the expenditure on capital account making the whole expenditure up to about $21,200,000.

Mr. BARKER. He added the deficits to the government's capital expenditure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He called it capital expenditure in effect. He did not say that it was technically capital expenditure, of course. The effect of his argument was to support the point I have been making and to answer the speeches of my hon. friends.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister asks how he could get this appropriation except by the way he suggests. I think I can show him with the utmost ease. If he will turn to item 268, which was passed at his instance the other night, he will find that he has taken an estimate for his working expenses, including maintenance, for the coming year of $5,500,000. But the hon. gentleman does not put all these expenses in here. He can just as easily make that $6,000,000 as make it $5,500,000. As the Finance Minister practically admits, the hon. gentleman is charging to capital, items that are really maintenance charges. The Finance Minister says that it does not really make any difference and that it would be inconvenient to charge them. Let the hon. Minister of Railways put the whole truth into these items, and then we shall understand what he is doing and know what his deficit really is. He has been saying for the last four or five years that his deficits are so much or so little. But he has never shown the public the whole truth. Last year, he did not show half his deficit. As the hon. member for West Toronto has said, under the system now pursued, the hon. minister can make his deficit as much or as little as he likes, or he can create a surplus if he likes. Surely, the public do not want accounts kept in that way. Unless we have the accounts kept properly, we shall never know whether this or any minister is earning a profit or making a loss. That is the object of keeping the accounts properly. The hon. gentleman cannot be even compared with himself, that is, one year of his working cannot be compared with another, because he charges to capital

what he pleases during one year, and arbitrarily charges as he wills in another year. The hon. gentleman says: What about the rolling stock? I admitted the other day that the moment the hon. gentleman added one car or one locomotive to the original stock he could charge that to capital. Nobody says anything to the contrary. He has got to maintain his original stock out of maintenance, and everything he adds to his original stock he is entitled to charge to capital. He can charge as much as he likes to capital, providing he is adding to his stock and adding to the line. When I asked the question of Mr. Pottinger the other day as to the propriety of charging the whole of this to capital, his answer was a very simple one: Why should I object as long as parliament grants the money?

Mr. OSLER. When these gentlemen get into a corner and are hard pressed for an answer their argument invariably is, well, your party did the same thing before we came into power. Now, I for one have not got the sins of the Conservative party before 1896 on my shoulders, and I think there are many new members in this House in the same position. I for one, in my innocence and in my foolishness, thought that in many ways the present government were going to be an improvement on the Conservative government. I find that I was entirely mistaken. I must say at once that I do not propose to accept that answer to any argument that I make. It is the school boy reply, You're another, that should not be used in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The general public is interested in knowing what the Intercolonial Railway has cost. We have had a good deal of controversy over it during the last few years. Hon. gentlemen opposite have contended that there was a surplus when in reality there was none. I think there ought to be some system followed by both sides under which the people of the country would know the exact state of the case. The present government contended that the system followed by their predecessors was wrong, and now we find them going still further in the same direction. We should endeavour to discover some system by which the people will understand whether the Intercolonial is a paying scheme or not.

Item voted; nays, 21; yeas, 56.

To increase accommodation at Sydney, $77,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The appropriation which we are asking for under this head is to enable us to establish car and machine shops, store buildings, to put in machinery and tools for boilers, to arrange for water service, and to provide for an addition to the track yard. Sydney is becoming a very important point, and is really the center and headquarters of the service in Cape Breton. We require to be able to repair our plant whenever that becomes necessary, and we require to have a proper equipment and buildings for headquarters. The business is growing very rapidly at that point. The operations which are being carried on by the Nova Scotia Steel Company, and which I understand are going to be enlarged, render it necessary that we should make provision for a considerable extension of our business.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. gentleman estimates in his department showing the works proposed to be executed, and detailing the cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. So that they will be available when we want to see what the expenditure is?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. gentleman ever estimated what the whole cost of the works at Sydney has been, and what is further contemplated?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can furnish information as to what has been expended, but not what will be.

Mr. BARKER. We spent last year $139,000 at this point. When are we going to be done with Sydney?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The very moment that the necessity for the expenditure is at an end. We must furnish this accommodation. We have cut down our demands to the lowest possible figure. I would not take the responsibility of saying that we can dispense with any of this vote. We have gone into it with our engineering staff as carefully as we could.

Mr. BARKER. When the hon. gentleman is entering upon a large work of this kind does he not get an estimate at the beginning, showing what is intended to be done? The hon. gentleman surely does not go on year after year spending hundreds of thousands of dollars without knowing what the end is likely to be. Has the hon. gentleman ever got an estimate from his engineers of what the whole yard and the works will cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We know what the plan which we are proposing to adopt must necessarily cost, but we do not feel called upon to embark upon that in all its details at the start. We proceed gradually in order that we will not be making unreasonable demands upon parliament, but the neces-

sity of the work is such that it must be done.

Mr. BARKER. Are we nearly through with it yet ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have made pretty fair progress.

Mr. BARKER. Why should not the hon. gentleman be able to tell us how near we are to the end ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I will be able to give the hon. gentleman a very fair estimate as to the progress of the work. I think we are very nearly reaching the end of this particular work at Sydney.

Mr. BARKER. I have no objection to the item passing if the hon. gentleman says he will furnish the information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. I think it would be necessary to have from the hon. minister an estimate of what the cost will be and whether, if he finds himself short, he will make up the shortage by drawing upon any other item instead of confining himself to this item. This has been done in the past, and I think it is time it should be stopped. There is an item for increased accommodation at Sydney and another for additional sidings along the line. The hon. gentleman has taken money from the second head and applied it to the first head, and he should not have done so. The hon. gentleman has no more right to expend money in that way than any private member of this House has the right to take money for public purposes for which it has not been voted. When the hon. gentleman asks for an amount with which he proposes to undertake a new work, he should be prepared to bring down an estimate of the cost of that work, so that every hon. gentleman would know exactly what we are going into, and then, each year, if the government are not prepared to pay the full amount, to have the work completed and ask for a portion of the amount, we should know what the balance is that they expect will be necessary in order to complete the work.

Mr. BARKER. In confirmation of what the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) has said, I would say that in 1900-01, the hon. gentleman spent $41,000 at Sydney which was voted for improvements along the line.

Mr. PUTTEE. This is a considerable item, and I imagine that a number of contracts will come under it. Therefore, I would like to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the shortcomings of his department in the matter of contracts containing the fair-wage clause. The Department of Labour issued their annual report some time ago, and I find an account of the contracts given out by the various departments. For instance, there is a list of :

> Contracts entered into by the Department of Public Works during the year ending June 30, 1901, containing fair wages schedules and above cited conditions for the protection of labour.

There is a page and a half of contracts given out containing fair-wage schedules, but I find upon turning over to the list of the contracts entered into by the Department of Railways and Canals that while there is an extensive list of contracts containing the 'above cited fair-wages and other conditions for protection of labour,' there are no schedules to go with these contracts. To find out to what extent such contracts had been awarded, I moved for a return which was brought down to this House, dated March 11, this year. A number of questions was put to find out if possible on what conditions these contracts were let, and I find these answers :

> The number of contracts in which the schedule of wages was prepared by the fair wages officers : None.
>
> The number of contracts in which the schedule of wages was prepared by the contractors and accepted by the department : None.
>
> The number of contracts which were unaccompanied by schedules of wages : All.

I am not satisfied that the Department of Public Works should have all the credit for the enforcement of this fair-wage resolution that was passed by this House two years ago. As a matter of fact, nearly all the contracts now given out by the Department of Public Works contain not only that clause, but the schedule of wages current in the district in which the work is being carried on. I believe that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) could tell us that the Department of Labour looked after this matter. They have officers appointed and paid to prepare these schedules, who speak both English and French, so that they can handle all kinds of contracts in any district in the country. I think that if the Department of Railways and Canals will hand the matter over, as it should be, and as the Department of Public Works has done, to the Department of Labour, it will cause no more trouble in the department, and it will be satisfactory to all interests. In the Department of Marine and Fisheries, where they have different kinds of work to give out, there are no schedules, but there is this clause :

> If this condition——

That is the payment of wages current in the district.

> ——is violated, the said party of the second part may cancel the contract and refuse to accept any work done thereunder.

In the Department of Railways and Canals there are no schedules or conditions what-

ever. In view of the fact that this matter has been passed upon by this parliament and that the fair-wage condition has been carried out successfully in the Department of Public Works, it seems to me only reasonable that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals shall, as far as possible, have a fair-wage schedule put in.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must confess that I was under the impression that the general clause covered the ground pretty well. If there had been any complaints that proper wages were not being paid we would have been in the position, under the general clause, to have called the contractor to account, and I think we would have been able to ensure the employees proper consideration at the hands of the contractors. But, since my hon. friend (Mr. Puttee) and others have been pressing on me the desirability, the justice and fairness of having schedules included in the contracts, I am not unwilling to give the matter my very best consideration as to the contracts which will be entered into in the future, in order to see what we can do towards meeting the wishes of these hon. gentlemen.

Original construction, $2,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is an item that has appeared, I might almost say, from time immemorial. It has reference to the claims that are still arising in respect to the first work that was done on the Intercolonial Railway. Every year the same amount is asked for, and it has been asked for during all these years. We have to have a general vote to cover it. Last year the amount we had to pay out was $1,728.52. We have expended during the year in which we now are, $758 on that account. These claims are constantly coming up, the result sometimes of litigation and sometimes of settlement in other ways.

Strengthening bridges, $175,000.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister explain what this is for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The extreme pressure under which the bridge companies were working last year made it impossible for them to supply what we required within the fiscal year, and so $75,000 of this has to be revoted. We started out with the idea that by spending $100,000 a year, we would in five or six years sufficiently strengthen our bridges to bear the heavy locomotives.

Mr. BARKER. Is this taking the place of old work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. The bridges that were built on the Intercolonial Railway were nearly all built after one pattern, and if they were not called upon to carry heavier trains than prior to 1898 they would last for many years to come. We have been obliged to increase their carrying capacity, and what we do is to take one span out and add it to the existing span of another bridge, then replacing the one which we have removed by a new span.

Mr. BARKER. None of the old structures have been taken away ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. MONK. Is the work progressing from Montreal to Halifax or from Halifax to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No regular system of that kind has been adopted. There is always some little difference in the condition of the bridges and we have been working on those which most needed prompt attention.

Mr. MONK. Is there an estimate of what the total cost of this work will be ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have only expended $225,000 out of the $600,000 which it was originally estimated we would require.

Mr. MONK. Is this work done by contract and tender ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Invariably.

Mr. MONK. Who are the principal contractors?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Hamilton Bridge Company; the Canadian Bridge Company; the Montreal Bridge Company; the bridge companies who do that kind of work are invited to tender.

Increased accommodation at Lévis, $22,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Does any of this money go for the land which has been the subject of an action in the Exchequer Court ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is nothing in this vote to pay for land. I believe that litigation is still pending.

Mr. OSLER. What is this money for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To grade the yard; to complete the track laying; to provide for a water service; to build a concrete walk; for sidewalks alongside of the tracks; for a wooden covering.

Mr. OSLER. I was in Quebec a few months ago, and from the Quebec side I saw a balloon like structure of wood, something like what would be erected in a mushroom town. It appeared to be a regular fire trap. Surely the minister is not putting up a wooden structure at Lévis. I am not

finding fault with the expenditure, but it did seem to me to be a most unsuitable structure, judging by the appearance from the other side of the river.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) is speaking of the station that is in course of erection at Lévis. The description he has given would not suggest it to my mind.

Mr. OSLER. I asked what it was and they told me that it was the Intercolonial Railway station.

Mr. MONK. Will the minister furnish us at a later stage with similar information with regard to Lévis that he promised with regard to Sydney as to the total cost, and so on ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Additional sidings along the line, $50,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to make any improvement in the sidings at Apohaqui ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not made any provision for Apohaqui.

Mr. FOWLER. The necessary improvement there would only cost a very small sum, and it is greatly required in consequence of the amount of business done there. The siding should be extended. It is now only possible to load four cars at a time. To give an idea of the extent of business done there, I may say that this year between the 1st of January and the 1st of July there will be shipped about five million feet of lumber besides a very large quantity of tan bark and cord wood. I think some little improvement was about to be made this spring to the through siding, but the other requires to be lengthened and graded. I will furnish the minister with a plan which I have had prepared showing the improvements that are necessary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We might possibly be able to do something in connection with that in the supplementary estimates, but it is a long and tedious job to get these items extended. We have to spread them over years, and we take first those for which there is the most urgent need. I will note what the hon. gentleman has said, and will see what can be done.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister will see from the number of cars of lumber shipped this year the amount of business, and it will not diminish in the near future. For the want of this improvement shippers are caused a great deal of inconvenience and expense.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I know that the trouble is serious.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the minister will give us a list of these sidings. If he will lay it on the Table with the other papers, we will not delay the item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will do so.

To exchange drawbars of freight cars, $15,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have no alternative but to put air brakes to freight cars and to change the couplers of passenger cars and the drawbars.

Mr. INGRAM. Are these the master car builders' drawbars ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are.

New machinery for locomotive and car shops, $10,000.

Mr. INGRAM. We would like a little explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Hon. members can understand that in having to handle heavier cars and locomotives we require heavier machinery, and we are endeavouring to supply that need as rapidly as we can.

Mr. INGRAM. What class of machinery?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the ordinary machinery required for handling our locomotives and cars in the workshop.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give us a statement showing the kind of machinery.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will try to do so.

To equip 10 passenger cars with Pintsch gas apparatus, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are equipping all our cars with that.

Mr. MONK. Will it require a vote every year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not. I think we ought to be able to complete all of them by next year.

New superstructure for six spans Mirimichi bridge, $51,000.

Mr. BARKER. I make the same objection to the whole of this charge being made to capital that I did with regard to steel rails. This is for substituting a new superstructure for an old one, and the amount should be less by a proper charge to maintenance as regards the old superstructure.

Mr. MONK. Is there any estimated charge to maintenance, as in the case of other railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are transferring this bridge to the Island Railway. So far as weight goes it is a first class bridge.

Mr. BARKER. Are you crediting this account with the full amount you are charging the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. There will be no profit between the two.

Mr. BARKER. What about the cost of replacing the new bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are valuing the old bridge at $32,000, as a bridge for the Prince Edward Island Railway.

Mr. BARKER. What about the old bridge on Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no old bridge. This is entirely new.

Rolling stock, Intercolonial Railway, $500,000.

Mr. INGRAM. The present system is entirely wrong. Just fancy this new master mechanic being engaged here for some months and not knowing the condition of the rolling stock of the road. Why should it not be the duty of the master mechanic to see that the hundreds of cars which are laying by, some of which require very little repairs, are repaired instead of buying new cars ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The cars that are worth repairing are repaired.

Mr. INGRAM. Not according to the evidence.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The repairs may possibly be deferred owing to pressure of work. I do not know that the hon. gentleman is in any position to condemn the mechanical superintendent. It would be an injustice to any officer to set him aside in that off-hand way as incompetent. This mechanical superintendent was formerly in the service of the Grand Trunk Railway as assistant to the chief mechanical superintendent and is a very bright man, and I shall be disappointed if he does not turn out exceedingly capable. But I would not expect him to be able in a few months to do work which, under ordinary conditions, would require a great deal longer. I ask the hon. gentleman to suspend judgment. No political aim can be served by his laying the weight of his condemnation on this young man who has done remarkably well up to the present. I found him very reliable as far as I could judge. One of the first things I asked him to do was to make up a schedule and prepare a scheme governing the wages and employees and the grading of employees in the shops. It was a new thing, but this gentleman applied himself to it at once with energy, and worked out a scheme that seems to have met with very general approval. I was well pleased with the work this young man has done. I endeavoured to get his predecessor interested in the work, but he did not seem able to take it up. This young man, however, took it up and dealt with it very satisfactorily.

Mr. INGRAM. I have not made any remarks for the purpose of belittling the mechanical superintendent. My sole object was to improve the working of the Intercolonial Railway. So far as this young man is concerned, I believe he is a practical man, but I am taking the statement he made at the committee. When asked whether he had examined all the cars, he said no, but he looked at some.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How was it physically possible?

Mr. INGRAM. He said why it was he had not the other cars examined. It was because he was not directly concerned in them, but was more concerned in anything he undertook since engaged by the government. Just as that young man said, these cars are automatically reported to the department, and those not requiring large repairs would naturally be repaired at the shops, but I understand in this instance there was a large number that require very little repair. Why should not the government repair these old cars and charge them to maintenance instead of buying new ones ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We require additional cars as well.

Mr. INGRAM. You are having cars lying around now, which the government is getting no service out of. It is for these reasons that the Intercolonial Railway is not economically managed. The hon. gentleman asked to-night how we would save expenditure ? In the first place, you should not buy three times more ties than are necessary, nor, should you have cars lying by idle when a little repairing would make them fit for use. Unless you can economically conduct your road, you are not going to make any money out of it. There is a large number of cars lying to one side, which could be used with very little repairs, according to the evidence of this young man, and why they should not be used is more than I can understand.

Mr. BARKER. In addition to the cars which have been referred to, which are capable of repair, there are 364 condemned cars. Those cars ought to be replaced out of capital. They are never going into service again, and it is absurd to go on pretending to work them. They are set down in the hon. gentleman's stock list as 364 condemned cars and remaining condemned to 1st July, 1901. The hon. gentleman should

replace those cars out of his revenue account. He must keep up his stock. Instead of charging the whole of this $500,000 to capital account, he ought to charge 364 cars to maintenance and the excess go to capital. Mr. Muhlfeld, the new mechanical superintendent, told me that from 25 to 30 locomotives were so worn that they could not be used economically. They should also be replaced before the hon. gentleman charges another locomotive to capital.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think my hon. friend must be referring to a number of cars which we got a great many years ago and which have been condemned for years, and have not been replaced in the ordinary way at all. They were coal dumping cars of an old pattern—short boxes with small hoppers—which have gone out of use.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Muhlfeld says that there are 25 or 30 locomotives on the line which are so old that they cannot be used economically. These should be sold to some contractors for $1,000 a piece and the money credited to revenue, and they should be replaced at the charge of revenue. No auditor of an ordinary railway company would allow him to charge one locomotive to capital until he had done that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We turn out of our shops or are buying on maintenance from six to nine of these big locomotives a year, so we are doing more in the way of getting new locomotives on maintenance account then was formerly done.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman is buying twenty-six on capital account.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the others were played out years ago.

Mr. BARKER. What difference does that make ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman say that it is fair that I should take the accumulation of cars and locomotives that were out of date before I came into the department and replace them on maintenance accunt, and so swell the maintenance account away beyond the appropriation of the year ?

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman made the same defence last year. When I was referring to his condemned cars, the hon. gentleman asked me if I had taken the trouble to look at the state of the rolling stock account when he took the line over. I said that I had and gave him the figures for every year, and showed him that he had more than doubled the number of condemned cars. He had at the beginning of last year, and during the year, over 500 condemned cars, and although he replaced some he still left 364 on the condemned list.

Mr. BARKER.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. With the enormous growth of the business and with the limited capacity of our shops, it is impossible to keep up. I am in hopes that we are approaching the time when, with these appropriations we shall be able to get this work off our hands as the demands arrive.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. minister has said that the former mechanical superintendent did not seem to be able to prepare a schedule of wages as it has been prepared by the gentleman who now fills that position. I would like to know if the former mechanical superintendent ever received instructions to prepare a schedule covering the whole number of men employed in the shops.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had a good many conversations with the former mechanical superintendent, and had not a word of complaint to make. I did not think he took hold of the idea with the same promptness that the present man has done. That is all I said.

Mr. MONK. What proportion of this sum is for cars, for locomotives and for passenger coaches ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is all for locomotives—twenty-five at $20,000 a piece.

Mr. MONK. And all to be built at the Kingston Locomotive Works, none in the United States ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I want to assure my hon. friend that there has not been a single locomotive ordered or purchased or built in the United States for us when the Kingston Locomotive Works have been in such a state of operation as to be able to undertake to carry out our contracts.

Mr. MONK. So far as I am concerned, that assurance is perfectly useless, for I maintain that years ago we should have placed ourselves in the same position as every other great railway in this country and had our locomotives built here. So, the hon. minister need not give me that assurance with the idea that it will produce any change of conviction in my mind. I say we should have had our locomotives built here ever since we had the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How would the hon. gentleman propose to do that ?

Mr. MONK. Like the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk—build locomotives. Why not ? There is no reason.

Mr. EMMERSON. When the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie was Minister of Railways and Public Works he established at

Moncton machinery for the construction of engines and locomotives. But, as soon as the change of government took place these works were practically dismantled, and they ceased to do any such work. That was a complaint for years against the government of the day after 1878. Mr. Mackenzie started out with the idea that the Intercolonial Railway would build its own locomotives. He did build excellent locomotives, and they stand there today, monuments to his good judgment, and to the good work that was done at Moncton. I think that recently there has been an attempt to renew these works.

Mr. MONK. It is high time that this kind of argument, this tu quoque argument, should cease. It is getting a little old. What have we to do with what was done by Alexander Mackenzie and by those who immediately succeeded him? Nothing whatever. But we have a right to ask the government to adopt the same policy in one department as in another. The Minister of Public Works requires dredges and many other things to carry on the deepening of the St. Lawrence, and he establishes works at Sorel in order to have these things constructed in our own country. Our contention is that the same thing should be done in the case of the Department of Railways and Canals. But the answer that is given us is that Mr. Mackenzie established locomotive works and that those who came in after him, some of whom I have never seen or known, destroyed his work. That is a strange argument in the mouth of hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson.)

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I confess that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) surprises me, and I am unable to understand precisely the object of his remarks ? A moment ago, when I made the statement I did, the hon. gentleman in a sort of contemptuous way, said I need not press any such argument upon him because it made no impression upon his mind. Of course, I must submit in all humility, but I can only conclude that the hon. gentleman's mind is not open to access by reason or common sense. Does the hon. gentleman think that, coming into the department in the latter part of the year 1896, and requiring locomotives and which could not be built at Moncton, I was not compelled as a matter of duty to go out of the country to buy those locomotives when I could not get them here ? Apparently, the hon. gentleman thinks that I ought to be able to improvise by a breath a complete equipment of shops and everything ready to turn out locomotives.

Mr. MONK. When did the hon. gentleman begin ordering those locomotives in the States ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The first locomotive we ordered was in 1897. I could not get any appropriation until the end of the session of 1897. Would it be reasonable for me, or could I justify myself in advising my colleagues and parliament to spend enough money at Moncton to manufacture engines and turn them out in the time we required them. All we needed to do was to keep renewing and repairing, which would not require works of anything like the same magnitude as to turn out 100 locomotives in three or four years. Our works are large enough to turn out seven, or eight or ten locomotives a year.

Mr. INGRAM. They must be very small shops.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A locomotive a week is a pretty good production. I do not know whether the Kingston works were ever able to turn out more than one locomotive a week. But one thing is clear, it was utterly impossible for me to get locomotives except by going to the United States for them.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. gentleman buy any during the last fiscal year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, except what we got from the Kingston works.

Mr. MONK. Have there been any cars purchased in the States during the last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None. A statement was made by the ex-minister of railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart)—I am sorry he is not here—that only one locomotive was bought by him. He was referring to an incident that occurred before the Public Accounts Committee about locomotives being condemned by this circular that was issued, when it came out that some of those locomotives were made in the United States in the year 1893. The hon. gentleman denied it and said there was only one, and it was got from the Cooke Locomotive Works. The reason, he said, why he did not get any from Kingston was that the Kingston works were shut down. I said that when this item was up I would furnish some evidence to show that the hon. gentleman was mistaken. I have before me a certificate from Mr. Birkett, the secretary treasurer of the Canadian Locomotive and Engine Company, and he certifies that the above statement is correct, and that the works at Kingston were going continuously from 1888 until the liquidators closed them in September, 1900. He says there was a large amount of jobbing done, besides making locomotives, and several marine engines were made. He commences his statement with 1888, and gives the output of the locomotive works from that year down to 1895. I need not particularize every year. The point I want to make is that the locomotive works were in actual operation

at Kingston at the very period the hon. gentleman went to the Cooke concern to procure locomotives.

Mr. BARKER. As the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is not present, would the minister read the number of locomotives purchased in each year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In 1888 they turned out 16; in 1899, 10; 1890, 28; 1891, 12; 1892, 26; 1893, 2; 1894, 11; 1895, 3; 1896, 3; 1897, 4; 1898, 4; 1899, 5; and under the reorganized management in 1900, 36.

Mr. BARKER. In 1893 there were only 2?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only 2 turned out. The hon. gentleman went to the United States for locomotives and declined to take those he could have got from the Kingston works. I have a letter or two here which perhaps may throw a little light on that subject. Mr. Lee, who is the mechanical man in charge of the Kingston works, wrote as early as April 15, 1893, to the department stating that he had received the specifications of the two locomotives that were required, and he says that he will 'mail an offer for those two locomotives on the 17th of April if possible, on the 18th of April, at the latest.' Then I have a copy of the specifications. On the 9th of May, 1893, I see Mr. Pottinger wrote to this effect:

> I have your letter dated May 6, with reference to the locomotives. The matter has not yet been settled. It is now being considered by the department at Ottawa.

So they were able to furnish locomotives. Mr. Lee writes again to know whether they would take the two locomotives, and he is advised that the department has not yet settled the matter. Apparently when it was settled, it was against giving the order. I have a letter dated in August, written by Mr. Birkett, secretary treasurer, to the late Minister of Railways and Canals, in which he complains about the delay. He says he would like to have an opportunity of building those, and 'owing to the depression in the United States a number of men have returned out of work, and we could offer them work on a government contract,' and so on. They came from Cooke's. I have here also a memorandum which shows that instead of there being only one such purchase made, there was quite a number. The Kingston works commenced operation I think in 1875, perhaps in 1873; I see where they furnished locomotives in 1875 to the government. I find a statement of the number of locomotives purchased from the time the Kingston works commenced operations down to the advent of the present government, and the total number bought in the United States was 91. The Grant Locomotive Works of Paterson, New Jersey, furnished 15, the Manchester Locomotive Works 29, the Portland Locomotive Works 11, the Danforth Locomotive Works 4, the Hinckley Locomotive Works 9, the Rhode Island Locomotive Works 5, the Cooke's Locomotive Works of Paterson, New Jersey, 2. They were the two that were got in 1893, and the Dubs Locomotive Works furnished 15. Two of the Grant, six of the Manchester, and one of the Danforth engines were furnished before 1875.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include the eight locomotives you got from the Manchester and Richmond locomotive works?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think the Richmond locomotive works were established at the time these were got.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include the locomotives which you got last year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No it does not include what we got. This is up to the time that we came in. It does not include what we got since we came in.

Mr. MONK. How many locomotives have been purchased by this government since 1896?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to say off hand. As soon as the Kingston locomotive works were got in operation, under the reorganization, we gave them an order for twenty locomotives, and we have given them two orders of twenty-five each, which would be seventy, speaking from memory. I would not want to be exactly precise about that. I think likely we must have got thirty-five or forty, perhaps, in the United States.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that this might have been foreseen and it seems to me a very poor answer to give when a wrong is pointed out or a fault indicated to say that the same thing was necessary under the previous administration. I was given to understand before I came into this parliament that the previous administration had been a very bad one. If that is to be the rule and at a certain time we come into power we can always point to something these hon. gentlemen have done as an excuse for what we do ourselves, and it would be a very easy way to get out of many difficulties. It seems to me that since we have been purchasing seventy-five or more locomotives in the United States not counting what we have purchased here since 1896, it would be well worth while to consider whether it would not be better to place this railway on the same footing as other great roads in Canada are, on the same footing for instance as the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway. If it be true, as I have no doubt it is, as the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr.

Emmerson) has stated, that Mr. Mackenzie had established locomotive works at Moncton, surely it cannot be very hard, with the extensive works I have seen there when I passed, to carry on locomotive works, and it would be much more satisfactory to do the work ourselves. It must be more profitable since this is the system resorted to by the other railways in this country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Canadian Pacific Railway are buying sixty or eighty locomotives today.

Mr. MONK. They have locomotive works at Montreal and they are constructing locomotives year after year and so are the Grand Trunk Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. And so do we.

Mr. MONK. You are constructing locomotives ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, from start to finish.

Mr. MONK. Where ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At Moncton—since we came in.

Mr. MONK. How long has this been carried on ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In 1896 they resumed the construction of locomotives. The works have been enlarged and I quite agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that the works might be still further enlarged in that direction. They have been greatly enlarged and they are doing more construction work there now. But, it must be remembered that with the extension of the Intercolonial Railway the repairs are greater than they were and they want more room. The original works, as established by Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Brydges, in their day, must necessarily be more crowded to-day than they were then. There would necessarily require to be some extension of the works if the government enter into the construction of locomotives to a greater extent than at present. I quite agree with what the hon. gentleman has stated. I think it would be well for the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to inquire into the matter as to whether the construction works should not be enlarged at that point. I do not speak from a sectional standpoint merely because Moncton is situated in the constituency I have the honour to represent, but it seems to me that in view of the character of the locomotives constructed in former years at Moncton, of their excellence and durability, it would be well that the works should be enlarged and that this work should be extended.

Mr. MONK. I understood from the hon. member for Westmoreland that we did not construct locomotives and I understood the same thing from the hon. minister. I thought the works which had been erected for that purpose at Moncton had been demolished. That was the expression used by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EMMERSON. Dismantled, or dismembered.

Mr. MONK. How many locomotives were turned out at Moncton last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to commit myself as to how many were turned out last year, but I will ascertain the number. Four or five were turned out last year or the year before.

Mr. MONK. Were the works dismembered ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, they were not dismembered in the sense that they could not be used at all. We had to repair our locomotives but the works were not equipped for anything more than the necessary repairs to the locomotives as they came in. That would be my judgment about it.

Mr. BARKER. I think that all you did in 1901 was to repair locomotives.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Perhaps that may be all we did in 1901. I do not want to be positive. But, I have a very distinct recollection of being told that we had turned out four or five engines in one year. Perhaps it was in the year before last. But, I will get that information. My hon. friend will see that in view of the urgent necessity there was of meeting the demands upon us, we were asking parliament for very large sums of money and we could not ask for an unlimited vote, we could not give priority to the enlargement of the locomotive works for the making of locomotives when we could get these elsewhere and use the money that parliament would be willing to vote for the necessary purposes of handling the traffic. We could buy locomotives, but if we had put the money into the form of more buildings, machinery and plant and left these necessary services unprovided for, hon. gentlemen would have had good reason to censure me if I had advised that course and my colleagues if they had adopted it.

Mr. MONK. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I must confess that I am very much impressed with the idea that our expenditures upon this road in 1900, would have been much wiser if we had installed proper locomotive shops at Moncton or elsewhere. The minister must not forget that in 1900 we bought 1,300,000 ties, when the most we ever used in a year on that railway was 500,000; that we purchased 1,300,000 tons of coal, when the most we ever used in a year was 500,000 tons; and

that the purchases of stores in that year were enormous. Out of that immense amount of money which seemed to have been expended uselessly, we might have equipped proper locomotive works in Moncton, where we could have built those engines ourselves, instead of even depending on Kingston, and especially saving us from going to the United States. In spite of what the minister said the other day ; that I do not represent public opinion in the province of Quebec or in the city of Montreal, I can assure him that it is the sincere belief of the people of my province and of the city of Montreal that the expenditure on this railway is not directed as it should be.

Mr. BENNETT. This vote is intended for 25 locomotives at an average price of $20,000 each ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. How is this price arrived at ? Were specifications prepared in the department and submitted to other locomotive concerns ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are getting these locomotives made on what may be called the standard specification for that weight of engines. They are practically the same class as are being made in the United States. We asked the prices from different manufacturing companies—and that was before the trust was organized too—and after getting prices we offered the Kingston works a contract for the number of locomotives we required. Our information led us to agree upon the price of $20,270 each.

Mr. MONK. The minister forgets that that famous telegram was the only negotiation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What famous telegram ?

Mr. MONK. The telegram that was sent to Kingston ordering these locomotives.

Mr. BARKER. The minister paid $20,000 to the Kingston works, when they only paid $15,000 for the standard locomotives bought in the States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman entirely ignores the fact that when the $15,000 was paid the price of locomotives was down to the lowest possible notch.

Mr. BARKER. For ten locomotives that the minister bought at Kingston he paid $19,000, when he only paid $15,000 in the States.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are buying them in Canada, and we are adding the duty less $500. That is what we are doing for the purpose of assisting Canadian industries. We are giving the Kingston people the benefit of the duty.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Are we not to consider that the manufacturer has to pay duty on some of the materials which enter into the construction of the locomotives? Would it be fair and reasonable, even from a moderate revenue tariff point of view, to tax the manufacturer for the material he uses, and then to bring in the manufactured article free of duty ? Might not even men who believe in a low tariff admit that the manufacturer is entitled to that degree of protection which he would have in another line of manufacture ?

Mr. BARKER. You added 33 per cent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We added the duty less $500. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not blow hot and cold on this question. They say we ought to build these locomotives in Canada, and when we do they tell us that we are doing too much for the home industry.

Mr. MONK. Who says that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) who has given so much attention to this railway question, says we are paying the home industry too much for the locomotives. Not only that, but in the Committee on Public Accounts the ex-Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Haggart) attacked us because we made advances to the builders of these locomotives to encourage them to go on with this work. Take the rail contract. There again we were trying to do something to encourage home industry, and hon. gentlemen opposite attacked us and said we were doing too much. If we get our locomotives made at home these gentlemen attack us, and if we bring them from the United States they attack us as well. They are very hard to please.

Mr. BARKER. We want you to buy them in Canada, but we want you to pay reasonable prices for them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is it not reasonable to say that the government should pay the same price that would be paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, when they bring locomotives into Canada ? Is not that fair ? We do better than that. We take $500 off the duty and we agree to that price.

Mr. BENNETT. To how many firms in the United States were these specifications sent ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We called for prices and we did not find much difference in the prices. We took the lowest price as the basis upon which we would negotiate with the Kingston firm. It will stand investigation gen-

tlemen; we will be very happy to have it investigated; it is a fair business transaction, and you can look into it.

Mr. BENNETT. I was not reflecting upon the minister, I simply want information as to how the price was arrived at. Personally speaking, I should prefer to see every locomotive manufactured in Canada.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no great difference between the locomotives we get in the States and the locomotives we get in Kingston.

Mr. BENNETT. I presume that every hon. gentleman would prefer to see the locomotives used in Canada manufactured in Canada, but while there is a protective tariff the government assume that is sufficiently high to protect the industry. I submit that the government when buying locomotives as everything else should go to the open market, and have competition, and if the Canadian manufacturer is not prepared to produce the article as cheaply as another does, the country should get the benefit of the lowest price.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. With the duty added.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, even conceding the addition of the duty.

Mr. MONK. My recollection is that there was a telegram sent to the Kingston people on the eve of an election in Kingston and that telegram was read in the House, and will be found somewhere in 'Hansard.' There was an order for so many locomotives at such a price, and there were no specifications or tenders or anything of the kind. My desire is that we should encourage home industries. We all desire that. But I do not say that from what experience we have had I believe it would be better for the government to construct its own locomotives so as to be independent of outsiders.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope my hon. friend will give me his assistance, then, to get the necessary appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. MONK. Well, I do it with the greatest diffidence, for my hon. friend is a very expensive Minister of Railways.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose we ought to have a rail mill, and make our own steel rails too?

Mr. MONK. The hon. Minister of Finance may find this very amusing, more amusing that I do.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is not even amusing.

Mr. TALBOT. Does the hon. member for Jacques Cartier endorse the position the hon. member for Hamilton is now taking, that we should give locomotive works in Canada, whether at Kingston or anywhere else, a premium of $4,000 each for locomotives, and will he blame the Minister of Railways for buying locomotives in the United States at $15,000 when locomotives of the same power might be produced in Canada for $19,000 ?

Mr. MONK. I think I have made my position clear, and I do not think I can make it clearer. I think we should encourage home manufactures after having obtained tenders, and doing it in a different manner from what was done in the case of the Kingston Locomotive Works. But I prefer the system adopted in the Department of Public Works; when you find that you require to incur a considerable expenditure for dredges or for locomotives, it is better for a government to be independent of manufacturers and to manufacture for itself. Of course, nobody would go the length of pretending that we should manufacture our own rails. It may be a joke of the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why not ?

Mr. MONK. Let us be satisfied with getting good locomotive works in the beginning.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If I am not mistaken, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company wanted to get the locomotives at the prices at which we were getting them, which I think would be a very good criterion of their value. The bargain was that the manufacturers should get the benefit of the duty less $500. The Canadian Pacific Railway or any other company that brought in locomotives would of course have to pay the duty, while the government could bring them in free, and the Minister of Railways would get his locomotives cheaper if he got them in the States ; but that is the understanding we had with a view to encouraging the industry in this country. Then, there is a very large amount of duty which the locomotive manufacturer pays into the public treasury on his raw material, which the locomotive manufacturer in the United States does not have to pay; and it would not be fair to ask a Canadian manufacturer who has to pay a heavy duty on his raw material to compete in the open market with the United States manufacturer who has no duty on his raw material to pay. I think the hon. member will admit that it is a very good bargain. The hon. member for Hamilton suggests that the hon. Minister of Railways should replace all these worn-out engines with new ones of the kind he is buying. I would like to ask him if he thinks it would be fair for the purposes of comparison, or for the purpose of keeping proper accounts of capital and maintenance, that a 30-ton or 40-ton locomotive should be replaced by an 80-ton one.

Mr. BARKER. The practice of all railway companies is to replace one locomotive with another. They do not go into the fine points of putting the cost of one against the cost of another. When a business is improving so as to require larger locomotives they are very glad to have the opportunity of putting them in. If the hon. minister came here and said that he would even charge to revenue the old locomotive at its original value, putting the extra cost of the new, larger one, to capital account, nobody would probably find much fault with him. What we are finding fault with is that he is turning it all over to capital. I may say that the practice of the railway companies is also to set a new car against an old one, and I may add that the Grand Trunk Railway Company at their last meeting proposed to close their capital account altogether.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is inconceivable that a company which is replacing a worn-out locomotive with a new one of about three times its tonnage and costing double the price, charges the one against the other, and I will take the trouble to inquire immediately of the two railway companies to ascertain what is their usage in that regard. I am glad my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has made the reference he has, because it recalls to my mind a rather cogent fact. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, knowing that the Kingston works were manufacturing locomotives for us, and ascertaining what price we were paying for them, offered us $3,000 in advance on the price we were paying if we would allow them to have a portion of those locomotives; but of course we could not spare them, and did not let them have them. But that is some evidence that we did not pay an exorbitant price.

Mr. INGRAM. The Canadian Pacific Railway have been very short both of engines and cars, and have tried everywhere imaginable to secure them; so that they might perhaps be willing to pay extravagant prices in order to get them. I have not heard the hon. minister say what he proposes to do with the old engines.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not doing anything with the old engines that are not worth being repaired. If a demand arises for them, we will sell them at a fair price if we can.

Mr. INGRAM. Does he intend to sell them as scrap ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do put a certain quantity into scrap every year.

Mr. INGRAM. No other railway in Canada finds it profitable to break their old engines into scrap, for the reason that they have not the cheap labour which is employed for that purpose in the United States. If the hon. gentleman will sell them, such as they are, that would be the better way of getting rid of them.

New superstructure for Restigouche bridge, $102,000.

New superstructure for North-west Miramichi bridge, $123,000

Mr. BARKER. What is being done with the old bridges ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One is going to Prince Edward Island. It is required across the river, where there was no bridge before, in connection with a new railway, the Hillsborough and Murray Harbour Railway.

Mr. MONK. Does the contract provide that the old superstructure will go with the new work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are not contracting for the superstructure but for the substructure.

Improvement at Point Tupper, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to provide a freight yard.

Mr. MONK. Will the hon. gentleman let us know how much has been spent altogether for improvements at Point Tupper and bring down a statement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

To provide yard for freight business, Riviére du Loup, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for yard room and track. The yards are altogether too restricted. A portion of this is for land. We have not got the land yet, but it is estimated that $15,000 will be sufficient to buy the land and grade it and put it in shape and $10,000 will put down the tracks.

To provide addition to erecting shop at Moncton, $15,000.

To provide freight car repair shop at Moncton, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We propose to put up an entirely new building 100 by 50 and about 50 feet high.

Mr. MONK. Are you going to build engines there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I hope so.

To provide engine house, machine shop, car shop, store office, &c., Riviere du Loup, $50,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How many private cars are now owned by the country, as compared with the time the present government took office ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In consequence of the visit of the

Duke and Duchess of Cornwall we bought one more, and there is one which was purchased by the traffic superintendent at a very small figure from the Grand Trunk Railway. He paid $4,000.

Mr. BENNETT. What unfortunate minister uses that one ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. How can a minister be unfortunate ?

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the minister to rebuild the engine house at Sussex to replace the one that was burned down a year and a half ago ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not that in contemplation at the moment. It is not one of the urgent things. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to a place into which to run the engines, not repair shops ?

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister knows that what is known as the Sussex train runs between Sussex and St. John, and the engine running it is kept at Sussex. The engine house was burned down and has never been replaced. There is a sort of shed there which is a disgraceful looking structure.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned it and I will look into the matter.

Mr. FOWLER. The hon. minister, might at the same time, consider the building of a new station at Sussex. This is one of the most important stations on the line of the Intercolonial Railway and among those yeilding the highest revenue.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not catch the reply of the minister as to how many of these so-called government cars there are.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not state that because the question was not asked. I was asked how many more there were now than in 1896.

Mr. BENNETT. I also asked the other question, but, perhaps, the minister did not hear. I will ask it now. How many of these cars are there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I could not say off-hand, I would have to count them up. There are four, I know.

Mr. BENNETT. That is besides the Governor General's car ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is the Governor General's own ; he pays rent for it.

Mr. MONK. As to this expenditure at Rivière du Loup of $50,000. Is this for the erection of a new building ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, entirely new. My hon. friend may not be aware that this is not only a divisional point, but it is the point where we do our repairing for the upper end of the line. We are erecting a new round-house or engine-house. It must be new, because the locomotives are large, and we cannot house them or repair them or do anything with them in the old shops. We also propose to erect a machine shop and to make it large enough so that we may have store accommodation and office.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No contract is let yet. We have not yet got the appropriation. I understand my hon. friend to ask if it will be by tender, and I tell him it will.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the hon. minister erected the station at Passekeag ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I don't think it is completed yet.

Mr. FOWLER. Has it been begun ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It ought to have been begun before this.

Mr. FOWLER. It ought to have been begun two years ago. Tenders were called for two years ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not over two years ago, I think.

Mr. FOWLER. Six months before the election.

Canals—chargeable to Railways and Canals capital—Prince Edward Island Railway—Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, $500,000.

Mr. MONK. It would be better to leave that until some other time.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to make a few remarks on this subject——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will reserve the item, so that the hon. gentleman will have another opportunity to speak upon it.

Resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 1.05 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

LAND GRANTS TO VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. SCOTT asked :

1. Has the Governor in Council received a memorial or communication from the North-west legislature on the subject of land grants in relation to Canadian volunteers for the war in South Africa ?

2. If so, what was the purport thereof, and what reply was made by the Governor in Council ?

3. Has the government considered the matter of granting lands to such volunteers ; and if so, what decision has been arrived at ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) :

1. Yes.

2. A request that the government make a grant of land to each volunteer who being a resident of the territories participated in the war in South Africa.

3. No reply has yet been made.

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What sum of money was expended on Canoe Cove (Prince Edward Island) breakwater from June 29th to December 31st, 1901 ?

2. What amount of this sum was expended for labour and material, respectively ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte) :

1. Three thousand seven hundred and twenty-two dollars and fourteen cents.

2. Labour, $2,070.75 ; material, $1,651.39; total, $3,722.14.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Does the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary have a veterinary surgeon on its staff ?

2. If so, who is he, and what is his salary ?

3. If not, what is the occupation of Dr. C. A. Descary, whose name appears in the last report of the Auditor General ?

4. Is the said C. A. Descary the same C. A. Descary, veterinary surgeon of St. Martin, Laval, and Liberal candidate for some time at the last election in Laval ?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Hon. H. G. Carroll) :

1 and 2. There is no veterinary surgeon on the staff of the penitentiary.

3. Dr. Descary has been employed professionally, from time to time, when such service has been required.

4. The department is not aware.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that to-morrow the House go into Committee of the Whole on the following resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that, after July 1st, 1902, one-half of the net proceeds of all taxes paid by Chinese immigrants shall, at the end of every fiscal year, be paid to the province wherein they were collected.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION LANDS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 120) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.—The Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). This Bill was adopted yesterday with the exception of section 2. Upon examining that section I have decided to ask the committee to make it read as follows :

Section 1 of this Act shall not apply to any contract, agreement, undertaking for sale, or grant, containing an express declaration that it is exempt from this section.

This will have the effect of enabling the government, if it is thought desirable in any special case, to withdraw any particular sale from the effect of this section.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill as amended reported, read the third time, and passed.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Yukon Territory Act (the Minister of the Interior), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. What are these sections of the old Act which we have repealed ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is just a re-enactment of the old section, with the exception that we provide for five members instead of two.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister tell us approximately what the population of that district is now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. According to the census, it is about 21,000.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What change in the law is effected by this ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. One change is this, that in case of an ordinance being passed by the local council which conflicts with an order affecting the same subject passed by the Governor in Council, the latter shall prevail. The second change

is to give the local council control of the traffic in intoxicating liquors, the section relating to the manufacture of liquors remaining as it is in the old Act.

On section 3,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What change is effected by this ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There has been a misunderstanding between my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and myself as to some changes which are to be made in this section. I have the amendments ready, but I wish to furnish my hon. friend the leader of the opposition with a copy of them before moving them. I will, therefore, move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the committee rises, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior as to the legislative powers which the Governor in Council now has with regard to the Yukon Territory. My attention has been directed to the Order in Council which was made with regard to what is known as the Treadgold concession, the provisions of which seem to have a very wide scope indeed. If the Governor in Council possesses power to legislate for the territory in that way, I do not see exactly where they are to stop; and it struck me that it might be expedient for the government to consider whether some amendment should not be made whereby powers of so sweeping a character should be exercised not by the Governor in Council, but by parliament. It is not desirable that I should go into the details with regard to that particular matter at the present time. Possibly I may have some observations to make at a later date; but as my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior is considering the amendments to this Bill, I mention it now. The Order in Council may not be founded on the Yukon Territory Act; possibly it is founded on the Dominion Lands Act.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Partially both.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps it would not incommode my hon. friend if he can do so, to state now the statutory enactments upon which that particular concession is founded.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The provision in the Dominion Lands Act which authorizes the Governor in Council to regulate the carrying on of mining on Dominion lands, and section 2 of the Act entitled an Act to amend the Yukon Territory Act which was passed in 1899, 62 and 63 Victoria.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is the section which we are now amending ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. My hon. friend will see that that gives very wide powers. What I want to call my hon. friend's attention to, in regard to his other observation, is this, that in passing this legislation the House practically followed the old North-west Territories Act and gave the same powers to the Governor in Council as were given to them with regard to the North-west Territories before they received a constitutional form of government. No doubt the power of the Governor in Council under the legislation as it now stands is very wide. The question as to whether that should be curtailed by giving exclusive power to the Commissioner in Council was considered, but it was thought that for a time at least it might be left in the shape in which it is in the clause we are now passing, that is to say, that in case of any conflict between the Governor in Council and the local council, the decision of the Governor in Council shall prevail. There has not been any conflict, so far as I am aware, and I do not think that there is any matter which has been dealt with by an ordinance of the Governor in Council except one. I think that under the late Minister of Justice an Order in Council was passed relating to the legal profession. The reason why I ask that this matter be laid over is because there is a portion of the old clause which, under the amendment, will be required to be left in. This amendment was not in contemplation at the time the Bill was drawn and that portion of the clause was left out. I will send my hon. friend a copy of the amendment before it is put in.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Orders in Council dealing with the disposal of very large interests in the Yukon apparently need not be laid before parliament or have the sanction of parliament in any way. That is correct, I think. What I would suggest is that the conferring of rights of so great a scope, and possibly of such large value, as those contained in this Treadgold concession, might be limited in some way. I appreciate the fact that it is necessary to give the Governor in Council certain powers with regard to unorganized territories, but I have not been able to persuade myself that it is necessary to give such wide powers as are required for the disposal of concessions of that kind. That is a matter to which I would like my hon. friend to give his attention, and when the Bill comes up again we may discuss it with the view to an amendment of that character.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the subject is a very fair one for discussion, and I do not think that the government desires any greater powers than are necessary for the administration of the territories. Of course, powers are necessary for the administration of a territory such as the Yukon, which would not be required in any other part of Canada. If my hon. friend desires to make any suggestion of a definite character regarding the limitations which should be put on the power of the

government, I would be quite willing to give them the fullest consideration.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—THE CORONATION CONTINGENT.

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

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of the House, and especially the attention of the Minister of Militia and Defence, to a certain matter, resulting from certain questions put by me to the House a few days ago, and which has come to me with some degree of surprise, and I may say has caused an important branch of the military service of this country a considerable amount of disapproval and disappointment. On the 9th of April, a resolution was moved by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to the effect that in the opinion of this House, the military force to be sent from Canada to the approaching Coronation ceremonies should be composed in its entirety of officers and men who have seen active service on the Canadian contingents in South Africa. In speaking to that resolution, the hon. the Minister of Militia is reported as having used the following language :

> All I can say now to my hon. friend and to the House is that I propose to recommend to the government that we should send a contingent composed of 580 men, representative of all the different branches of the Canadian militia ; that the different corps in the various districts of Canada should be fairly represented numerically ; that the selection should be made with reference to the numbers enrolled in the militia in each district ; and that we will endeavour to have it truly representative of the force of this Dominion which will show to the people of England and to the people of the empire as clearly as possible the kind of militia force we have in this country.

If reference be made to the regulations and orders of the militia of Canada, the table of precedence will be found in section 7 of subsection 17 :

> The following is the order of precedence of the several corps of the militia of the Dominion of Canada. The corps of each arm taking precedence according to the date of formation. 1st, the gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military College.

Now, we have the statement of the hon. minister that each and every branch of the militia of Canada should be represented upon the contingent sent home to attend the Coronation festivities. We have then the fact that the gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military College are a branch of the militia force of this Dominion, and rank first, according to the regulations and orders of the militia department. In addition we know that during the visit lately made by His Royal Highness, the Duke of Cornwall and York, His Royal Highness took advantage of the opportunity to visit the Royal Military College, and expressed himself as being very highly pleased with his visit. In fact he used even stronger language to show his appreciation of the work done by those cadets. I am instructed further, that in June last the hon. minister himself paid a visit to the college at Kingston, and during the course of his inspection promised the cadets that he would use every possible endeavour to see that this branch of our Canadian military forces would be represented at the Coronation proceedings. He further expressed the hope that the conduct of the cadets would fully warrant him in making such a recommendation. I am not at all surprised that the minister should have made that pledge, but am disappointed that he should have, despite his promise, adopted the course which he has within the last few days. These young men who are attending the college are sons of some of the very best families in this Dominion. They are young men who have placed their services at the disposal of their country, and who are obliged, in the course of their studies, to undergo considerable hardship. They have to spend a number of years of the very best of their lives in qualifying themselves to render greater service to their country.

Not only is that the fact, but they are obliged to spend considerable sums of money in order to so qualify themselves. These young men have not only done this, but those who have passed through the college have brought glory to the name of this country. It is only a few days ago that the First Minister spoke of the brave acts of one of the cadets of the Royal Military College, and could hardly find language strong enough to express his admiration —an admiration which is felt by all the people of Canada—for the bravery displayed by Lieut. Bruce Carruthers of the Royal Military College. While Bruce Carruthers stands out as a shining example, he is no exception to the young men who pass through that college. So, if there is any part of the militia of this country that should be recognized by parliament and the people it is that made up of the gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military College. In view of the facts that are so well known, I was surprised at the answer I received to a question I put in the House only nineteen days after the minister had made the statement which I have refered to. The question will be found reported in 'Hansard' of the 28th April. It is as follows :

> Is it the intention of the government to send a detachment of cadets from the Royal Military College to attend the Coronation ?

The answer to that question is simply 'No.' And so we have this state of affairs : First, there is the statement made by the minister

pledging himself that each and every branch of the militia force of the Dominon should be represented on the contingent to be sent to the Coronation; secondly, we have the statement made by the minister to the cadets of the Royal Military College that he would use every possible endeavour to have this branch of the militia force represented on that occasion, and that he hoped they would so acquit themselves from that time until the time came to send them to the Coronation, that he would feel warranted in doing so. I have letters from a gentleman high in military circles who says that, when recently in England he learned that the present Prince of Wales had expressed the hope that there would be a detachment from the Royal Military College to attend the Coronation proceedings. In view of the promise made by the minister, these young men have been striving to the best of their ability, they have been putting forward extraordinary efforts to qualify themselves the better for a representation on the Coronation contingent. And now they are told by the minister on the floor of this House that he does not intend to send any squad or detachment from the college to accompany the Coronation contingent. It is needless to say that these young men are disappointed. I think the country also will be disappointed. I would like to know from the minister whether the government have changed their minds as to sending a squad or detachment from the Royal Military College to the Coronation. Or is it posible that these young men, even in the face of the promise given them, have not acquitted themselves in such a manner as to justify the minister in giving them representation upon this contingent? If that is so, I would like the hon. minister to point out on the floor of this House in what way they have been deficient or lacking in their efforts properly to represent their country.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Hon. F. W. Borden). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter) has not been a member of the House long enough, I suppose, to become aware of the custom of the House to give notice to the minister immediately concerned of intention to bring up a matter of this kind. If my hon. friend had done so, I would, perhaps, have been better prepared to meet his statements than I am. However, I may say that this complaint is quite wide of the mark when it is based upon the assumption that there was ever any intention expressed or understood, or any promise whatever given, that a representation as such should be sent from the Royal Military College. I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means by a reference to a promise made by me or by the government to send such a representation. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Duke of Cornwall and York, now the Prince of Wales, when visiting the Royal Military College, had expressed some hope that the college would be represented at the Coronation of the King. That is the first intimation I have had of any such statement being made. But my hon. friend need not worry. There is no doubt whatever that there will be, among the officers, and probably among the men, who will go over to take part in the Coronation proceedings, gentlemen who have graduated at the Royal Military College. The hon. gentleman refers to the cadets of the college as being part of the active militia. Technically they are, but practically, until they have received their diplomas, they are not members of the active militia in the ordinary sense of the word. When the question was raised, I think by the fathers of some of the young men in the college, I discussed the matter with the General Officer Commanding, and he advised me very strongly against sending these young gentlemen over on this errand. I will not go into details with reference to the matter, but it will be readily understood that if they were to go, they must go as ordinary privates of the militia, and it seemed to me undesirable that this should be. They are very young men, and their studies are not yet completed. Besides, if we accepted cadets of the Royal Military College, there are cadets of other schools of Canada whom we would be obilged to accept. We thought it would be impossible to accept these cadets without accepting representatives from the cadets in different parts of Canada. It did not seem to the general, and I approved of his decision, that this was what was understood as a representation of the militia of Canada. I have only to say, in conclusion, that I think I have as high an opinion of the merits of the cadets of the Royal Military College and of the importance of that institution itself as the hon. gentleman can possibly have. I think the government have shown, by the consideration which we have given to the college since we came to power, that we have the interests of the college at heart. When it is known that when this government came in there was a list of less than 30 students at the Royal Military College, with an annual graduating class of seven or eight, and that now we have 80 or 90, or more, on the list of the college, with an annual graduating class of over 30, I think the House and the public will take very litle stock in any cheap attempt which the hon. gentleman may make here to endeavour to show that this government are not looking properly after the interests of the college. After careful consideration, we thought it was in the best interest of these young gentlemen that they should not take part in this demonstration. In conclusion, I repeat what I have already said, that there is no doubt whatever that among the officers and men of the contingent there will be found graduates of the Royal Military Col-

lege who have distinguished themselves, not only at the college, but on the field of battle in South Africa, and in militia service generally throughout the Dominion.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). There is one matter the Minister of Militia and Defence referred to which ought not to be allowed to pass without reference, and that is his statement that the number of graduates attending the Royal Military College when the present government came in has greatly increased. It might appear at first blush that there was something in the contention the hon. gentleman wishes to suggest by that comparison of figures. But I venture to say that any one who reflects upon the position of affairs to-day as compared with what obtained when the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, will see at once that the comparison is not at all favourable to the minister; and in fact we would expect a much larger increase under the conditions which exist in Canada to-day. When we bear in mind the dominant military spirit that has been aroused by the recent contest in which Britain has been engaged, a contest which has been echoed throughout every part of the British empire, the feeling of unity and the desire to maintain the integrity of the empire being now everywhere prevalent, it is not at all surprising to find that there are a larger number of young men now attending the Royal Military College than in 1896. The imperial feeling and the feeling that animates almost all classes of Canadians to-day is that Canada, as an important part of the British empire, has reached a period when, by reason of its resources, and by reason of its increasing wealth, it should be able and willing to defend itself and to aid materially in the defence of the British empire when occasion arises; and this fact is quite sufficient of itself to account for the difference in numbers at present as contrasted with four or five years ago.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The increase in numbers had taken place prior to the commencement of the Boer war. The college was up to its maximum before there was any prospect of a war in South Africa.

Mr. LENNOX. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement, although he does not give us any figures as regards the two periods. But the minister must not forget that when the war was declared between Britain and South Africa the defence of the British empire had already been engaging attention in this country. As far back as 1894 there was a military spirit aroused in Canada in reference to the defence of the empire, which was expressed in this House, and which received a ready response among all classes of our people. So that prior, at all events, to 1896 we see that a spirit had arisen in this country which would account for the difference in numbers, and that spirit has been developing ever since. Now, we have reached the time when Canadians recognize that, having been under the wing of the British empire for so long and receiving protection for which we gave nothing in return, it is their duty, and it will be their pleasure in future, though perhaps not engaging in the European wars of Britain, to adopt some means of affording a reasonable measure of assistance to Britain whenever occasion arises, both for the defence of the empire as a whole, and for the defence of Canada in particular.

EXCLUSION OF CANADIAN BEEF FROM IMPERIAL CONTRACTS.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to bring to the attention of the House and of the country a matter of great importance to the majority of the people of this country, and at the close of my remarks I shall move a resolution bearing upon that subject. I refer to the fact that by an order of the War Office passed apparently in 1901, Canadian cattle cannot participate in the contracts for the supply of beef to the imperial troops of the United Kingdom. As I say, that was done by an order of the War Office, because there has been no legislation passed as was the case in regard to the embargo, or the statute, that compels the slaughter of cattle immediately upon their arrival in Great Britain. First I will read to you a letter dated Liverpool, January 4th, 1902:

Mr. D. A. Campbell, Montreal.

Dear Sir,—In respect to your inquiry regarding the closing out of Canadian cattle and beef from government contracts, we beg to hand you a letter and form of contract received from the War Office. You will note they state no special order was made on the subject. As regards the number of Canadian cattle that was used to fill these contracts it is impossible to give the exact figures as no record was kept, but we would say that about 40 per cent of the North-west cattle were used by the government contractors and the restriction has had a serious effect on the prices of Canadian cattle.

Yours truly,

BAKER & WILLIAMSON.

I may say that these gentlemen are large live stock dealers in Liverpool. This is the reply:

War Office, Pall Mall, S.W.,
December 28, 1901.

Gentlemen,—I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated the 21st inst., relative to the supply of meat under army contracts and to forward for your information a form of tender for meat. I am to add that there is no separate

order on the subject of the supply of home bred beef only.

I am, gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
W. P. PURY.
Assistant Director of Army Contracts.

Now, I have here the form of tender previous to the date I have mentioned, that is the 1st of June last, calling for the supply of beef from the 1st of December, 1900, to the 31st May, 1901. Clause 1 reads as follows :

The meat shall be well fed, good, sound, sweet and wholesome. The beef shall be ox, not under two nor more than eight years old, or heifer or cow, not under two nor more than four years old ; the mutton, wether or ewe, Carcasses of sheep weighing less than 50 pounds will not be received.

That is the form of tender previous to this restriction being embodied. Then, this is the form of tender calling for the supply of meat from the 1st of June, 1901, to the 30th November, 1901. These tenders had to be in on the 24th April, 1901. The form of tender having been redrawn, and in the amended form the first clause reads :

The meat shall be well fed, good, sound, sweet and wholesome. The beef shall be home bred ox, not under two nor more than eight years old, or home bred heifer and cow, not under two nor more than eight years old ; the mutton, wether or ewe. Carcasses of sheep weighing less than 50 pounds will not be rereceived.

We now pass to the form of tender from the 1st December, 1901, to the 31st May, 1902, which is as follows :

The meat shall be well fed, good, sound, sweet and wholesome. The beef shall be home bred ox, not under two, nor more than eight years old, or home bred heifer and cow, not under two nor more than four years old ; the mutton, wether or ewe. Carcasses of sheep weighing less than 50 pounds will not be received.

Subject to clause 19 as to issue of preserved meat, and to clause 9 as to hospital requirements, the demand will be for the supply of home bred beef five days each week, and mutton (which may be frozen) two days.

Then there is a clause added to this form of tender.

Clause 23. Each quarter or other portion of beef supplied under this contract must have a label attached to it guaranteeing that it is the produce of a home bred animal in accordance with clause 1 of the specification. The labels will be provided by the contractor and should be drawn up in accordance with the pro forms as follows :—

The beef to which this label is attached is guaranteed to be the produce of a beast reared in the United Kingdom.

Signature of contractor.....
Date.....190....

Now, notwithstanding the fact that this very important industry, as I have said, has, by this Act of the Imperial War Office, been debarred from participating in this trade, it seems strange that our government should not be aware of it. It seems that even as late as the 31st of January the government, presided over by our practical farmer here, was not aware of the great injustice that was being done our people in that respect. I say it is strange that such should be the case, but it is a fact, nevertheless. The hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) and the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Robinson), whose speeches I heard during the debate on the budget, told us that all we had to do was to go to the free trade market of England with our stock and there place it. I would like these hon. gentlemen, and I am glad they are both here, to think about this. Not alone was protection adopted at the time the embargo was placed against our cattle, as I shall take occasion later on to prove, but, in a matter which the Imperial War Office and the imperial government have control of, it is total exclusion. Coming back to the point at which I referred to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, mentioning the date of the 31st January, I would say that this matter was agitating the minds of the people of Manitoba, and that it was made the subject of a resolution which was brought up in the form of a petition to be presented to this House asking whether this could be so or how it possibly could be true after all that had taken place between the imperial government and our own government. I, for my part believe that if the attention of the War Office had been called to this matter a remedy would have been provided. On the 30th of January the following telegram was sent to the hon. Minister of Agriculture :

Winnipeg, Jan. 30.

Please wire why Canadian cattle not accepted by imperial authorities for army contracts, quoting authority under which exclusion is enforced.

(Sgd.) CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

To that the hon. minister replied :

Ottawa, 31st January.

To the Clerk of the House, Winnipeg.

Regarding your question, why Canadian cattle not accepted for army contracts, I am not aware of any such exclusion.

(Sgd.) SYDNEY FISHER.

It seems strange that such an important industry as this should have such an embargo placed upon it and the Minister of Agriculture should not be aware of it. I was told by Mr. Wylie, a large cattle raiser and trader of Maple Creek, that this embargo made a difference of at least $5 a head because he said the contractors to whom they were selling took advantage of it and said : We regret that we are not able to supply this Canadian beef to the contractors ; otherwise we would be able to give you a better price than we are giving. I do not wish

to occupy very much time. I have briefly stated the facts and I regret that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Lawrence, (Mr. Bickerdike) is not here, because I expected his support in regard to the matter with which I am now dealing.

That hon. gentleman (Mr. Bickerdike) feels very keenly upon this subject, but owing to the serious accident which befell him, he has not been able to attend constantly in the House. However, the last time he was here I told him that I would take an opportunity of discussing the question on going into Supply, and that I would refer to what took place between us. I cannot understand how the government can justify their action in allowing this very important matter affecting Canadian interests to pass without notice. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has been in England since this exclusion took place, and as Mr. Wylie told me many of the cattle commissioners were surprised that he did not go to interview them, and that he did not exercise his influence with the imperial authorities to have this exclusion removed. A deputation waited on the Minister of Agriculture in Aberdeen with reference to the embargo on Canadian cattle, and he told them that if this embargo were not incorporated in an Act of the imperial parliament it might be dealt with. Well, Sir, this exclusion of Canadian beef from Imperial contracts is not incorporated in an Act of Parliament, and why did our government not deal with it? Indeed, one would think, in view of the action of the imperial authorities in this matter, that they place very little value on the preference which Canada has seen fit to give them. It will be noticed that the exclusion does not apply to mutton, and so Australia is not affected, and Canada is practically the only colony whose interests are militated against by this order of the imperial authorities. It is a very serious matter, and I think that the House will agree with me that the government is deserving of censure for not having acted more promptly and with more effect in regard to the protection of this important industry. I therefore beg to move, seconded by Mr. Halliday:

That all the words after 'that' in the main motion be struck out and the following substituted.

It appears from the form of tender and contract called for by the British government for the supply of beef to the British troops in Great Britain and Ireland; contractors are not allowed to supply Canadian beef for that purpose. That although this exclusion has prevailed since the month of June, 1901; this House regrets that no steps have been taken by this present government to redress this grievance by making timely representations to the British government with a view of securing the protection of the interests of the farmers and cattle dealers of Canada.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) has moved what is practically a motion of want of confidence in the government, on going into Supply. I regret that he has taken this step and I think perhaps that if he had considered the matter a little more carefully he would not have gone to the extreme of making this motion. He wishes to censure the government and myself particularly, because, as he says, we did not take time by the forelock, and when I was in England last spring especially, see that this action was not taken by the imperial government. The action of which he complained was taken, as I understand it, in the month of June last, actually, I believe, when I was in England. I must confess that I was not aware of it then, nor had I any means of being aware of it for some time afterwards. It would no doubt be better that we should have the contracts of the War Office and of the navy sent to us in the regular form. That has not been done as a matter of practice in the past. This form of contract in question was issued without any notice to us, or as far as I know, to anybody else, and it did not come under my attention until the early part of this year. It was known to a certain gentleman who is interested in the cattle trade, and who, I presume, obtained the information from his friends in England who are interested in the supplying of this beef to the British army. The moment that information came under our notice representations were made by Lord Strathcona to the War Office, pointing out that this was detrimental to the Canadian trade; that it was unfair, and that he hoped steps would be taken to remove that restriction in the form of the contract. It will be a perfectly fair and frank statement of the course of events when I say, that since Lord Strathcona made that representation to the War Office no reply has been received by my department. If Lord Strathcona had received a reply I think it would have been forwarded immediately to me, but of course I cannot say that he has not received a reply within the last week or ten days. At any rate, no reply to his communication has been received by my department or by the government here. I appreciate fully that this action on the part of the War Office may have some detrimental effect upon the Canadian cattle trade in England. I believe that it will cut out to a certain extent our cattle from the market of the dealers who are filling these contracts. But I find it rather a peculiar circumstance that since this form of contract has been adopted there have been contracts made by the War Office for the supply of meat to South Africa, in which they have allowed colonial cattle to be received. I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) that in consequence of representations which my department has made to the War Office, forms of contract both for the army and navy have been sent to Canada quite recently, and

these forms of contract are for the supply of meat by Canadian contractors whose names have been put on the contract list in Great Britain. The War Office and the navy have lately sent these forms of contract to people in Canada to be filled up by Canadian contractors for the supply of Canadian meat.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister any of these forms ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not them under my hand at the present moment.

Mr. MONK. I suppose they will be laid on the Table ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. The forms of contract were not sent in very great numbers, but I think they have been forwarded to the people whose names had been submitted, and who asked to have an opportunity of tendering for such contracts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister lay on the Table of the House the communication of Lord Strathcona to the imperial authorities, to which he has referred.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. I have that particular communication here. I have not got the communications which have passed between my own department and the War Office in regard to contracts being let to Canadian firms. But I can assure the House and the hon. gentleman that while I have not particularly noticed the form of the contract in Great Britain which was a form for British contractors, I have been and my department has been for some time back exerting all our influence and all our efforts to secure from the War Office, and also from the navy, contracts for contractors in Canada to supply what was wanted for these services; and the War Office and the navy have both exhibited a certain amount of readiness to yield to these representations and to allow Canadian contractors to take part in the supply of these requirements. This indicates that while under the particular forms of contracts which have been quoted this afternoon as being entered into by British dealers and British butchers, they have required home-bred cattle to be used, they have not hesitated at all to take the meat from Canadian-bred cattle when it has been supplied or contracted for by Canadian contractors. I believe most sincerely that, on the representations that have already been made and the representations that are being made to-day in London, this disability also will disappear. I trust that it will do so, not that I fear any very great hurt to our cattle trade in England, but because I feel, as I think every Canadian feels, that our cattle in England are just as worthy to supply the meat for fulfilling these contracts as any home-bred cattle are, and that we should not suffer on the English market from any greater disabilities than we do now.

The hon. gentleman has referred to the question of the embargo. In regard to that, I have only to say that over and over again, not only to our own representations, but also to the representations of certain classes and associations in England, the Minister of Agriculture in England has declared that he cannot and will not remove that embargo. It was only lately, as I dare say, the hon. gentleman and others have noticed, that the Butchers' Association of London have made representations, in consequence of the scarcity of meat in England, that the embargo on Canadian cattle should be removed; but they received just the same reply from the Minister of Agriculture in England that the associated interests in Edinburgh did last year. The injustice, as I think I may fairly describe it, which Canadian cattle are suffering from in the English market through the embargo is one on which I think everybody in this House and this country is thoroughly agreed; and nobody is more desirous than myself to try to persuade the English Department of Agriculture, or the English government, or the English parliament, to raise that embargo; but the way in which our representations have been received by the Minister of Agriculture in England, and the way in which he has replied, has led me to believe that at the present time there is really no hope of securing a change in that respect. While thus quoting the Minister of Agriculture in England, I must also confess that Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, dealt with me in the same way in regard to this matter when I was in England last year, and he gave me to understand that the dictum of the Minister of Agriculture must be considered as final. Under these circumstances, I do not consider that it would to-day be worth our while or in anyway necessary to discuss the question of the embargo.

I do not know that I can add much more; but I am afraid I must ask the House to vote down the motion which the hon. gentleman has placed in your hands, Mr. Speaker. I do not consider that any fair or just cause has been made out to show that my department or the government have in any way failed in their duty; but they have taken the necessary precautions to try to remove any difficulty that may have occurred, and are ready at all times to work to the best of their ability in the interest of our Canadian farmers.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's speech is largely apologetic. He speaks just like a school boy who has done wrong and knows it, and expects to be whipped. The hon. minister has first called the attention

of the House to the fact that this is a vote of want of confidence, and he complains of that. Well, in the first place, my hon. friend could not well bring it up in any other form at the present stage of the session. He has been endeavouring for a length of time to get it before the House, but unsuccessfully. In the second place, I do not know whether the hon. minister should complain, because my hon. friend proposes to express the regret of the House that he had not availed himself of an earlier opportunity to make some effort to prevent this embargo being placed on Canadian cattle. It is quite plain that the hon. minister either gave the matter no attention or that there was culpable negligence or carelessness in his department. If he had been giving any attention to it, it would scarcely have escaped his notice that for over a year this position of things had existed. He above all others was interested in ascertaining in every possible way where the Canadian farmer could get an advantage in the British market. During a large portion of last summer the Minister of Agriculture was in England along with the Dairy Commissioner. They went all over that country, made speeches, had reporters along with them, and had their speeches liberally reported; and the minister conducted himself in a most generous way towards the British people. I noticed in a report of one of his speeches that he told the British people how generously Canada had acted towards them—how we had reduced the duties on their imports, gracefully and deliberately, without desiring or asking any return. He was extremely generous about what we had done for England, but at the same time he was extremely neglectful of the opportunity which was presented to him of getting anything for the Canadian farmer in return. It was a generosity on his part which the Canadian farmer scarcely expected. But this matter was drawn to his attention on the 1st of December, 1901, and although it had been in existence for over a year it was unknown either to him or his department. He could not have been keeping himself very closely in touch with what was taking place on the market which above all others is of great value to the Canadian farmer.

The very fact that he did not know justifies us in expressing regret that he was not more alive to the needs of the situation and looking more closely after the interests of the Canadian farmers, which he, above all others, ought to have at heart. On the 31st December, 1901, or on the 30th January, 1902. the hon. gentleman wired the secretary of Agriculture in Manitoba that he knew nothing about the matter. It is somewhat strange that the people in Manitoba and British Columbia and the territories should know all about it and that the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa, who is supposed to be always in touch with the British people, should know nothing. Does this not show that he is not sufficiently alive to the situation ? Does it not show a carelessness in the management of his department not at all compatible with the responsibilities of his position ?

He says that some contracts have been sent lately to Canadians to supply beef to the imperial army. But he did not tell us when representations were made to the High Commissioner to have the embargo raised. Had the hon. minister been as anxious to benefit the Canadian farmer, as he ought to be, he would have done as Sir Charles Tupper did, when High Commissioner. He would have availed himself of the earliest opportunity, and both by wire and otherwise put in play every influence to get the advantage desired for the Canadian farmer. Sir Charles Tupper did not wait for letters to pass to and fro between the Department of Agriculture in this country and the Department of Agriculture in England, but he used the cable, and used it extensively. He did not allow an hour to be wasted before endeavouring to get the embargo raised, and succeeded in having it raised at a very early date. But all the present Minister of Agriculture has done has been to make some representations to the High Commissioner in London, and we are not informed whether these were made one, two or three months ago, but he tells us he has no information about the matter to-day. He has been content to rest on his oars, apparently indifferent as to whether the High Commissioner sends him a reply in six months or not. I think, therefore, that this House should express regret that the hon. minister did not take action earlier or was not more alive to the situation in the interests of our Canadian farmers than he has shown himself to be.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). If the hon. gentleman had drawn this motion on broader lines, and with the idea of getting rid of the grievance complained of, I would be most happy to support him. I consider this a pressing matter, and drew the attention of the House to it at the very beginning of the session, when I moved for the correspondence relating to the embargo on Canadian cattle. I regret that my hon. friend should have made his motion with the sole object of casting blame on the Minister of Agriculture, when the Minister of Agriculture is really not the guilty party. It is the British government and parliament who are to blame. And had the hon. gentleman simply asked this parliament to protest against the glaring injustice inflicted by the British government and parliament on the Canadian people by this embargo on Canadian cattle, I would have been glad to vote for his motion. The hon. gentleman has told us that the British Minister of Agriculture, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Hanbury, declared last year that were it not for the statute, the general question of the embargo on Canadian cattle might be dealt

with. But my hon. friend has evidently forgotten what Mr. Hanbury did say. If he will refer to the Montreal 'Star,' of the 26th October last, and the Montreal 'Herald' of the 30th October last, he will find that what Mr. Hanbury did say was that so long as he would be Minister of Agriculture, not only would the statute remain as it was, but he would never ask the British parliament to remedy the injustice. Therefore if we are to blame anybody, we should blame the British government. I believe that this parliament should express its opinion, not in any spirit of anger, but in a dignified, temperate manner, on the injustice perpetrated, and ask the British goverment and parliament to remedy that injustice. In my opinion, we should urge upon the British government and parliament the propriety and the justice of abrogating or amending that statute. But so far as Canada is concerned, if anybody is open to blame, it is our High Commissioner in London. I do not say that he is, but I say that when we pay $10,000 a year to a High Commissioner to represent us in London, and when we maintain a staff of officials in London, to keep us in touch with the British government, and report upon any matter of importance, it is their duty to inform immediately the Canadian government of anything that may transpire. Surely the High Commissioner should be made aware of what is done against Canadian interests before any minister in Canada. I should suppose that the reason we employ the High Commissioner is that he may keep us informed of any advantage we may obtain in Great Britain, and of any disadvantage we may have to contend against. But I am afraid that he is so busy complying with the wishes of Mr. Chamberlain, that he has no time to look after the interests of Canadians. I am afraid that Lord Strathcona, with all due respect for his devotion to Canada, is so busy supplying live stock to the British army that he has no time to look after the interests of our cattle raisers who want to supply it with dead meat beef. I think it only right that I should correct the mistake of my hon. friend in quoting the words of Mr. Hanbury.

Mr. BOYD. What I said was that in discussing this matter in Scotland, before a deputation of farmers, Mr. Hanbury said that there was a statute passed as late as 1896, and for that reason he could not consider their representations. The words my hon. friend has quoted, Mr. Hanbury used later on.

Mr. BOURASSA. But if my hon. friend wants us to be really aware of the position in England, he should not lay the whole blame on the Minister of Agriculture here, but let us understand that not only is the Minister of Agriculture in England prevented by statute from acting, but he has stated most positively that he would not act so long as he continued to be Minister of Agriculture. As far as the Minister of Agriculture here is concerned, I am glad to say that I was present in England at the time he was making all the efforts he could in our behalf, and I know that he did not neglect anything possible to bring about a change in the feelings of the British people. In saying this, I am not moved by any purpose of flattering the Minister of Agriculture or the government in general. I think that the position I occupy in this House will free me from any imputation of that kind. When I give credit to the government, it is simply because I believe it is due, and when I blame the government it is equally because, in my opinion, they are deserving of blame.

Mr. BOYD. You don't blame them very often.

Mr. BOURASSA. There is one point on which I differ with the Minister of Agriculture and it is this. I do not agree that because Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Hanbury have said that they will not correct the wrong, we should therefore submit. I believe that this parliament ought to give expression to its views and transmit those views to the British government and parliament. The hon. gentleman has just admitted that this is an injustice. He has said that at the present moment there is no reason for keeping this exclusion Act in force against Canadian cattle. Therefore, I say that no session of this parliament should pass without a direct expression of opinion being given by a unanimous voice of this House protesting against the injustice, so long as it is not corrected. Those who have the right to complain of this injustice are the representatives of the Canadian people, and they should protest. I regret that the hon. gentleman has not brought forward his motion in this broad spirit, and I hope that the session will not pass without a motion directed by this spirit being proposed, a motion designed to convey the protest of the representatives of the Canadian people but without the intention of making political capital for one side or the other.

Mr. WM. J. ROCHE (Marquette). The subject which has been brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) is one of very great importance, I think we will all agree, to the people of Canada as a whole, but more particularly to our ranchers and farmers. The South African war is the opening up of a new market, we might say, causing an increased demand for many of the products of our farmers, especially for our hay, our flour, and our meats. But we can only look upon it as a temporary market. And, as we raise so much more of articles of this character than we require for home consumption and must find an export market, it behooves us to have every possible restriction or embargo that might tend to

hamper this trade removed, whether it refers to the army in South Africa or in the British Isles. So far as the slaughtering of our cattle at the port of entry into Great Britain is concerned, that embargo has existed for a number of years past. The Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has told us that he has given up all idea of having that embargo removed through representations to the British authorities, that, in fact, he has practically ceased all efforts in that direction. But if the hon. minister has not been any more prompt in his efforts to have that embargo removed than he has been in the matter of having the clause in the contract prohibiting the use of outside beef in the army contracts, I do not wonder that he despairs of having the embargo removed in the near future. Whatever show of colour there may have been at the time the embargo was placed upon our cattle, on the ground of disease—and I believe that there may have been some cases of disease among American cattle—there has been no reason for it in the way of an ascertained case of pleuro pneumonia amongst our Canadian cattle since that embargo was adopted. So, we are driven to the conclusion that the embargo is intended simply as a measure of protection to the cattle raisers of Great Britain. And this clause of the contracts for army beef is simply designed for the same purpose. It seems a rather peculiar condition of affairs that, while Canada has granted a preference in trade matters to Great Britain, allowing the products of her manufacturers to come into this country at 33⅓ per cent below our usual tariff, and, while our boys have been in South Africa fighting the battles of the empire, where they are privileged to eat Canadian beef, the remainder of the British soldiers in England are prevented from eating Canadian beef. Actually our beef is prohibited and not a pound can be supplied for the use of the imperial troops on account of this clause in the contract. It may be that the home government is taking the Minister of Agriculture at his word. As the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) said when the hon. minister was in England, he advised the statesmen of Great Britain that we did not desire any return for the preference we granted to Great Britain in our markets. This measure not merely does not grant us a preference so far as our beef is concerned—I am not aware that any has been asked—but places a prohibition upon Canadian beef, shuts it out from competition with the old country beef. Some may think that this is no very great loss to the cattle raisers of Canada. But we have heard an hon. gentleman who is engaged in the trade declare here to-day that at least forty per cent of our North-west cattle were used in connection with the supplying of beef to the army, and also that this clause means that a loss of at least $5 a head on these cattle shipped from Canada has been incurred. The loss, therefore, is a very serious one. But, even if there were no financial loss at all, from a sentimental standpoint the condition is most undesirable. Our government has allowed sentiment to move us in changing our commercial arrangements with the mother land. The sentiment of imperialism now prevails, and the tendency in business, as in other matters, is to draw the empire together. To have this additional embargo placed upon Canadian beef at this time is most unwise. It may be a business move on the part of Great Britain, but it seems rather strange for a free trade government to adopt a course not of protection but of what is worse, prohibition. It seems also that Canadians might well take a lesson from this example, that Canadian statesmen should learn to look after the interests of Canada. I am quite in accord with the Prime Minister in the declaration he made not very long ago that John Bull will respect us all the more, the more we take care of our own interests. Now, the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) says he cannot support this resolution because it condems this government. The hon. member is always ready to give advice to this government, he is always ready to be the adviser of the British government, to be even the censor of that government and to condemn it strongly ; but when it comes to condemning his own leader, of course he will not do that.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman will allow me I would like to say that I have voted more often against my party than he has voted against his.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). That shows that the hon. gentleman's party is more frequently wrong than my party is. Besides, I do not pose as an independent member of the House or as the leader of a third or fourth party. The hon. member (Mr. Bourassa) says he cannot condemn this government, because they have exercised due diligence in the matter, and that it is the fault of the British government. But, considering that these tenders had to be put in in April of last year and that a whole year has gone by, it seems clear that the Minister of Agriculture has not exercised the diligence he should have shown. And, when the matter was brought to his attention last January by the clerk of the legislative assembly in Manitoba, the hon. minister admitted that he knew nothing about it whatever. One would imagine that in such a case as this a clause referring to a matter under his own department, a matter so important as the supply of the army rations, the hon. Minister of Agriculture would be the first man in Canada to be seized of the facts and the man who would take the first and promptest measure. But the records show that, as I say, he knew nothing about the matter until his attention was

called to it last January by the clerk of the legislative assembly of Manitoba. Therefore, we have a right to condemn the hon. gentleman for not being as diligent as he should have been, and for not taking steps for doing away with this clause in the contract. A series of resolutions were passed by the legislature of Manitoba last February, just prior to the prorogation of the legislature, urging upon the Dominion government the necessity of petitioning the imperial authorities in favour of allowing our cattle to be placed on the same footing as the cattle of Great Britain in relation to these contracts. Those resolutions were passed unanimously. They were moved by a man who is a large exporter of cattle. Evidently, the people of the North-west look upon this as a most important matter and one that, unless a change is made, will have a serious detrimental effect upon the interests of our people. Therefore, I view this differently from the hon. member for Labelle, and think that the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Macdonald is worthy of the support of every Conservative member of the House and of every independent member as well.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I feel disposed to adopt a middle course in this matter, because it seems to me that both the British government and our own government are to blame. I do not believe that the home government will vary from the course that is indicated to us by Mr. Hanbury's speech. And why should they? There is no doubt that if they admit our own beef on the same footing as the home-bred beef, they will do a certain amount of injury to the stock-raisers of the British Isles, their own constituents; and I doubt very much if any pressure we can bring to bear upon them would lead them to remove that impediment to our trade. Where I find the action of the home government at fault is in the fact that we ourselves having given them a considerable preference in our market, and having, as indicated by my hon. friends from the west, made considerable sacrifices, particularly of late years, in defence of the flag, it seems to me that under these circumstances we would be entitled to more consideration. But as to our being successful in any representations we may make, I doubt very much. The language of Mr. Hanbury, as quoted by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), is much more positive than is generally used by British statesmen, and I think we may regard it as a certainty that our efforts for a long time to come in that direction will be fruitless.

But I wish particularly to point out that our own government has in that respect a duty to perform, and that the Minister of Agriculture has totally failed to perform that duty. I believe that when the House is in session it is the prerogative of the House to express its opinion on matters of this kind; and during the recess, it belongs to the department interested to make proper representations to the home government in trade matters of this magnitude which concern the welfare of our agriculture. It is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture at any time, and at very short notice, to make proper representations to foreign authorities, and to the home government particularly, when that is necessary for the preservation of our interests. The question which arises in my mind is, What has the Minister of Agriculture done under the present circumstances? He has had three or four days' notice at least of this motion, and what has he brought down to the House to show that he has used diligence? A motion such as that made by my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) places upon the Minister of Agriculture the obligation of showing that he has used diligence in the premises.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I never had any notice of a motion. The hon. gentleman said he was going to make some remarks about this matter, but until he moved this motion this afternoon we never knew anything about it.

Mr. MONK. I am informed that the hon. minister had notice. He had not the text of that motion in his hand, but he had sufficient notice to have led him to bring down the scanty papers which he has in connection with this matter, and if there are further papers which justify or excuse him—because after all it is only an excuse that he has pleaded here—why have we not those papers before us? There is not one line, there is no despatch, there is no letter, there is nothing from the Minister of Agriculture to show that he has done anything in this matter. Here is his own telegram of the 31st of January last, and what does he say in that telegram? He says that he knew nothing about this prohibition. This is his telegram to the Clerk of the House at Winnipeg:

> Re your question why Canadian cattle not accepted for army contracts, I am not aware of any such exclusion.

He knew nothing of it on the 31st of January. What has he done since? Well, we have a letter addressed to the Minister of Agriculture by Lord Strathcona not in answer to any communication of the minister. This is the letter which, on the 18th of February, Lord Strathcona addressed to the Minister of Agriculture:

> Dear Mr. Fisher,—I think you may be interested in the inclosed copy of a letter I recently addressed to Mr. Chamberlain with regard to contracts for fresh beef for supply of military forces stationed in the United Kingdom. A copy of the letter from Mr. Wylie, which is referred to, is inclosed, as well as copies of the forms of contract which have given rise to the correspondence.

No communication from the Minister of

Agriculture excited the interest of our commissioner in England; it was correspondence, a copy of which is here found, from one of the cattle ranchers, if I am not mistaken; a private individual interested in the cattle trade took up this question and brought it to the notice of Lord Strathcona. Lord Strathcona having communicated with the War Office, he was not sure, was not certain, but he imagined that possibly the Minister of Agriculture might take some interest in this matter, and sent him over this correspondence. Therefore, though I agree with the hon. member for Labelle in thinking that the British government is at fault, if we are to take the view expressed by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), still it seems to me it is impossible not to arrive at the conclusion that the Minister of Agriculture has not moved one step in this matter, or at least, he has not seen fit to lay before the House proof of any diligence whatever. What we have from him is the proof that he knew nothing about the matter, and a letter from our commissioner in London inviting his attention to the matter, and to the correspondence which he, upon his own responsibility, had had with the War Office. With what result? None whatever. That restriction pointed out by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) still exists, and in my opinion will continue to exist. The Minister of Agriculture will not deny that it exists, and we are precluded from supplying beef to the British army. Out cattle are excluded to-day as they were a month ago. There is no change, the Minister of Agriculture knows it. It may be true that for supplying the army in the field in South Africa, as competition has been invited from all quarters, as there are contracts with the Americans, so there may be contracts with the people of this country for furnishing these war supplies. But will the minister state here on his responsibility that the restriction complained of by the hon. member for Macdonald has been removed, and that that form of contract is to-day changed? If he will make that statement he will enlighten the House on the point that we are discussing.

Under these circumstances it seems to me that there is ground for the claim that these things have occurred, and that they have been brought to the notice of the minister, although that should have been unnecessary. That should have been unnecessary. That hon. gentleman was travelling in England last year and surely this was the matter which might have caught his attention without his attention having been specially called to it.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (North Victoria). He was treading on air.

Mr. MONK. I do not say that, but I do say that he, having been in England, when this important matter was brought to his attention he failed to use diligence. Under these circumstances it is our duty to say that he has been lacking. Now, I am not going to take up any further time upon this question, but it is a matter which invites the attention and consideration of all the members of this House. When year after year, we have given a preference to the home government, in our markets, a preference which I, for one, and I believe some hon. members on this side of the House, claim has been a disastrous one to our own industries in many respects, we find here, as I have found on more than one occasion, that our own interests on the other side have not been guarded as they should have been. I will not carry this discussion any further.

Mr. W. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of asking any of those hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side of the House what reason was given by the British government for the exclusion of Canadian cattle. They have not been pleased to enlighten us on this subject.

Mr. MONK. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche, Halifax) does not ask me to enlighten him on that subject. I suppose, however, that there are two reasons, one perhaps resulting from this embargo on our cattle and another probably from the praiseworthy desire to encourage their own stock raisers. I do not blame them.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). Did they keep out Canadian cattle because they were diseased or for any reason of that kind.

Mr. BENNETT. I think it was deceased cattle they wanted.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say that the correspondence which has been referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has completely met the argument of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that it was the High Commissioner in London who was in a sense responsible for the injury done to Canada in the contracts, or the tenders for food supplies for the British army. I cannot see how the hon. member for Labelle can possibly drag the name of the High Commissioner into this question. The High Commissioner, I can assure him, has been most energetic in looking after Canadian interests. The High Commissoner, without the authority of the Canadian government endeavoured to have the embargo on Canadian cattle removed, and I am satisfied by the correspondence which has been produced here that he is still active in looking after Canada's interest.

Mr. BOURASSA. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) not know that the letter just read by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is dated the 18th

of November ? How is it that the High Commissioner, who is looking after our business, did not know between the 30th June, 1901, and the 18th November, 1902, that the War Office was putting a condition into its contracts which would do harm to Canada ? Is he not there to look after our business ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). No, he is not there to look after contracts of that kind, or to conduct such business ; he is only there to carry out the instructions of the Canadian government. It is the duty of the hon. Minister of Agriculture here and his agents to see that the interests of Canada are properly guarded in all these respects. I merely rose to point out the fact that the High Commissioner seems to be the only person in London who has taken an active part in looking after Canada's interests in this matter.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Boyd).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	LaRivière,
Barker,	Lennox,
Bennett,	Léonard,
Birkett,	MacLaren (Perth),
Blain,	McCormick,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Boyd,	McIntosh,
Brock,	McLeod,
Bruce,	Monk,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Clarke,	Northrup,
Cochrane,	Osler,
Culbert,	Porter,
Earle,	Richardson,
Fowler,	Robinson (Elgin),
Ganong,	Roche (Marquette),
Gourley,	Rosamond,
Hackett,	Sherritt,
Haggart,	Sproule,
Halliday,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tolton,
Hughes (Victoria),	Vrooman,
Ingram,	Ward,
Kemp,	Wilmot,
Kidd,	Wilson.—51.
Lancaster,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Argers,	Legris,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Béland,	Lewis,
Bernier,	Lovell,
Blair,	Loy,
Bourassa,	Macdonald,
Bourbonnais,	Mackie,
Bureau,	MacKinnon,
Calvert,	MacLaren (Hunt'n),
Campbell,	McCarthy,
Carbonneau,	McColl,
Carroll,	McCreary,
Champagne,	McEwen,
Christie,	McGugan,
Copp,	McIsaac,
Costigan,	McLennan,
Cowan,	Madore,
Delisle,	Malouin,
Demers (Lévis),	Marcil (Bagot),
Douglas,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Dugas,	Martineau,
Dyment,	Matheson,
Edwards,	Meigs,
Emmerson,	Morrison,
Ethier,	Mulock,
Farquharson,	Oliver,
Fielding,	Paterson,
Fisher,	Power,
Fitzpatrick,	Préfontaine,
Flint,	Puttee,
Fortier,	Reid (Ristigouche),
Gauvreau,	Riley,
Geoffrion,	Roche (Halifax),
German,	Ross (Ontario),
Gibson,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Girard,	Scott,
Gould,	Sifton,
Guthrie,	Smith (Vancouver),
Harwood,	Stephens,
Heyd,	Stewart,
Holmes,	Sutherland (Essex),
Hughes (Kings, P.E.I.)	Sutherland (Oxford),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Talbot,
Kendall,	Tarte,
Lang,	Thompson,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tolmie,
Laurier (L'Assom'n),	Turcot,
Lavergne,	Turgeon,
LeBlanc,	Wade.—98.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Cartwright,	Tupper,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
Fraser,	Bell,
Horsey,	Pringle,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Bickerdike,	Cargill,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Archambault,	Avery,
Beith,	Kendrey,
Belcourt,	Kaulbach,
Borden (Kings, N.S.)	Maclean,
Brown,	Ball,
Bruneau,	Roddick,
Davis,	Casgrain,
Erb,	Calvin,
Gallery,	Seagram,
McCool,	Clancy,
Murray,	Lavell,
Proulx,	Robinson (Northumberland),
Russell,	Broder,
Schell,	Smith (Wentworth),
Tobin,	Clare,
Tucker,	Hale,
Wright,	Johnston (Cardwell),

Amendment (Mr. Boyd) negatived.

EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). I beg to give notice, Mr. Speaker, that when the House is again moved into Committee of Supply, I shall move the following amendment :

That this House protests against the maintenance of the provisions of the Diseases of Animals Act, G.B., against Canadian cattle, and hopes that the Prime Minister will take advan-

tage of the proposed imperial conference in London, to press upon the British government the necessity of amending the said Act in order to free Canadian cattle from the operations of the said Act.

THE FISHERY AWARD—STATEMENT BY THE PREMIER OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House and of the government to the budget speech delivered on the 10th of this month by the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island, in which he spoke of certain negotiations now pending between the government of that province and the government of this Dominion with regard to claims by that province upon what is known as the fishery award. I propose to read a portion of the speech of the premier of Prince Edward Island in which that reference is made. He was speaking of the taxation of his province, and he said :

> We had in mind a plan of taxation which would practically remodel the whole existing system, but when we set about making up our estimates for the year, we found that the deficit woul be so small that it would be absurd to change the existing system of taxation in order to meet it. But not only that, I believe before the year 1902 closes, we will receive from Ottawa a sum which will be sufficient to carry on the affairs of this province without any additional taxation. We thought it would be absurd to go to the expense and annoyance of putting extra taxes on the people, entailing a large expenditure in connection therewith, when we felt confident from advices from Ottawa that in a very short time our claims for our share of the Fishery Award would be recognized and paid. I am well aware that this has been flaunted, this little flag of truce has been held before the face of the electors of the province for a great number of years—that is true, but every thing has its day. We all know the story of the importunate widow.'

Then the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island goes on to refer to certain claims heretofore made by the province upon this government, and which claims were successfully made. I will not allude to these, as they are past transactions. The Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island continues, in his speech :

> Thus was our persistence rewarded and so will it be with our Fishery Award. $4,000,000 of hard earned money was paid by the American government to the British government and by them paid to the Canadian government ; money earned by the sweat of the brow, by the toiling on the rowlocks of the boats of our island fishermen ; and by the terms of union and by the evidence given before the Halifax commission, we are entitled to our share of that money. It has been claimed for years and now I am happy to say our hope is near fruition. Messrs. Farquharson and Mackinnon, who represent West and East Queen's in the House of Commons, have been pressing this claim, and I have communications not only from Mr. Mackinnon but also from the Department of Marine at Ottawa, which indicate that our claim has been so far admitted that the federal government is willing that it should be submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada for decision as to whether or not we are entitled to the amount. As to the result, any lawyer who has studied the question, the statute, and the evidence taken before the commission will admit that we as well as Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, are entitled to the $4,000,000 ; and if it should have been ours in 1878, we are now clearly entitled also to the interest that the Dominion government has been putting into its coffers for all these years down to date. They have been collecting interest on our $1,000,000 at 3 per cent, $30,000 per annum and have been paying back in fisheries bounties to this province the sum of $13,000. We will be entitled to receive at least $30,000 yearly interest, per annum, since confederation, in addition to our $1,000,000, and, Mr. Speaker, I feel all the more confident that our claim will be acknowledged since I find that the great province of Quebec, the pivotal province of the Dominion, has taken the initiative and is now claiming her share of the award.

Now, Sir, in the King's speech at the opening of the session, we were told that this government had been negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company about a matter between the people of the Northwest and that company, and that the government had agreed to refer that matter to the Supreme Court. That was thought of sufficient importance to be communicated to this House in the speech from the Throne ; but although important negotiations affecting nearly $7,000,000—$4,000,000 of principal and about $2,800,000 interest—although these negotiations have been pending with certain provinces, not one word has been communicated to parliament on this subject, and that, mark you, although the negotiations seem to have progressed so far that members of this House who are in communication with the government, have been able to inform the premier of Prince Edward Island that this claim is so far admitted that the question will be submitted to the courts. Further than that, the government of Prince Edward Island seem to have had communications officially with the Minister of Marine upon this subject, and all this has been going on without the slightest word to this House. I do not know that I need make any extended remarks upon that question. It does seem to me a most extraordinary thing, that while this House is sitting and when we are only two weeks from the end of this session, we have not heard a word on this subject from any of the ministers. I cannot believe that this statement of the premier of Prince Edward Island is wholly without foundation. So certain is he of what he speaks, that he actually puts off the raising of necessary taxation in his province, because he believes that during this year and before another session this money will be paid, and it will not be necessary to raise that taxation, but that the province will be able

to pay its debts out of the money that is to be handed over by the Dominion government. I am not going to discuss the question as to whether the provinces are entitled to any portion of this award. I think it will be found that the people of this Dominion are not disposed to concede that this is not an asset of the Dominion at large. Whatever may be the case upon that point, what I contend for is this: That no such negotiations should have been carried on without our having knowledge of them in this House. I think, Sir, we are entitled to at least that much consideration. It is not merely that the province of Prince Edward Island is being led to expect the payment of this money, but probably Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are expecting it as well. I suppose these are all importunate widows as the premier of Prince Edward Island calls them. We, therefore, have four importunate widows appealing to the government for this $4,000,000 principal and a quarter million dollars interest. Perhaps it would be good advice for me to tender the Prime Minister to beware of the widows. However, that may be, if the right hon. gentleman's government is negotiating with them he should let us know it. I hope that the First Minister will be able to assure the House, that notwithstanding the positive language used by the premier of Prince Edward Island there is really no foundation for these expectations of his.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have no fault to find with the spirit of the remarks of my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), and in view of the speech which has been delivered by the Prime Minister of Prince Edward Island, perhaps it would not be amiss if I should take this opportunity of altogether reassuring my hon. friend from Hamilton on the fears which he entertains that we may succumb to the blandishments of these several widows of whom he has spoken. I hope our virtue will be equal to the occasion, and that he will have nothing to fear upon that score. There has been loose talk, as my hon. friend knows for several years in the maritime provinces, and even in the province of Quebec: That the award which we obtained under the Washington treaty (which was not $4,000,000, but $4,500,000) should be distributed amongst the provinces. My hon. friend is aware that for a great many years past—almost since the time we received that award—we have been distributing, practically the interest on it in the shape of bounty to the fishermen; and whether the fishermen receive it from us or from the interested governments in the provinces in which they live, I do not know it would make very much difference. But there is another question which has occasioned a good deal of correspondence with, and remonstrances from the maritime provinces—indeed from all the provinces connected with fishery questions—and that is the foreshore question. A judgment was given three years ago by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which, unfortunately has left in doubt a good many questions with regard to the ownership of the foreshore. We have received communications from the several governments upon this point, and we have agreed to have a conference upon the whole subject. As to the distribution of the money which we have received under the fisheries award, though I am aware that claims have been made to us by several provinces, no decision has been arrived at. In fact, the subject has not been considered at all; and I may supplement what I say now by stating that at an early day the whole correspondence will be brought down, and then my hon. friend will know what action has been taken.

INQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask the right hon. gentleman whether certain resolutions and memorials from boards of trade, which were to be brought down in answer to a question by my hon. friend from Toronto, have been brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER. They will all be brought down at an early day. They are being prepared.

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

Prince Edward Island Railway—Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsboro' Bridge, $500,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This vote is to continue the undertaking for the current year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount required to finish the bridge and this branch, and what has been expended already?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There has been expended from the 30th of June to the 31st of December, on the bridge and the railway, $215,210. The branch, including the rolling stock, will cost in the neighbourhood of $2,620,000. The bridge itself will cost $1,100,000.

Mr. INGRAM. How long is the bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between three-quarters of a mile and a mile, I think.

Mr. INGRAM. How many abutments are under it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think 13 or 14.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount required for rolling stock?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $200,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Does not the local government pay a part of the expense of building this bridge?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. HACKETT. Is there not $10,000 deducted every year from the subsidy to the island ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. We have a contract with the island.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the length of this branch ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the line is continued all the way to Murray Harbour, with a loop, as is under consideration, there will be about 55 miles altogether. If we stop at the Murray river, as to which no definite decision has yet been arrived at, it will be shorter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the work being done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the object of the bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The railway is constructed from the main line at Charlottetown across the Hillsboro river and thence down to Murray Harbour.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I have no objection whatever to make to the expenditure of $10,650 for improvements along the Prince Edward Island Railway, but I think the amount might well have been larger. I am in receipt of communications from different sources on the island, which point out a great many improvements that might be made, and for which I see no provision in the estimates. On the line between Cape Traverse and Emerald, there is not a booking station in that whole length. The people of Kinkora, where there is quite a large settlement, have been asking for freight accommodation for some years, but so far have failed to obtain any satisfaction. In February last a large and influential meeting was held at Kinkora, and the following resolution unanimously adopted :

Moved by Rev. J. J. Macdonald, and seconded by Mr. John P. Smith :

Whereas up to the present, Kinkora has had insufficient railway station accommodations ; and whereas a cheese factory has been recently established, an agricultural implement factory is in operation, several merchants do a large import and export trade and the traffic on the railway here has about trebled itself within the last three years.

And whereas a greater volume of business is transacted at Kinkora than at many localities along the main line where booking stations are now established.

And whereas there is every indication that in the near future there will be a large increase in the import and export trade of the community.

And whereas the government outlay necessary to establish proper station facilities will be more than compensated for by the consequent increased traffic.

And whereas great inconvenience and loss have been sustained for want of a proper station and for lack of telegraphic communication with business centres.

Be it therefore resolved that for the benefit of the railway itself, as well as for the interests of the community, this meeting recommends and urges the immediate erection by the government, of a suitable booking station at Kinkora crossing.

Further resolved, that a petition praying for such railway facilities and for the appropriation necessary for that purpose, be circulated and presented to the government without delay, so that action may be taken thereon during the present session of the federal parliament.

These resolutions were passed at a large representative meeting and a petition forwarded to the government asking that the required improvements be made.

During the past season two merchants alone at Kinkora paid out $500 freight on their shipments, which of course is but a fraction of the general business done both in exports and imports. The train on this section leaves Cape Traverse about six o'clock in the morning, and the people exporting freight have to be out along the line about seven o'clock, in order to get it shipped, and as most of the shipping is done in the summer and the train has to wait for the boat, there is often no end of delay. The train frequently gets into Kinkora about two o'clock in the morning, so that the people there have to wait up to receive their goods and the mail carrier has to sit up all night to receive the mail. And as the trains are not always on time, people have been known to wait hours in order to catch the train going out or coming back. There is only one train a day for passengers and freight. Besides the station for payment of freight is at Emerald, and goods are often held over until the merchant can go up to Emerald and pay his freight there. There is a large amount of business done in this section. As shown by the report, business has trebled there in the past three years. The business of the Prince Edward Island Railway during the past three years has increased—thus keeping pace with the general prosperity of the Dominion—some $50,000 over previous years, and there is every reason why the people of this vicinity should not be given railway accommodation at that point. I may also say that the people of Kensington, a village which has grown considerably during the past few years, require increased freight accommodation. There is a large cheese and butter export from that section, and the superintendent of the company requires increased accommodation for the freight, and is anxious that the yard around the station should be put in proper repair. There are also several other sta-

tions along the line which are asking for improved accommodation. I am personally acquainted with the condition of affairs in Kinkora and Kensington, and I know that repairs and improvements are very much needed in these places. It seems to me that the hon. minister might well put in something more than $10,650 for improvements on the Prince Edward Island Railway, especially when the amount is charged to capital account. I would ask him to take this matter into consideration and not let another season pass without having this crying need of the people of Kinkora and Kensington for freight accommodation and booking stations supplied. I do not think it would cost over $3,000 or $4,000 to do the whole thing, and I have no doubt that the business of the railway would benefit.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite ready to acknowledge that there is much in what the hon. gentleman has said with respect to the necessity of making improvements, at the earliest possible moment, along the line. It is not very long since I paid a personal visit to the island and traversed it on the railway, and I am free to acknowledge that there is quite a lot that should be done in order to give the people the facilities they need. I have not been allowed to lose sight of the importance of the question, because a number of members of parliament, among them my hon. friend from East Queen's (Mr. Mackinnon) and my hon. friend from West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) and of King's (Mr. Hughes) have been urging upon me the importance of providing these improvements without delay. The necessity of having booking stations at Alberton, Fredericton and Kincora have been strongly impressed upon me, and I shall be very glad to give all this matter the eraliest possible attention.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would ask the hon. minister to take the Kinkora station especially into his consideration at an early day, because the people there have been asking for this accommodation for some years. The hon. members for West Prince and West Queen's understand the situation as well as I do, and we have talked it over on several occasions. I have also discussed it with the superintendent of the railway, who was strongly of the opinion that this improvement is needed at that point.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 101) to incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

ORTHODOX RUSSO-GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

On the Order being called for:

Second reading of Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and Aleutian Islands, and each of the parishes and missions of the said church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). I would ask my hon. friend to allow this Bill to stand until Friday.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). May I ask the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) why he wishes the Bill to stand?

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I may say that the Bill is not yet printed in French.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman is mistaken. The Bill is printed in French.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) move the second reading?

Mr. OLIVER. Unless the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) gives good reason for postponement. The Bill has already been postponed a number of times. If the hon. gentleman has any reason to give, I shall be glad to hear it. But a mere request for postponement is hardly sufficient.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I have some reasons which are personal. I hope my hon. friend will not insist upon going on with the Bill. I do not intend to offer any opposition to the Bill unless I have good grounds for it. If he will not object to the postponement, I will be prepared to tell him my reasons when the Bill comes up on Friday.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). We entertain the hope that we are geting near the close of the session. This is only the second reading of this Bill, and it will have to be referred to the committee. Would it not suit the hon. gentleman (Mr. LaRivière) better to discuss it before the committee? If there is delay, the consideration of the Bill may take so long that it may be difficult to get it through.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) seems to forget that in giving the Bill its second reading, we are affirming the principle of the measure.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) move the second reading?

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to accommodate the hon. gentleman, and if he says it is a personal matter, and if he says he has good reason, I will agree to the postponement if he will concede——

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Order allowed to stand.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Post office—Outside service—Salaries and allowances, $1,302,580.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase here. Will the hon. Postmaster General please explain ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are a very large number of changes.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the letter carriers and mail delivery men have been pressing for an increase of salary, and I saw by a circular issued by them that something equivalent to a promise had been made by the minister that he would increase their salaries.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman refers to the mail carriers. What is contemplated appears in the Bill before the House, which will be moved to a second reading at an early date. The hon. gentleman refers to an alleged promise of mine. I made no promise except to give the matter consideration, and that I have done.

Mr. CLARKE. In the Bill which the hon. gentleman has before the House I understand that the letter carriers are allowed to reach a salary of $600 in four years and a half instead of, as formerly, in nine years. But I understand that men who were appointed previous to 1896 are not receiving any consideration at the hands of the hon. gentleman in the Bill before the House.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Perhaps it would be more satisfactory if we discussed the Bill when it is up for its second reading. I will take the Bill up to-morrow if the hon. gentleman likes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is the minister making any provision for the appointment of an additional number of letter carriers in Toronto, and if so, how many ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no provision here for an increase in the number of letter carriers in Toronto, for the reason that certain changes are being made now in the Toronto service, and it is premature, therefore, to anticipate any necessity for an increased staff of letter carriers. At present the collection of letters is made by the staff, and it is intended to have that done by contract. There is a considerable number of men specially engaged in the collection of letters, and they will be relieved from that work and available to be transferred to the regular staff of letter carriers. Then we are erecting a station in the west end, at the corner of Queen and Abel streets, which I hope will be completed in the month of July. When it is completed it will simplify and expedite the work to be done in the west end. At present mail matter for the west end arriving in Toronto has to be taken from the railway station to the city post office, there to be handled. By the methods now in view the mail matter will be taken from the railway station to this depot, and the carriers will have much shorter routes; they will start from this depot instead of, at present, as many of them do, from the central post office, or other places not so convenient. That will also have its effect. But until the system is in full operation it is not possible to say definitely whether any increase will be required in the numerical strength.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the automobiles now in use be taken over by the contractors, or be left in the hands of the department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They are on trial yet, and the trial, on the whole, is not satisfactory. One of the large machines answers fairly well. I do not want to say anything against the city, but I think the automobiles would be more satisfactory if the conditions were more favourable for their use. We hope there may be some change, and we are still hanging on to them.

Mr. SPROULE. Were they purchased by the Post Office Department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They were purchased, like all public property, by the Public Works Department. They are charged to public works, like public buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be another item fairly chargeable to the Post Office Department that is not found in the accounts.

Mr. McCREARY. Before this item passes, I would like to ask the Postmaster General when he is likely to visit the west. We have had a good many ministers visiting there, but we have never had the Postmaster General visiting Winnipeg, and the cities of the west. It may be news to most hon. gentlemen here that the city of Winnipeg to-day is the third highest in post office receipts of any city in Canada. Last year $116,000 were received in revenue from the Winnipeg post office, and it is expected this year that the revenue will be $150,000 or $200,000; in fact, we will come very close to Toronto in a year or two. I want to suggest that the post office should be increased in size. The ground floor is very small, and when I came down this session I proposed to one or two of the ministers that a certain property could be bought at that time for about $750 to $800 per foot. They laughed at the idea of buying property for $800 a foot. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that that property has since been sold for $850 per foot to an American firm, who expect to build a block upon it, and to make money

out of their investment. So the government was not very businesslike in that matter. Now, we are growing, our post office is growing and going to grow, and we want the ministers to grow up with it, and to realize what is going on. Our post office is a backwoods post office, the city of Winnipeg has to-day practically a backwoods post office. I have stood at the general wicket, and seen ten or fifteen people, on the average, waiting for one hour to get their mail, people who have no private boxes. The boxes are always taken up very quickly, and people have to wait at the general inquiry wicket; as I have said, I have seen ten or fifteen at a time waiting for an hour to get their mail. That is a condition of affairs that should not prevail in an up-to-date city. With regard to the distribution of the mail, why should we not have some such arrangement as Toronto, that the mail should be taken from the depot in an electric railway and distributed throughout the city by automobiles? It may surprise you to know that though, a few years ago, we were a muddy city, now we are building ten miles of streets per year, asphalted, at the expense of the city, the property is owned by the city. We are not doing that by contract, but by day labour. It is one of the most modern municipalities in Canada. Why will not the Postmaster General come up and see us, and see if he cannot increase the efficiency of the post office in the city of Winnipeg, see if he cannot give us some better facilities for getting our mail. A letter comes in there now and it is probably four or five hours before a business man receives it. That should not be permitted, it is not permitted in eastern cities. I cordially invite the Postmaster General to pay us a visit, and give us the benefit of his long experience, and try to help us out.

Mr. MONK. I would like the Postmaster General not to confine his visits to the west but come to the east also.

Mr. MORIN. I say, stay where you are.

Mr. MONK. If the hon. Postmaster General will come to Montreal he will find, that, having regard to the proportionate population, we have, probably, there, the most unsuitable post office that there is in the Dominion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. If, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) says, there is not sufficient accommodation in Winnipeg, it will be found that having regard to population the accommodation in Montreal is still more insufficient, and I believe, as we contribute such a large amount to the public revenue, we are entitled, in this respect, to some consideration. Those who are familiar with the conditions in Montreal know that the accommodation of the Dominion government in that city is altogether inadequate.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. The Dominion government are obliged to pay a very considerable sum in rent in order to procure insufficient accommodation. I have in past years, urged, and I urge again on the attention of the government the fact that they would really economise considerably if they gave to the post office the dimensions that the post office should have, in view of the large population there is in Montreal, and by enlarging the building they could give the public the accommodation they are clearly entitled to above the post office—accommodation for the different departments of the public service that at present are obliged to pay a considerable amount of rental, representing certainly more than the capital which would be sufficient to place the post office on a decent footing.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. While the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) is on the eastern tack, I would invite him to come down to Charlottetown. Charlottetown is the capital of the province and in that city the post office is altogether inadequate to the wants of the people. It is small and it is dark. The hon. minister kindly consented to send an engineer down there, I understand; in fact, he has so informed me, and I hope we will hear something about it later. I hope the hon. minister will place an amount in the estimates about to be submitted for this purpose. However, I will say that we have been kindly treated, and I have to thank the hon. minister for any favours which we have received in regard to the post office. In fact, I think, we may have in some places too many post offices in Prince Edward Island. In our province it is very difficult to get suitable men to keep the post offices, because the remuneration is very small. I do not know whether there is any provision made for an increase in the remuneration or not. I believe that if it is not increased in the near future there will be many men who will give up their post offices, and the department will have to give them in charge of people who are not fit for the offices or who are located at inconvenient places. In Charlottetown we have no delivery system. That was suggested to me when I heard the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke). I do not know that we are asking for that, but if we do not get it, I think we should have an equivalent, a good post office in Charlottetown. Then again I would say a word in reference to the mail carriers in the country. I find that some of these men carry the mails for a mere nothing. As it is a matter of tender largely, I would say that it is their own fault, but I can assure the committee that there is no extravagance in connection with the mail service so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. In reference to the officials in the post office and in other offices in the civil service, and I refer more particularly

now to the post office, I wish to say one word. I spoke here the other evening, and I now repeat what I then said, that I do not think it is fair that there should be the large discrepancy which does exist between the remuneration paid to different officials doing the same work. I have in my mind several good men that are in offices side by side with men who are no better than they are and not as good in some cases, because they entered the service at a different time, and under different conditions; yet, some of these men draw $350 to $500 only a year, and the other $800 or $1,000, or $1,200, though doing the same work. I know all about this. There is something wrong which should be remedied. The law may be against the men who come in latterly. This is a condition which prevails under the laws and regulations as at present existing. Why should an official be the victim of some law that is perhaps an improper law? I consider that the law in these matters must be changed to meet the circumstances. You cannot get good men to go in under certain conditions at a salary of $400 or $500 a year. We have one young man in the post office at Charlottetown who, I think, will be six years in the service in July. He is competent to perform the work of the post office. He gets, I think, $510, and there are others in the service geting $1,200. He is a better man than some others. I am not saying anything against the others, because they are very good men. I say this with all respect to the government and to the hon. Postmaster General, and I hope that there will be a redress of wrongs. I want to serve every one alike. I do not want to over pay a man, I do not want to under pay a man, but I want to see men paid in proportion to the work they perform. I would say: Get good men, and when you get them pay them fairly and see that they do their work. If the hon. Postmaster General does this, I believe that the people will stand by him. I consider that the law, as at present constituted, must be changed in order that these men shall receive justice at the hands of the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved:

That the item be amended by adding, after the word 'allowances' the following words: 'including J. W. Bain, post office inspector of the first-class in Montreal at $2,200, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE. Who is Mr. Bain? Is he a new appointee?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Bain is a former member of this House, and was appointed by the late government. He is a worthy officer and deserving of this.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this an additional employee beyond the number contemplated in the estimates?

Mr. FARQUHARSON.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. The item was included but these words are necessary in compliance with the ruling of the Auditor General.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister told us that the automobiles were not proving satisfactory, but he did not tell us how many were purchased, and what they cost.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have had them for about three years now. My recollection is that there were six quadrocycles which are used for the collection of mail matter, and which I think cost about $600 each. There are I think two four-wheeled vehicles for carrying light loads between the post office and branches. There is also a large wagon capable of carrying probably a ton and a half which is in operation between the post office and the Union station. Of course I am only speaking from memory, as the contract was made by the Public Works Department. I think the assistant postmaster for Toronto told me that these other machines cost in the neighbourhood of $1,500 each.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle do you charge those to the Public Works Department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a mixing up of the departments in the public service. There is not the clear accounting between the departments that I think there ought to be. For instance, the Post Office Department renders a great many services that it gets no credit for, and perhaps in turn it may be a charge on other departments. The enormous amount of franking that goes on is not remunerative. During the recess, the different departments send an immense quantity of free mail matter, and the local governments have certain franking privileges as well. The Post Office Department is put to a large expense in connection with the savings banks which it carries on for the Finance Department, and which of course is not properly a matter of mail service, although it may very fittingly be done by the Post Office Department. There is no revenue from this, and the larger the savings the more it costs the Post Office Department to manage that service.

Mr. SPROULE. What difference does the Postmaster General make between paying contractors for carrying the mails all over the country, and this automobile service that he charges to the Public Works Department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the theory is that the Post Office Department does not own any property, and that the Public Works Department is supposed to own the buildings and everything else. The view of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) is perhaps more accurate, and if there was a strict accounting, everything used by the Post Office Department should

be charged against it and every service that is rendered by it to the other departments should be credited to it. However, that is not the way it has been done in the past. I do not know whether the country is prepared yet to do away with the franking and other abuses; I consider them abuses to a certain extent. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Monk) has referred to the post office building in that city; my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. McCreary) has alluded to the Winnipeg building, and my hon. friend from Charlottetown (Mr. Farquharson) draws the attention of the House to the inadequacy of the post office building at Charlottetown. I believe that all these objections are perhaps well taken, and it is gratifying in a sense to find that the increased volume of business under the policy of the administration is causing these public buildings to be inadequate for the demands upon them. I suppose that as fast as the circumstances of the country will admit, the Minister of Public Works will endeavour to enlarge these buildings so that they will meet the increased demands upon them. In all cases these buildings were in existence when we took office. They have not been made smaller, but the business has outgrown the facilities afforded by them. My hon. friend (Mr. Farquharson) refers to inadequate salaries being paid, and he cites a case in Charlottetown where one clerk is receiving $500 a year and another clerk is receiving $1,200. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman desires me to accept as a standard every abuse that may be in the public service. It is perhaps a difficult thing to explain why one man doing the same kind of work as another, is paid a large salary and the other a much smaller one; but it happens that in our service men are promoted from the third to the second-class, and from the second-class to the first-class in process of time, without due regard at times to their efficiency or to the value of the service they render. That is to be found in all branches of the service. When I took office, I may say by way of illustration, I found a clerk who was reported to me as engaged in doing nothing more than copying letters in a letter press, and I think the salary he received for that valuable service was $1,400 a year. That was an abuse of course, and yet if I employed a boy to do the work at $300 a year he would have complained that his mate was being paid four times as much. However, I would not think that that abuse should form a guide for our conduct. Abuses seem to be inseparable from the public service and in giving this illustration I am not reflecting on any person or on any government.

It often happens that men grow old in the service and yet are not retired, though they are more or less unable to perform work, and light work is given to them. It is a very pardonable weakness of human nature if we are kindly disposed towards those who have grown old and infirm ; but all the same, in view of a debate which took place in this House a short time ago, I am afraid that parliament would not approve of an increase of the salary list of the Charlottetown post office just now. I think the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) pointed out that the amount being paid by way of salaries in the Charlottetown post office was very greatly out of proportion to what was being paid in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. McCREARY. Before this item passes, I would like to get a promise from the minister that he will give us an electric service in Winnipeg from the station to the post office the same as there is in Ottawa, a city which contributes less revenue to the Post Office Department than the city of Winnipeg, also that he will provide automobiles to collect the mail matter throughout the city.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman knows that I could not promise anything involving public expenditure without obtaining the permission of the government and the assent of His Excellency, because that would involve a vote ; but I will promise this, which is all he can expect from me, that I will give the matter my best consideration. As to putting the mails on a tramway between the station and the post office, I will promise to give that consideration too ; and if it is reported to be a better plan than the one that exists now, and we can make fair terms for the service, we will adopt the improvement. We are always ready to adopt an improvement if we can make proper terms. As to adopting automobiles in Winnipeg, I would not care to promise it at present, because we are testing them. They have only gone through one winter, and the test up to date is not satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. It is said that they are most of the time in the blacksmith's shop being repaired.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is very much that way.

Mr. KEMP. I think I might come to the rescue of the Postmaster General at this stage. He has been requested by hon. members to visit Winnipeg, Montreal and Charlottetown, in order that he may see for himself the very poor facilities which are provided in the post offices of these cities. In Toronto we enjoy the distinction, I may say the honour, of having the Postmaster General with us all the time, and I must take issue with my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he says that Montreal has the most unsuitable post office in proportion to population in the Dominion. I venture to say that we have in Toronto

the most unsuitable post office in the Dominion in proportion to the amount of business done. Perhaps when only half the business was done that we are now doing, it might have been considered satisfactory; but at present it is most unsatisfactory. The Postmaster General informed us to-night, as I think he has done on previous occasions, that it was the intention to build branch post offices—one at the corner of Queen and Abell streets, and perhaps others at other points. But it would be a great credit to the country and the city to have a fine post office building, and I hope the government are not shirking the responsibility they should assume in the way of erecting a respectable post office building in the city of Toronto, a city which I understand pays the largest revenue to the Post Office Department of any city in the Dominion. If the system is carried out of having these branch post offices, I suppose the mail will have to be assorted at the Union Station.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the train.

Mr. KEMP. I do not understand the system sufficiently to discuss that feature; but I hope that we shall not be side-tracked in Toronto in the ambition to have a fine public building in the shape of a post office, such as the Dominion will have good reason to be proud of.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General whether the postmaster for Holstein in the south riding of Grey has been dismissed, and if so, for what reason?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot say from memory, but I will make inquiries and tell the hon. gentleman tomorrow.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to say a word or two about the small salaries paid the country postmasters throughout the province of Ontario. There is a very universal complaint on this subject among the postmasters and farmers in the rural districts of the western part of the province. As the hon. Postmaster General will understand, a different condition of things prevails among the farmers now from what there was several years ago. The farmers are now engaged in supplying the larger cities with dairy produce, such as butter, milk and cream, and they require a better postal service than they did many years ago when they were engaged in growing grain. The country postmasters are really very poorly paid. In many instances in the county which I have the honour to represent the patrons of country post offices are compelled to contribute money privately in order to get a proper service. It is all very well for the hon. minister to talk about the large and increasing revenue, and I am very glad he has the privilege of talking that way; and it is all very well for the city members to ask for larger post office buildings. I am not complaining of that; but I say that in my humble opinion there is no class of employees of the Post Office Department of Canada who are so poorly paid as the postmasters in the rural districts. If ever there was an opportunity for the Postmaster General to comply with the demands of the country people in that respect, surely it is now, when the revenue is so large; because there will come a time, I have no doubt, when the revenue will not be so large. I am sure that I speak the sentiments of the members on both sides of the House when I say that in this prosperous time some special provision should be made for paying country postmasters a sufficient salary for the work they are called on to perform.

Mr. HENDERSON. I listened to the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) when he was speaking for better postal facilities in the city of Winnipeg. I was rather surprised to hear that hon. gentleman ask for such an expenditure as would be necessary to provide the accommodation he desires, when we remember that the Postmaster General is extremely anxious to make his department self-sustaining, and also that our friend from the North-west is always prepared to talk free trade and to deprive the country of that revenue from customs imports which is necessary to supplement the postal revenue and to provide the accommodation he desires. The hon. gentlemen who do not want to contribute to the revenue of the country should not be so exacting upon the Postmaster General or any other minister for increased expenditure. While on my feet I desire to ask a question of the Postmaster General in reference to a matter which came up the other evening in connection with the Customs Department; that is, how postmasters provide their sureties. I understand that the plan adopted by the Postmaster General is to have the government bond all the postmasters and the other officers of the department, instead of paying a guarantee company a certain sum of money or compelling the postmasters to pay a certain sum for their guarantee. I am under the impression that this is a wise movement. I understand that the postmasters are now guaranteed for about two-thirds of what they were guaranteed before by the Guarantee Company, and I am under the impression still that that could be even cut in two and yet leave a sufficient sum to meet all the default cases likely to occur in the Post Office Department. I would like the Postmaster General to go a little further along this line, and he would then be assisting men, who are underpaid, by enabling them to contribute less for their guarantee. I understand that that has been the practice for one or two years, and I hope that it will be extended.

There is another matter I would ask the hon. gentleman about. I am told that a letter posted at Toronto Junction, which is a separate post office, requires only a cent stamp to carry it to Toronto, but to carry a letter from the city of Toronto to Toronto Junction requires 2 cents. It seems to me that that is an anomaly.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The condition to which the hon. gentleman refers did exist with regard to the mail service between a number of the villages around Toronto and Toronto itself, but I put an end to it when it was brought to my attention some two or three years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought that if it extended to villages around Toronto, say five miles out, there was no reason why it should not extend 35 miles out, and include the village I am living in. I am glad to hear that we are all put on the same footing. I would like to hear from the hon. gentleman what he proposes to do with reference to guarantees.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When I took office I found that the only system in vogue was a separate guarantee bond for each official. These bonds lasted a year, and it was quite a task to keep track of them, and also to get the bonds taken out in the first instance. I got parliament to authorize the establishment of an assessment system in the service itself, but did not transfer to that system all the insurance of every officer, but only a portion. By degrees, however, the system has been extended, and by the 30th June next we will cease taking the bonds of any guarantee company at all. As regards the postmasters, where the revenue of the office is $200 or less, it is optional with them to furnish a private bond or to subscribe to the assessment system, in which latter case they will have to pay 40 cents per $100 or 80 cents for the $200. We may practically consider that the whole service is now under the system with the exception of postmasters, the revenue of whose offices is $200 and under, and it is optional with them to join the system or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then, the government practically bond their officers without reference to any guarantee company.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the end of the fiscal year the majority of the officers will be furnishing insurance on the assessment system. Some of the higher officers, who have to furnish a larger amount of security, are partly insured in the assessment system and partly in the guarantee company.

Mr. CLARKE. I understood the Postmaster General to say, in reply to the question as to whether he has made provision for the employment of a larger number of letter carriers, that he is going to ask for tenders for the collection of street letter boxes, and that the men who are now engaged in that work will be available to act as letter carriers. There will probably be eight or ten of these men available for that purpose, but so far as I can gather, that number is entirely inadequate. If the hon. gentleman will examine internally the Toronto post office, he will find that it is the biggest sweating shop in Canada.

The hon. member for Selkirk said that merchants from Winnipeg have to wait from four to five hours after the mails are received in the general post office, before they are delivered by the carriers. Well, it is a fact that merchants in Toronto send their messengers to the side door of the post office to get their mails rather than wait until the over-burdened letter carrier is able to reach them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What do you think should be the load of a letter carrier ?

Mr. CLARKE. That would depend upon the size of the man, and I do not know what the weight should be, but the letter carriers are pretty heavily laden down, especially on the first delivery. As a matter of fact, they cannot complete their delivery in the time they were able to do it formerly. Merchants are compelled to have the letters brought by special messengers of their own rather than wait until the letter carrier reaches them. In some instances, the first delivery does not reach them until nine or ten o'clock. It is false economy not to employ a sufficient number of men to do the work promptly. It seems to me that if the hon. minister has the time to spare he should look into the situation, so far as the distribution is concerned in the city of Toronto.

I do not want to worry the hon. gentleman but would like to know what has become of the branch post offices. They appear to have dropped out of existence. We require pretty sharp eyes to find them out. We had several of them, and I believe the deputy postmasters received salaries equivalent to $500 or $600 a year, but their services have been dispensed with and others appointed on salaries from $100 to $200 a year. And instead of being in commodious, suitable places, these branch offices have been transferred, in many instances, to small places you can hardly find. Why was the change made? Was it to effect a saving in the salaries? Was any complaint made as to the inefficiency of the men in this branch of the service ? Were they not discharging their duties satisfactorily? Or was the sole idea of dispensing with the services of these men and appointing others the saving of three or four hundred dollars a year in each case? The complaint, as the Postmaster General knows, was very general with re-

spect to the change of these branch post offices in Toronto. Complaints were made by friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as by those who are not so friendly, against the dismissal of these men, and the removal of their offices from their various locations.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As to the last inquiry, of what had become of the branch post offices? I would say that the branch post offices were found to be largely engaged in so-called work which was not only useless, but was really an obstruction to the public service. Though the system of collection and delivery by special messengers existed in the city, yet some twenty or thirty branch post offices had been established to which people could go and post their letters, the branch postmaster taking possession of them, stamping them and tying them in bundles to be taken to the city post office, where the parcels had to be untied, and the letters re-stamped. This meant a wholly unnecessary handling of the letters. Experience has shown that the more hands letters pass through, the less security there is, as a rule. A recognized part of good management of a postal system is to have letters pass through as few hands as possible. It was considered in the public interest, as being more expeditious, not to have the letters pass into the hands of the branch postmasters but to have them taken from the ordinary receptacles by the collector and carried at once to the central office. With this change, the work of handling the letters was taken from the branch postmasters. The remaining portion of the work is of a comparatively trifling character. These should not be called branch post offices, because they are not such in the ordinary sense; the term is a misleading one. They sell postage stamps—which are to be found on sale in hundreds of places throughout the city—they receive registered letters and issue postal notes and money orders. That is about the extent of the work in these institutions.

Mr. CLARKE. I tried to follow the hon. Postmaster General closely. If I understand him, the letters instead of being posted in the branch post offices are posted in the pillars outside. But the letters have still to be collected from these receptacles as they were before, and there are as many collectors as there were before. I take it that the only difference in the work done by the branch postmasters is that they do not have to stamp the letters and send them to the general office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That was nine-tenths of their work—the handling of the letters. The public would hand letters to them, and the branch postmasters would act as postmasters and make up a mail on the central office. That was a wholly unnecessary procedure. We have many letter boxes in Toronto and the letters dropped into them are simply taken by the collectors to the general office where they are stamped, and this one handling is sufficient.

Mr. CLARKE. All these branch post offices were supplied with letter boxes. Parties going in to buy stamps handed their letters to postmasters or dropped them into the boxes. Now, I understand, they must go outside to drop the letter in the pillar outside the branch post office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The ordinary boxes on the highway. My hon. friend knows that when they were dropped in the branch post office they were practically in the custody of the branch postmaster and were handled by him. That is not the case now—he cannot touch them. The letters go direct from the letter boxes through the bag of the collector, to the post office. They are not handled by the branch postmaster, and that unnecessary handling is dispensed with.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there an additional collection made from the pillars or large receptacles outside the branch post offices now as compared with the number of collections made before the branch post offices were dispensed with?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot tell whether there has been an increase in the frequency of the collections. The practical working of the post office in Toronto is left in the hands of the staff there, and I do not think the hon. gentleman can expect me to tell him how many times a day these boxes are visited. I believe the boxes are visited frequently—I think more frequently than before. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I am sure he will not contradict what I say.

Mr. CLARKE. As the Postmaster General said he did not know anything about it, I thought that perhaps——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sure there has been no reduction in the frequency of collections.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the amount that the Postmaster General has asked the House to vote, has he made provision for the re-opening of the post office at Marble Rock, a post office established some thirty years ago.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Where is it?

Mr. TAYLOR. Seven miles from Gananoque. A petition was presented to the Postmaster General not very long since, signed by over a hundred persons who received or would receive their mail at that office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will make a note of the inquiry and will be able

to give my hon. friend the answer to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well. I desire also to call the attention of the Postmaster General to what I consider an abuse of the postal service—the post office practically doing an express office business. Large departmental stores, as I understand, get the voters' lists of the various municipalities throughout the province, and to the names upon these lists they send catalogues. In response to a letter they will send a full set of samples of dry goods or to other articles, which they can send for a few cents. People make their selection, send their money and get the goods back by mail. This is a great injury to the country storekeeper, and, as I say amounts to the post office doing an express office business. A large portion of the mail now is made up of dry goods and other merchandise. The mails should be exclusively for mail matter and the post offices should not be the means of carrying on a retail and wholesale dry goods business.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is a very proper subject for consideration. But perhaps my hon. friend would not find public opinion at his back if he proposed to restrict the mails entirely to correspondence. That is not the practice either in the United Kingdom or in the United States. I do not know when the parcel system was inaugurated in Canada, but it was many years ago, and no change has been made in any respect since the present government took office. The abuse my hon. friend refers to has existed for many years. I do not remember having heard him take this point earlier. I doubt very much if public opinion would support us in refusing to allow small parcels to be sent through the mails. That would be a very sweeping change. A person can send a small parcel through the post office for a couple of cents, which he would have to pay 25 cents to send by an express company.

Mr. MORIN. Referring to the question of wages brought up a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Farquharson), I would suggest to the Postmaster General a change in the basis of paying for carrying the mails. At present in many country districts the mail is carried on horseback or with a vehicle, and I think the hon. gentleman would do well to pay so much per mile instead of as at present, paying a fixed price. Sometimes the mail carriage is given out by tender and sometimes it is not. When it is not given out by tender, of course the friends of the government get it, and when it is given by tender they have some other way of getting it. I remember the Postmaster General said five years ago in this House that all mail should be carried by public tender, he said he was going to do so, but he has not fulfilled his promise. He still keeps up the system of giving that work to the friends of the government. I know one of his friends who is carrying the mail a distance of 26 miles, and it takes the whole day to make the trip back and forth, on a very bad road, and that man only gets $270 a year. He gets a starving price, a bankrupt price to carry that mail. I say, give him a little more, and let the man live. I know another place where the mail carrier carries the mail 6 miles. He leaves home in the morning about 9 o'clock and comes back in the afternoon at 5 o'clock. He has a horse and wagon, and that man gets $90 a year. How can a man live at such a price, maintain his horse, and keep up his wagon or sleigh for $90 a year ? At another place a man carries the mail 13 miles, or 26 miles the round trip. He leaves home in the morning at about 7 o'clock and gets back at 8 or 9 in the evening, by very rough roads. The Postmaster General should establish a price of so much per mile, as he gives railway companies so much per pound.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am afraid that mileage system would hardly work. The law says that we shall give out the contracts, and award them to the lowest tenderer. When men tender I cannot go and increase the tender price for them. If I did so, I think my hon. friend would very likely take exception to it. As to adopting the mileage system, it is to be borne in mind that many mail carriers do the business of carrying parcels and passengers as well as the mails. There are other districts, perhaps, which do not afford any such advantages.

Mr. MORIN. That is all right, but I would advise the hon. gentleman to do as he has been doing. The law says that he shall do one thing, and he does another, and so he could in reference to these mail carriers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Postmaster General whether the Morris street branch at Halifax has been closed, and if so, for what reason ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am informed it has been discontinued as a branch office, and will be opened out shortly as a sub-office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the distinction between a branch office and a sub-office ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Under the old system a branch office was, or might be, an independent post office. Mail matter was posted there and handled by the postmaster, and if people in the vicinity chose to go there they could get their letters. We have discontinued generally throughout Canada the system of branch offices, and are applying the free delivery system.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the public at these sub-offices be enabled to transact business in the same way as at the post office ? For example, can they get money orders ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, they can buy postage stamps, money orders and postal notes, and deliver registered letters and get receipts for them, and do savings bank business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At how early a date is it expected that office will be opened ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At once, you may look for it daily.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the Postmaster General inform me what salaries were paid to branch postmasters prior to the 31st of December last, and what salaries are paid now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not had the fixing of salaries before the 1st of January. There was an arbitrary sum being paid, that was not based upon any rule that I could discover. I suppose it was dependent on the amount of influence the postmasters had. As to the present system, a general scale of remuneration has been adopted, and a printed tariff; and keepers of branch post offices were furnished with a copy of the terms upon which they could continue as keepers of the sub-offices. In most cases they have elected to continue on as keepers of the sub-offices.

Mr. CLARKE. What salaries were paid to keepers of these branch offices prior to the change referred to; what was the smallest salary paid under the old method ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As I have said, there was no fixed salary. They were paid varying sums. The hon. gentleman will find in the report of the Postmaster General, that in the city of Toronto, sums were paid varying from $200 to $800 or $900. They are now paid according to a regular scale applicable to all.

Mr. CLARKE. Would it be possible to get the information from the hon. Postmaster General now. Could he say how much he is paying now ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a minimum allowance, by way of gratuity, for postmasters of $60. A postmaster is also paid one per cent upon the postage stamp sales, he is also paid a commission upon the sales of money orders and postal notes and a commission of one-quarter per cent on the receipt of deposits.

Mr. CLARKE. His salary, or gratuity, is $60 a year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He receives a gratuity of from $60 to $100. One hundred dollars is the maximum of the allowance which covers any special inconvenience he may be put to. He also receives a commission on certain classes of business.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the person who has charge of the branch office to pay the rent of the building and give attendance, to issue money orders, registered letters and receive deposits for this amount ? Is he called upon to provide a suitable place and to pay the rent for which he receives $100 remuneration and a commission amounting to $50 or $100 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We do not employ persons who are not engaged in business as the keepers of sub offices. The sub offices are placed, as a rule, in charge of druggists and stationers. This does not involve an increased size of building, extra equipment, or staff. The amount of business done at a sub office is comparatively trifling and the keeper probably makes no addition to his expenses.

Mr. PUTTEE. We, in the city of Winnipeg, for a couple of years have had these sub post offices. I remember that at the time the Board of Trade of Winnipeg and I first applied to the hon. Postmaster General for branch post offices such as they had in the city of Toronto, the hon. Postmaster General pointed out the serious drawbacks he had found in the department when operating these branch offices. He established five or six sub offices which have proved of great benefit. The public appreciate them very much. As far as we are concerned, as the city extends, we shall apply for more sub post offices. The people who keep these sub offices get very little for it. They admit that. I am doubtful if it actually pays the expenses but I notice that these offices are always given to tradesmen, that there is keen competition for them and I am also aware of the fact that they hang on to them so closely that it is hard even to change a location. I have been impressed with the idea that the system of sub post offices is the best system to operate. I would like to ask the hon. minister, in cities where there is a letter carrier service, is there any basis of apportioning the number of carriers according to the population. Is there any approximate relation between the population and the number of carriers that a city is allowed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, the number of carriers is increased from time to time in accordance with the local demands. The officers in a city report that they require additional assistance and that becomes the foundation for increases. The volume of business would not be the only basis because it is sometimes more difficult to serve one city than another. One city may extend over a greater area than another, or

one city may be more difficult to serve. Take the city of Quebec, for instance. Therefore, the volume of business, although it has a material influence, is not the only determining factor.

Mr. PUTTEE. Having reference to the complaint of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) that there were not enough letter carriers in Toronto, which is probably correct, I want to state that I have looked through the civil service list and I have found that Toronto has 140 carriers and that in Winnipeg, according to the Civil Service list, there are only eighteen. Our population at the last census, and the actual population is greater than the census population, was over 44,000, which would give us one carrier to every 2,400 of the population. Upon that same basis Toronto would have a population of over 300,000. Whatever may be the position of affairs in Toronto we are exactly in the position that has been brought to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) that we cannot get any of the public services in the west to extend as rapidly as business and population increase. I have had great trouble and the postmaster in Winnipeg has had trouble to impress upon the post office department that there is need of a steady increase of the staff there. Two years ago when this matter was brought before the post office authorities it was not nearly so pressing as it is now. It was almost impossible then to conceive that the business which is being done to-day could be done without more accommodation and without an increase in the staff. I imagine that the business has increased more than fifty per cent. We have still only eighteen letter carriers. As a matter of fact there are some temporary men, as I presume there are in Toronto, but our city covers a large amount of ground, it is not an easy city for a letter carrier service and yet we have that limited number of carriers.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand from the Postmaster General whether the system which he intended to adopt in Toronto of having district post offices was a system which would be adopted generally in places where the business has increased. Is it intended to have a similar system in Montreal to that which it is proposed to establish in Toronto; for instance, the system of having a post office in the west end at the corner of Queen and Abel streets, because of the inadequacy of the present post office? Then, before he answers that question, I would like to ask him another. He said that he intends to sort letters for the western post office on the trains. Does he intend to divide the city up into districts numbered 1, 2 and 3, or A, B and C, and is it possible to have a staff of clerks on the trains coming in from all directions to handle the mail matter intended for district offices. Is this to be a general policy or is it to be a policy just for Toronto? Is it intended to extend this policy and have other district post offices? Is it the policy of the hon. gentleman to have more than one, or two or three post offices in large centres?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As far as Toronto is concerned it is found that the post office now is not central. It is too far to the east. My hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is familiar with the locality. It has been found that there is a loss of time in the transfer of the mails from the station to the eastern part of the city in which the post office is situated; that is of those mails which are intended for the west. In like manner there is an unnecessary delay in transferring the mail matter from the west end to the station if it it has to go around by the post office. By cutting off the Toronto post office from the route to be taken the mail matter which will come in by rail will arrive at station C in the west end much more quickly and we will be able to close the outgoing mails from the west much later. That office has been decided upon as the outcome of the situation there. It is in contemplation as well to have at least one more in the northerly part and perhaps one or two coming around towards the east, but we cannot do it all at once. This one office will be equipped and I hope in working order towards the middle of July and my hope is that next year I will be permitted by parliament to make provision for another station at the next most convenient place in Toronto. As to Montreal, simultaneously with the arrangements being made for the establishment of a west end office in Toronto it was decided to inaugurate the system in Montreal by having a similar station in that city. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is in charge of the matter and I think has been negotiating for the selection of a suitable place as a site for it. I do not know whether there will be provision made in the estimates but that will appear when they come down. But Montreal is as much in need of a station as is Toronto, and I hope it will have one in the near future. The hon. gentleman asked me what the system of sorting it. The heaviest mails come in from the east arriving by the morning trains, and in order to enable these letters to go out on the first delivery in the morning, officers are sent down the night before by the night train to meet the upcoming train and to sort the letters for the letter carriers. That enables the letters to go out on the first delivery instead of on the second delivery as formerly. That is not yet necessary on the westerly trains, but should it be necessary that system will be adopted also.

Mr. KEMP. I do not think that it is the practice in the United States to have so

many different post offices in cities of the population of Montreal and Toronto. I presume that the Postmaster General has given this matter a great deal of consideration, and I will have to bow to his decision, but it strikes me at first glance that the better system would be to have one central post office. If the Toronto post office is not now in the centre of the city according as the population has grown of late years, would it not be better to sell that property and build a large post office that would be a credit to the country, near the present centre of population, rather than to have so many small post offices scattered in different places. Has the Postmaster General considered the question of this American advertising matter which comes through the post office at very low rates. I see the letter carriers bags overburdened with this useless matter, and I would like to know if it is carried at a less rate of postage in the United States than would be charged in Canada ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The newspaper rate in the United States is 100 per cent higher than in Canada.

Mr. KEMP. These are not newspapers, but large cards printed on one side with the address on the other.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These would probably pass in the United States as post cards, which have the same rate here as in the United States, and according to the international arrangement, mail matter posted in the United States and directed to Canada must be delivered for the rate prevailing in the country of origin.

Mr. KEMP. What is the policy of the government as to branch post offices ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are the outgrowth of necessity, and when the conditions demand it an additional station is erected. The letter carriers for the districts assemble at these stations, and a great deal of time is saved by them in not having to go to the central post office and return to their beats. I think my hon. friend will see the wisdom of that feature.

Mr. BELL. Experiments have been made in the United States in regard to rural delivery. Has the Postmaster General considered the application of that system to Canada ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I sent Mr. George Ross, assistant postmaster at Toronto, to the United States to study the system, and he was of opinion that it was not adaptable to Canada, which is a country of vast distances and rather sparse settlement. I do not think that the taxpayers of Canada would for a moment consent to the great expense which would be involved. Moreover, there is a very divided opinion as to its benefits in the rural districts of the United States, the contention being that the post office is used by farmers and others for the purchase of goods from larger cities, and the local merchants are not patronized as they were before. The system is not at all popular in some districts in the United States.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid I will have to withdraw my invitation to the Postmaster General to come to Montreal, because I notice that in Toronto, where he lives, the same abuses exist as in Montreal; but in Winnipeg, where the Postmaster General has not been, the conditions seem to be better. Perhaps living is more expensive in Winnipeg, but at all events the letter carriers are comparatively adequately paid.

Mr. PUTTEE. We are not satisfied.

Mr. MONK. It shows how these western people are difficult to satisfy. The smallness of the salaries paid to the letter carriers in Montreal and Toronto is a very real grievance.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) So it is everywhere.

Mr. MONK. Surely not where the hon. gentleman lives; living must be very cheap down there.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I live in Halifax.

Mr. MONK. I find that in Winnipeg the majority of the letter carriers get a salary of $720 a year. The salaries of the letter carriers in Montreal are much too low. There is no sense in it at all; they are almost as bad as the salaries of our judges. In Montreal, I say, the delivery is not satisfactory, because I think the letter carriers are very badly organized, very poorly paid. The delivery is not what it should be in a large city. I have been in other cities where you could drop a letter in the box, and tell to the hour almost when it would reach its destination. It is not so in Montreal by any means. You find letter carriers in Montreal getting $365, $390, $358, $367, $382, $308.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no officer getting $308.

Mr. MONK. Here it is in the public accounts.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not for a year's work.

Mr. MONK. Yes, to be exact, $308.71 for a year's work. The man's name is Pacific, and the hon. Postmaster General must admit that he has to be very pacific indeed to live on that.

Mr. McEWEN. Is that the highest ?

Mr. MONK. No, there are some who receive $600—why ? Does the one who gets $308 not deliver as much as the others ? I say the salary is inadequate and the system is bad. It is a cause of complaint in

Montreal among a large class. I do not say that the Postmaster General should come there, because his residence in Toronto does not seem to have improved matters; but he should send down some one who can give us a remedy.

Mr. BLAIN. Before the item is adopted, I would like the minister to make some statement in reference to the salaries paid to country postmasters, and as to whether the government are prepared to make any proposition to the House for paying them better ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The salaries paid to the country postmasters are in accordance with a scale adopted by my predecessors in office. They maintained that scale for eighteen years, with the approval of the country, and I suppose also of my hon. friends who are now in opposition; and they have not yet explained to this House any changed circumstances which would call for a reduction of those rates.

Mr. WILSON. The growing times.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may say that there are a great many small post offices where the postmasters receive the whole revenue and more too. Post offices are found dotted all over the country—almost too close to each other, as my hon. friend from Queen's, P.E.I. stated a little while ago. Does my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) propose that a person who keeps a post office the gross revenue of which is only $10 or $15 a year, shall be paid more than $15 ? In many cases the postmaster himself is the chief gainer, because he has the mails brought to his house instead of having to go for them to a post office a mile or so away. If the public insists on post offices being so close together, there must be small salaries paid. In reality, these are only nominal allowances, the offices themselves doing a merely nominal business.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister state about what the average pay of a country postmaster is in the western part of Ontario ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The pay is based on the revenue of the office. Up to a revenue of $800 the postmaster receives 40 per cent of the gross receipts. He also gets some small commissions on money orders, postal notes and savings bank business; but these make a rather trifling amount. When the revenue is in excess of $800 and up to $10,000, he gets 25 per cent on the excess ; and if it is over $10,000 he is paid 15 per cent on the excess.

Mr. BLAIN. Is it not a fact that there are a large number of postmasters in country districts who get salaries ranging from $10 to $25 a year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands of small offices which have been opened perhaps for the convenience of half a dozen people, the postmaster being the chief beneficiary. These offices are only doing a nominal post office business, perhaps averaging only a letter a day, and the postmasters are paid a nominal fee. That has been the invariable practice in Canada, and I presume it will continue for all time. I do not know what my hon. friend's idea would be for paying postmasters. You could not, I suppose, offer a man a lower salary then say $100 a year. At that rate you would pay $1,000 postmasters $100,000, while the revenue from their offices would perhaps be only $10,000. I do not think the country would justify our opening those offices on such conditions.

Mr. BLAIN. I am sure that the Postmaster General's statement will not be satisfactory to the farming community of the province of Ontario. It is all very well for the minister to say that he found a certain state of things existing when he came into office. I would remind him that he has been making many changes, some of which have been approved of by the people of Canada; but many of his changes have been in the direction of benefiting the cities almost exclusively. Who gets the greatest benefit of the reduction of the postage from 3 cents to 2 cents ? Is it not the banking institutions, the large loan companies, the merchants and manufacturers of this country ? These are the people who have been getting the chief advantage of the changes which the hon. minister has made. If it is true, as I think it is, that in some parts of Ontario there are too many post offices, that is a matter that ought to concern the hon. minister himself, and he should give it some consideration. If there are too many, he should reduce the number and equip the offices, and pay the postmasters proper salaries. The farmers in Ontario are now engaged in a different kind of work from what they were engaged in twenty years ago. They are supplying butter and small produce to the larger cities, and for that reason require to go to the post office every day for their mail matter. Therefore, the minister should seriously consider the advisability of re-adjusting the condition of things in the country districts, so that the farmers may have a better service, and not be called upon to contribute a special amount to the country postmasters, as they are in many parts of Ontario at present. No doubt the hon. minister has been considering this question, but what I complain about is his want of action in giving the farmers better mail service in the province of Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend complains that we are doing more for the cities and less for the rural districts, but he will only have to wait a few minutes to hear a different story from the representatives of the cities. He suggests that there

should be a reduction in the number of post offices and larger salaries paid the postmasters remaining. Would the hon. gentleman like me to give any attention to the county of Peel and reduce the number of post offices there ? Would it be far more satisfactory to the farmers of Peel to drive a longer distance for their mails than they do now and pay higher salaries to the postmasters. It may be that in the hon. gentleman's county the farmers are so philanthropic that they believe that the offices exist for the benefit of the postmasters. Elsewhere, however, the idea prevails that these offices exist for the general public. Surely the hon. gentleman is not serious when he proposes a reduction in the number of post offices. He may rest easy, however, in his mind as regards the county of Peel, for I do not purpose to close any of the post offices there or elsewhere. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I do not believe he could get any of the people to consent to the closing up of one office out of a thousand in the whole Dominion, however, unnecessary these offices might be. Once post offices are established and the people have become accustomed to them, they insist on their being kept open. I have had not only to open up new offices but to carry on those which were established by the late government, even in places where perhaps they were not actually required. There has been no such serious change in the mode of carrying on business to-day as calls for a greater increase in the number of post offices in close proximity than existed five years ago in the rural districts. I am quite as familiar with the methods of doing business in the rural districts as my hon. friend, and with the conditions in Ontario, and I think that the farmers are in favour of a multiplicity of small offices. When a man, for his own sake, or that of his neighbours allows his farm house on the road side to be used as a post office, he does not, as a rule, expect any substantial remuneration, although quite willing to take it should it come his way.

Mr. BLAIN. Let me remind the hon. minister that he has already given some consideration to the county of Peel by cutting off the heads of some of the postmasters in that county.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I did not close the offices.

Mr. BLAIN. No, but the hon. gentleman cut some of their heads off, without any complaint being made against the postmasters at all. He need not therefore expect to create any apprehension by saying that he might bring further consideration to the county of Peel. No doubt he will do that in any case, in the general conduct of his business. I am quite sure that the hon. gentleman did not wish to misquote me. I did not say that the post offices should be reduced in Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You argued that way.

Mr. BLAIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. What I did say is that the question should get the consideration of the minister, and if he found that there were too many post offices in the province of Ontario, it would be his duty to reduce the number.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am quite satisfied that there are too many, and I am perfectly satisfied that if I took the hon. gentleman's own riding I would find too many there. Would he wish me to close any of the post offices in that county because I thought there were too many.

Mr. BLAIN. I might tell the hon. minister that he could begin with his own county. I had a drive through his county a short time ago, and the gentleman who accompanied me pointed out where the hon. minister had opened up several post offices in North York, for some very peculiar reasons which I will not weary the House with at present. When the hon. gentleman says I am not in earnest, I wish to correct him. I am in earnest, and I might remind him that many of his own supporters in the county of Peel have written me complaining of the condition of things, complaining that the minister gives special consideration to the large manufacturing establishments and the large financial and banking institutions, but does not give the same consideration to the farmers by furnishing them with a proper postal service in the province of Ontario. Let the hon. gentleman come to the county of Peel if he wishes, and make such arrangements as will bring about a better system of postal service for the people of that county, and I will be very glad to give him what assistance I can. But I would like him to see that there are no postmasters who work twelve months in the year and only get from $10 to $14 for their services.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman complains that the reduction in postage favours certain classes and not others. He has argued that that reduction inures only to the benefit of the large banking establishments and manufacturers, but that the farmers get no advantage.

Mr. BLAIN. I did not make any such statement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Then what is the hon. gentleman complaining about ? If he thinks that the whole advantage derived from the reduction of postage rates accrues to the inhabitants of large cities, he is mistaken. Only one-third of the postal revenue is derived from the cities. Two-thirds is derived outside the cities, so that two-thirds of the advantage accrues to the rural districts. Every one who sends a letter, be he a farmer or a millionaire, has a corresponding advantage. If my hon. friend means to say that he represents a

constituency, the farmers in which never write letters, he would be correct in saying that they get no advantage from the reduction of postage. But if, like other farmers, they make a reasonable use of the mails, they get the same relative advantage as other Canadian citizens.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.). I think the county of Peel has been pretty well aired between the Postmaster General and its representative, and it is time that we should be allowed a few minutes for the other counties. The complaint is general that the amount received by the postmasters throughout the Dominion is very small, but there is no use to expect any increase while there is such a large deficit in the postal revenue.

I look to the time when there will be a surplus, and then we will make a general raid on the Postmaster General for the increase of the salaries of the postmasters throughout the Dominion. In Nova Scotia, before confederation, when I represented my county for eight years, the direct salaries paid to postmasters were much better than they are now. Postmasters were paid salaries according to the services performed, but now they are paid a certain percentage. I do not think any person wants to reduce the number of post offices in his own county, but the desire would be to increase them in several instances. So far, in all my appeals to the Postmaster General, I find that we cannot make any impression upon him. He is very pleasant when in the House, but when you want a particular favour from him for your own county, he is pretty rigid. In fact, there is no elasticity in him at all. I hope that after this he will be a little more elastic and that we shall be able to get our daily mail between Baddeck and Englishtown for which I have been pleading all this time.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I hope the Postmaster General will take the cue from the hon. members who have spoken of reducing the post offices. You may do it in some of the counties where the people do not read and write, but I hope you will not attempt to reduce the number of post offices in my county. Most of the farmers in that county take a daily paper, and I am sure you will be doing them an injustice if you do not make it convenient for them to get that paper. As to the farmers contributing toward the expense of the post office, I think the farmers already contribute their share. They help to keep up the merchants, the bankers and others who are benefited by cheap postage. Now as to the centralizing of post offices in large cities, I know that St. Martins le Grand in Old London is the head post office, and the only large post office in that city of over four millions of people, but I have never heard of any suggestion of a change because the city has grown west. It seems to me it would be folly to tear down the post offices in Toronto and Montreal because they are not in the present centres of those cities. I do not think it would be wise for the government to spend more money building more post offices when those now in existence will do, even though they are not in the centre of the city. I think that it would be much to the public advantage to have a system of free delivery in cities of from ten to twelve thousand inhabitants. Much time is wasted by people trudging to the post office, it may be miles, two or three times a day to look into their boxes and see if there is anything for them. It is time that in these large towns postal matter should be delivered two or three times a day. I am pleased to see the reduction in postage. But there is one point worthy of consideration. I was in the little post office in my neighbourhood a few nights ago, and I saw the postmaster putting circulars into almost every box. He handed one to me. These were circulars from the United States that had come in a large bundle, each circular bearing a one cent stamp. Our government got no revenue from that. I asked the postmaster if he had sent the names of parties in that neighbourhood to the firm, and he said he thought they had secured a copy of the voters' list. We are carrying free a large amount of mail matter for the purpose of advertising quack medicines from other places, and I think it is time we had a change. The Postmaster General talks a great deal about plans that existed eighteen years ago. He talks back to hon. gentlemen on this side because he found such and such a system in existence when he took office. But you know we have had a growing time since then, and people have to pay a good deal more for everything they get. I do not know but that the Postmaster General should have a little of that growing time for the villages. The postmasters in towns and cities are well paid, and do little work. It would be a good thing if we could get some of this money from the cities and towns and give it to the rural districts.

Mr. HENDERSON. As to the view taken by the Postmaster General of the statement made by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) I do not for one moment understand the hon. member for Peel as agitating for a reduction in the number of post offices in that county. I understand the remark to have a more general application, perhaps to the whole province. There may be some counties which have too many post offices while some may have too few. For example, the county of North York, the constituency represented by the Postmaster General, has secured recently a number of new post offices. But if the matter were equalized, probably Peel would have got one post office while North York might have got two. I take it that the remarks of the

hon. member for Peel were intended to have general application, and not by any means—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose they were to apply to every place but Peel.

Mr. HENDERSON. They were to have a general application. As to my own county, the Postmaster General since he came into office has been very generous. We have had only one post office closed. And I may tell the Postmaster General now, that I think it was a mistake to close that post office, for the simple reason that it was on a mail route, the carrier passed it every day in the year, and could just as well supply that office as not. The only difference, I suppose, would be that the postmaster would be paid at the rate of about $10 a year for keeping the post office open. I am one who favours the extension of the postal system in the rural districts, and have advocated that time and again. I believe the reduction of postage from 3 cents to 2 cents is of far greater benefit to the large centres of population than it is to the rural districts, and that the rural districts, the farmers especially, have to make up the deficiency in the revenue of the postal system. For I do not expect ever to see the revenue of the Post Office Department meet the expenditure. I tell the Postmaster General plainly that I do not hope to see it. I think it would be a mistake to try to attain such an end. There is no more reason why the Postal Department should be made self-sustaining than there is why the Intercolonial Railway, which cost us $13,000,000 in five years more than the revenues accruing from it should be self-sustaining. There is no more reason why the post office should be self-sustaining than there is why the Department of Public Works should be self-sustaining. Who would think of making the St. Lawrence route pay ? We do not expect to get enough out of the canals to pay the interest on the expenditure we have made on that route. Why should we expect the Post Office Department, which interests every man, woman and child in the country, to be self-sustaining ? Why not give that department a more extended operation and bring it within the reach of every person, even if it costs more money, and let the deficit be charged to the general revenue of the country the same as the deficiency in other departments is made a general charge ? I believe the Postmaster General would find that system approved of by the country even if it did cause a larger deficit.

I find that in 1891 the number of post offices was 8,061, and in 1896 there were 9,103, an average yearly increase of 208 offices. The hon. gentleman was making some comparisons with his predecessors, and I desire to make this comparison with his predecessors, who established on an average 208 new post offices a year during the period of five years before going out of power. Now what did the hon. gentleman do ? He came into power and attempted to do what no Postmaster General in this country has done since Confederation, because every year since Confederation we have had a deficit in the Post Office Department, and I do not look for anything else, in the near future at any rate. The hon. gentleman, in his efforts to make revenue and expenditure meet, commenced the system of curtailing the number of offices he was opening up, and in some cases struck off offices that he found in existence, notwithstanding the great development we hear of, especially in new Ontario, where so many offices will be required. The hon. gentleman found 9,103 offices in existence when he came into power in 1896, and on the 1st of July, 1901, he has only 9,834 offices, or a yearly increase of 146, instead of 208 under his predecessor. I tell the hon. gentleman plainly that if he is going to make revenue meet expenditure simply by curtailing the service, I do not think he will meet with the approval of the people. What the people want is a better service, a more extended service, even if it costs more money. The revenue from the Post Office Department increased $630,000 under the old 3 cent rate, between 1891 and 1896. From 1896 to 1901 the revenue increased $625,000. The increase during the last five years was not as large by $5,000 as it was in the previous five years. Of course that may be owing to a reduction in the rate of postage. The deficit in the Post Office Department, I say, must be made up from the general revenues of the country. The farmers are called upon to contribute through customs duties and otherwise to make up that deficit, and they do not derive the same benefit pro rata from the reduced postage that the people do in large centres of population. Therefore, I say they ought to have a better postal accommodation accorded to them. Where there were two mails a week, they should have three where they have three mails a week give them a daily mail. Where new post offices are required by the new conditions of things mentioned by the hon. member for Peel, on account of the changed occupation of the people from being simply growers of grain to producers of small commodities that require to be sent daily to market, where the farmers want to be in daily touch with the great centres through their newspapers and letters —I say this new condition of things requires in many rural districts that there should be more post offices. I was very anxious a year ago to have a post office opened in my county, because the hon. gentleman had closed one, and I thought it was only fair that he should open another in a section of the country where the people largely grow small fruits, and they pleaded that as a reason why they should have better postal accommodation. I hope the hon. gentleman will reconsider that application; and do

something for the rural section generally in order to compensate them for what they are contributing to pay postage for these business centres. I would be the last to complain about an increased deficit if it was caused by an increase in the number of post offices. There is another point mentioned by the hon. member for Leeds. I would like to ask the minister if he has ever made a calculation whether the government is losing money by carrying small packages of dry goods from large mercantile establishments in the cities. Take a parcel weighing four pounds, for instance, at one cent per four ounces, the postage would be 16 cents. Such a parcel sent from Toronto to Vancouver would cost 16 cents.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The rate on general merchandise is one cent an ounce. But there are plenty of other articles carried at the rate the hon. gentleman quotes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was going to ask the hon. gentleman if he has ever made a calculation as to whether the department does not pay the railway more for carrying that parcel than he receives in stamps ? I am under the impression that the department is losing money, and if that is the case there would be no hardship whatever in doubling the rate on such parcels.

Mr. McLENNAN. I hope the Postmaster General will not apply the suggestion of the hon. member for Peel so far as the county of Inverness is concerned. It is a large farming county, and I am afraid the people of that county are not so altruistic as the people of the county of Peel are represented to be, who are willing to walk two or three miles to post a letter in order that one of their number may be adequately paid for keeping a post office. I would also remind the Postmaster General that the county of Inverness has special claims upon his attention; and I desire to tell him that, like my hon. friend from Victoria, I propose laying siege to him before the session is over in order to get more post offices. In answer to a question I asked in the House last year, he gave the very gratifying answer that $5,000 a year was saved in the postal service of Inverness since 1896, as compared with a like previous period. With that satisfactory record I hope the hon. gentleman will give the people of that county better postal accommodation.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that a number of postmasters, besides being paid a salary, are allowed a rent allowance. Now what must be the revenue of the post office in that case ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Eight hundred dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is no rent allowance allowed to any postmaster unless the revenue amount to $800 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is the rule, I understand. I am not aware of any exception.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does that apply to branch post offices in the city ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman is asking me about a rent allowance made to postmasters. These sub-offices are not post offices in the full sense of the word.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are post offices that are given a rental allowance and as I am informed by the Postmaster General the revenue must amount to $800 a year before a rental allowance is made. I think that rule is not strictly adhered to in every particular.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think I have varied from it. If there are any exceptions they have been made before I took office. If my hon. friend will call my attention to any particular cases I will look into them.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. Postmaster General made the statement a few minutes ago that the revenue from the cities amounted to only one-third of the gross revenue of the post office department and that the other two-thirds was derived from the towns, villages and rural constituencies. The argument of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) is that the reduced postage is not a benefit to the farmer. That is his argument and that is my argument, and the hon. Postmaster General corroborates that by saying that one-third of the revenue comes from the cities and two-thirds from the towns, villages and rural municipalities. Therefore, it would be fair to assume that one-third comes from the towns and villages and one-third from the rural population. If the post office was a self-sustaining institution, then, the rural municipalities would benefit pro rata with the merchants, manufacturers and bankers, but when it has a deficit of half a million, or a million, as it probably will have this year, who pays the taxation ? If the cities pay one-third of the revenue, if the towns and villages pay one-third and the rural municipalities pay one-third, the farmers pay three-fourths of the taxation and therefore they have to pay three-fourths of the deficit that will occur in the administration of the Post Office Department. The farmers, no matter whether they write a few letters or not and receive the slight abatement from the reduction of postage, have to pay more in proportion to make up the abatement they receive than the manufacturers and merchants of the country, so that while the post office is a losing concern, the farmers are the parties who are paying the largest proportion to make up that revenue.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would draw the attention of the committee to the fact

that the hon. Postmaster General represents a little bit of a county and that in his riding he has thirty-nine post offices, whereas the great county of Peel, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) has only thirty-eight.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yet he wants to close them up.

Mr. BLAIN. No, he does not.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He wants to close up unnecessary post offices in ridings like North York.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The riding of North York is a gerrymandered riding representing pieces of different counties and so inaccessible that it is necessary to supply a large amount of accommodaton.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I should say that as the hon. Postmaster General gets returned regularly it is a gerrymandered riding. I find that in the county of Inverness there 155 post offices. I wonder if that is a gerrymandered riding.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the length of the riding ?

Mr. McLENNAN. It is 140 miles long and 50 miles wide.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is a small riding. I have the honour of representing a riding much larger in every way yet we have only one-third of the post offices and a people much more given to reading. What I rose to ask the hon. Postmaster General about is the matter to which I drew his attention a few days ago. It is the removal of a post office from the centre of populaion to one side of a settlement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What is the name of it ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Head Lake.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The papers have been forwarded to the inspector but his report has not been received.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General to say whether he has ever made any calculation in regard to the cost of sending parcel letters long distances to ascertain whether the government really loses money or gains money in carrying mail matter of this kind, practically merchandise, because I do not think there would be any hardship if the government were actually losing money in the rate being doubled so as to compensate the department for the outlay.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At the present time statistics on this point are being gathered throughout the whole of the Dominion. It will be some time in June before the weighing is completed, but we are studying that question now. The parcel post rates are unsatisfactory in many respects. Some of the rates are arbitrarily fixed by Act of parliament, other rates are fixed by the Postmaster General and in short, the rates are to-day in an unsatisfactory condition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the item is adopted I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General about the dismissal of two postmasters in my county. Mr. David Mitchell, of Jeddore, and Mr. Robert Kaulbach, of Middle Musquodoboit. Can he tell me if they were dismissed and if so for what reason ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General, if, in this vote, provision has been made to give statutory increases to the third-class clerks and letter carriers who have not reached the maximum sum in their different classes.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The supplementaries will deal with that branch of the expenditure.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no provision in this vote ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There may be some small increases, but the report was not ready when these estimates were prepared, and the increases were not dealt with when the main estimates were sent over to council. But, these estimates contain increases in all cases in which the salaries are under $800. They are provided for in these estimates.

Mr. AVERY. Is it the intention of the hon. Postmaster General to raise the salaries of the postmasters in the rural districts where they are so poorly paid ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend (Mr. Avery) has missed a most valuable and instructive debate on that question. We have had it before the committee for some time and I would say that there is no policy in that direction at the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The complaint of these men is that the quantity of work under the new postal rate has increased, while their salaries have been diminished.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been no diminution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The postmasters in my own county have told me the reverse. They say their salaries are paid to a certain extent by commission.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the rate of postage was reduced, instructions were given that whatever salaries they were receiving before the reduction they should continue to receive.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then some of them who have spoken to me on the subject cannot understand it that way, because they tell me they get less than before, and have more work to do. I particularly wish to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General that in Halifax, one letter carrier has a salary of $336.77 a year; another, $375; another, $373; another, $331.96; and another $375. Is this salary which is set out in the public accounts the total amount they receive for the year? At what rate of pay do they enter the service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. A letter carrier is entitled by law to receive the minimum of $360 a year on entering the service. The policy is to appoint letter carriers who have passed the examination but where there are none such, temporary letter carriers may be put on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the yearly increase?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At present it is $30, and if a man enters the service at $360, it would take him eight years to attain the maximum, but under the Bill which I have submitted to parliament, a letter carrier on entering the service will remain for six months probationary at a salary of $1.25 a day, or $390 a year. At the end of six months he will be confirmed in his position if he is deserving and get $1.50 per day, or $460 a year; after two years he will get $1.75 a day, or about $540 a year, and at the end of the fourth year he will get $2 a day.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). In confirmation of what the hon. leader of the opposition has said, I desire to state that in my own constituency I have almost positive knowledge that the salaries paid to postmasters some years ago were a little in excess of the salaries they receive to-day. For what reason the salaries have been reduced I am at a loss to know.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is quite an error.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). I am delighted to hear that, but I think I can produce evidence to show that what I state is the fact, and if I do produce such evidence I shall expect to know from the Postmaster General the reason for the reduction.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course, salaries are sometimes reduced for different causes. If my hon. friend can produce a single instance where a postmaster's salary was reduced simply because of the reduction in the rates, the department will feel bound to recoup the amount. When the reduced postage Bill was going through, I stated that the government did not intend to reduce the salaries should the revenues decrease. I only know of one instance where a reduction took place contrary to that rule, and in that case the amount that was reduced was repaid.

Mr. HENDERSON. I quite well remember the statement made by the Postmaster General with regard to the salaries of country postmasters. But I desire to call his attention to the fact that the rule which he announces has not been adhered to. I can give him the name of the post office in the village of Acton in which I live as an example of that. I cannot suppose for one moment that the revenue of that post office has been reduced because that village has about 300 more people than it had in 1891; the surrounding country is equally well populated, and the manufacturing industries are as extensive now as they were then. I do not think the revenue from that post office has been reduced, but the salary of the postmaster has been reduced.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We will look into it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Thank you. If the Postmaster General will look into that one and find that I am correct, I will give him the name of another postmaster similarly situated, because I think the hon. gentleman intends to do what is fair with these postmasters.

Mr. CLARKE. Are the commissions paid now, the same as before?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). It has been well said that the country does not expect the post office to be a revenue producing department. It is, of all the departments of government, the one which comes nearest to the people. Those of us who represent outlying regions far removed from large cities—I may say that my own county of Bonaventure is 180 miles long—those of us who represent such constituencies know how much our electors appreciate the post office, and they certainly have reason to thank the present Postmaster General for the great improvements which he has made in the postal service. The Post Office Department is to a great extent an educational agency in so far as it contributes to the diffusion of literature and newspapers amongst the people. Though newspapers may in some cases be looked upon with no very great favour, yet we know how glad we are to see a newspaper when we are far removed from the centres of population. The Post Office Department has done very satisfactory work under the present minister, but I would like the hon. gentleman to consider whether it is not possible to have newspapers more cheaply distributed through the mails in the rural districts. The newspaper proprietors are at present weighed down by a very heavy postage tax, and I would ask the Postmaster General to give this subject his consideration during the recess, and to endeavour if possible to reduce the postage rate on newspapers. We all know that almost the only means of communication which the people who live far from large centres have with the outside

world is through the newspapers. They are a great educational agency and their diffusion should be encouraged by all means possible; and the Post Office Department can do more towards that work than probably any other department of the government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would like to say a word about the mail service between the Magdalen Islands and the mainland. As you are well aware, comunication is closed there from the beginning of December till about the 15th of April. This year navigation was opened on the 7th of April, but that is quite unusual. Every year I am asked by my electors to obtain for them an extra mail between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands during the early part of April. The people of the Magdalen Islands, 5,000 or 6,000 in number, would like the Postmaster General to send one of the government steamers with the mails, because the merchants and the canners there are very anxious to begin their business early. This year I called the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to this matter, and he promised that he would consider it very seriously; and I hope that next year we shall have a steamer to take the mails to the Magdalen Islands in the early part of April. As I see the hon. Minister of Public Works in his seat, I may say that we have a cable system connecting the Magdalen Islands with the mainland at Meat Cove in Cape Breton. This is the only means of communication the people of the Magdalen Islands have during the winter, and it has been suggested that while navigation is closed the government should give them a telegraph mail rate, of say 10 cents and postage for 25 words between Magdalen Island and Meat Cove or North Sydney, to which place correspondents would post their matter. This cable does not pay, and it is not supposed to be a paying institution. It is used only for government business, and the ordinary rate is quite high. So I think it would be a good thing if the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is so progressive, would think of my poor electors, who cannot communicate during the winter months with their relatives on the mainland, and grant them a special telegraph mail rate.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General, in answer to my inquiry a few moments ago as to where the rental allowances began, told me that the amount of revenue must be $800. If he will turn to his report in reference to Ontario, he will find that at the post office of Emsdale the receipts are $456, and the postmaster gets a salary of $295, and an allowance of $40 for fuel and rent. Then, at the very next post office, Enterprise, the receipts are $475, and the postmaster gets a salary of $210, and no allowance for fuel or rent, so that I fancy there is a political friend of the minister in that post office of the village of Newboro, the receipts are $654, and there is a salary of $330, a forward allowance of $30, and an allowance for fuel and rent of $40. In neither of these cases has the sum of $800 been reached. I find the same thing all through, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick as well as in Ontario.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will say to the hon. gentleman that never once have I authorized a departure from the rule that has been laid down; and if my hon. friend now desires it, I will instruct the department to go through the list and in every case apply the rule. Many cases of this kind I found in existence and left there; but these are not advantages to our friends; they are advantages which our predecessors granted, and therefore it is reasonable to suppose they were not made to benefit the Liberal party. My hon. friend knows about Newboro. I know nothing about that, but I will look into it, and I will apply the rule generally if my hon. friend desires.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can assure the hon. gentleman that he will not apply it to Newboro, because the postmaster there is the secretary of the Reform Association.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How long has he been postmaster there?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been member for the county for 20 years, and he was postmaster when I was first elected, and he is yet.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This allowance was made before I was Postmaster General.

Mr. TAYLOR. Although he was a most active partisan against me in every election, while the Conservative government was in power, and I could have had him displaced as an offensive partisan, yet I never interfered with him, because he was within his right. But the hon. gentleman has dismissed many postmasters in my county.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Postmaster General if Mr. LeSueur is still in the service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has been recommended for superannuation. The recommendation went to council some time ago.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. Postmaster General what age Mr. LeSueur has arrived at, and the reason for his superannuation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has arrived at the age of 60 years, and the reason for his superannuation is enfeebled health. He applied for supperannuation some two or three years ago, and I asked him to remain in the service, if possible, for a couple of years. He repeated his request, and finally last fall I yielded to it. He told me he was in reduced health, that he was suffering, I

think, from disease of the heart, and required rest. I acceded to his request and made the recommendation.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that Mr. LeSueur is still in the service ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is not in harness but has been recommended for superannuation.

Mr. BENNETT. What would be the amount of his superannuation allowance, and the salary of his successor ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He has been over forty years in the service and would be entitled to 70 per cent of his salary. Of course, the appointment of a successor could not go through until Mr. LeSueur is superannuated, but his successor will be Mr. William Smith, who has been recommended at the initial salary of $1,800, which is that of a chief clerk. Mr. LeSueur was appointed in February, 1856, and has therefore now been in office 46 years.

Mr. BENNETT. Was Mr. Smith a senior in the office, and in what grade ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a first-class clerk, and entered the service in 1878. He was appointed in 1876, but I am told that he was only appointed to the Ottawa inside service about 1883 or 1884.

Mr. BENNETT. He has every qualification I assume ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I recommended him because of his fitness.

Mr. BENNETT. Is he the gentleman who distinguished himself in the preparation of a book commonly known as the private letters of Sir Adolphe Caron ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Never heard of the book.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General's memory is singularly at fault. He must remember with what a flourish of trumpets he published at one time a blue-book consisting of private letters, which had been laid aside by Sir Adolphe Caron when he went out of office, and which comprised correspondence of a very private character. Might I ask the Postmaster General if he now remembers the book to which I refer?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I never heard of any book of the name mentioned by the hon. gentleman. I remember an official book published as an appendix to the Postmaster General's report, containing very useful information of a public character, which the public had a right to. Mr. Smith rendered useful assistance, as did other clerks, in the details of that work.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Smith was credited with having been the chief compiler of that book. In what year did Mr. Smith come to Ottawa ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am told in 1883.

Mr. BENNETT. Was he the senior in the office or were there other clerks, his seniors, available for the position ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Smith was recommended because of his special fitness. In the opinion of myself and the deputy, there was nobody in the department as well qualified. At present he is in Newfoundland, where he has been some months putting the postal service of that country into a satisfactory condition. As soon as he is relieved from that work and his appointment goes through Council here, he will be put in Mr. LeSueur's place.

Mr. COCHRANE. I wonder whether he is preparing another work down there.

Mr. KENDALL. I would like to endorse the remarks of my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). I happen to be somewhat acquainted with the Magdalen Islands, having lived among the people a certain time, and taken a considerable interest in them. these islands have been inhabited since about 140 years, and at present the population is about 6,000. During four months of the year these people are cut off from communication with the mainland. There is a telegraph system connecting with the island, which is owned by the government, but the rates are very high, and it seems to me that it would be only reasonable for the government to allow the people to send their messages at much lower rates than are charged at present. The government has to keep a full staff in constant employment, and it would not add materially to the expense of operating the line if messages were transmitted at lower rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It would bring revenue.

Mr. KENDALL. And no doubt it would add to the revenue. Another point I would like to make, is that the present steamship service from Pictou to the Magdalen Islands might be made much more valuable, if for a certain length of time the steamship was sent from North Sydney instead of from Prince Edward Island, particularly during the later part of March and April. I wish to endorse the remarks made by my hon. friend from Gaspé. If members of the cabinet could only visit the islands and see the conditions under which those people live, they would appreciate to some extent the difficulties from which they suffer, and I am sure would make provision as far as possible for better service.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the law does not require a person asking superannuation to make application in writing and have it accom-

panied by a certificate from two medical doctors that he is unable to perform his duties. Did Mr. LeSueur make an application in writing, and accompany it by the necessary medical certificate ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He made an application in writing, but when an officer is over sixty years of age, he may be retired for other reasons than ill health, and no medical certificate is required. I have given the reasons why he wants to be retired and he has made application in writing.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). In connection with the Magdalen Islands, I would ask the hon. minister to remember that those people are deprived during four months of the year of newspapers and letters. The splendid postal service which we enjoy is of no avail to them whatever during that period. There is a cable telegraph service, but the rates are almost prohibitive. The people of the islands have to endure great hardships. They have no railway facilities and are deprived of most of the benefits enjoyed by citizens in other parts of Canada, and surely it is not much to ask that they be given the privilege of using the cable at the lowest possible rate. If the Minister of Public Works will give the matter his attention, he will admit at once that what my hon. friend from Gaspé has asked for is most reasonable and should be granted, and it would tend to increase the revenue from that cable, which to-day is only a few hundred dollars. The cable is very seldom used because the rates are too high, but the government have to employ a staff to work the cable, and might as well reduce the rates and give the people the advantage. If the hon. minister will just consider that during four months of the year these people are without a newspaper or a letter, and are unable to use the government cable, which stretches across sixty miles of water, because of the high rates charged, several cents a word, he will see the justice of conceding to this request and enabling the poor fisherman to make some use of this means of communication with the world outside. At present the rate is prohibitive except to commercial people.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not the first time that my hon. friend from Gaspé has called my attention to the peculiar and difficult position of the people in the Magdalen Islands. The great trouble is that our telegraph system is not completed. It is true we have a cable, but on the main land we have no lines. We have only a small piece of cable which has no connection with the outside world, except through the Western Union Telegraph Company and other companies. I have just now under consideration, and, I may add, under discussion with my colleagues, a plan to complete our telegraph system. It would not cost very much money for us to become master of the situation. We could connect our telegraph system with the cables at Canso and also with our present system on the North Shore. We have just completed that system to Belle Isle, our terminal point being St. Paul's Bay in the county of Charlevoix. For a small amount of money we could take the system up to Quebec, if we could not make satisfactory arrangements with the Great North-western Telegraph Company. I am very glad that the attention of the House has been called to the difficulties of the situation in the Magdalen Islands. While I am on my feet, I would like to ask the name of the postmaster in the riding of my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who is secretary of the Liberal Association ? And when I learn his name, I shall be glad to suggest that he be dismissed because he has not been successful in defeating my hon. friend.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would like to direct the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that there are a great many people living away in the northern part of the Canadian North-west who receive a mail, some of them only once a year and many of them twice a year. The way these gentlemen keep up with the times is this—they take their daily papers, lay out their year's or half year's supply in order, and then read one paper each day. These are very intelligent and altogether a very fine class of people, who live in that remote region, and I would urge that they be considered. And I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) whether, after those cables and telegraph lines that he speaks of are constructed, they will be controlled by the Department of Public Works or by the Post Office Department ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That grave question will, no doubt, engage the attention of the best minds of the land.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that probably it will be arranged in this way—the cables and telegraphs will be in charge of the Minister of Public Works, while the Postmaster General will have charge of the Marconi system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Marconi system is not bad, but, so far, we have not been able to establish it in such a satisfactory manner that we can quite understand one another across the floor of this House.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inform the Postmaster General that the name of the postmaster at Newboro, to whom I referred, is Mr. Lewis. He is the postmaster there and the secretary of the Reform Association. Prior to the last election but one, there were appeals put in to strike names off the voters' list. I appeared to defend the parties who were appealed

against. And when we came before the judge, I raised the point that the notice had to be sent by registered letter, and I wanted the registration receipts produced. The postmaster was called, and swore that the letters were registered. When asked where the receipts were, he said they were at the post office. The judge asked him to bring them. He went away, and, in about half an hour returned with a bundle of receipts. I asked the question: Have you changed the date of your post office stamp, written out the receipts and stamped them? And he had to admit that he had done so. That is the kind of postmaster they have at Newboro.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not responsible.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Is the hon. gentleman going to dismiss this man?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to have some information on the subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman will inquire of Judge Macdonald, of Brockville, he can get full particulars.

Mr. AVERY. I understood that the hon. gentleman was going to have this man dismissed because he had not succeeded in defeating the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor)?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I should attempt to interfere in Ontario, they would say it was a case of French domination.

Mr. CLARKE. The question of superannuation has been raised. Has Mr. David Matheson, who was one of the chief officials of the savings branch, been superannuated? And if so, what was his age when superannuated, and what allowance is he to receive?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is at least two or three years since Mr. Matheson was superannuated. He is an old officer of the department. He broke down in the service. As in the case of Mr. LeSueur, I did not accept his resignation at first, but gave him leave of absence—I think for six months—I hoped that he would recruit. He came back and resumed his duties, but the anxieties of so important an office bore too heavily upon him, and, he felt would shorten his days. He came to me and said that he must be superannuated so that he could live a quiet life. I do not remember his age, but I am pretty sure it exceeded sixty years. He was in the department for many years, having come in, I think, under Sir Oliver Mowatt before confederation.

Mr. BENNETT. I find, by the report that Mr. Matheson was born in 1840.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). He was an excellent officer and had only one fault—he was a Liberal.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the minister a list of superannuations that he intends to make in the Toronto post office on the 1st of July?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no such list.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the carriage of the mails between the post office and railway station at Barrie, the courier service I referred to, now done by tender or by appointed officials?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it is done by tender.

Mr. BENNETT. I am informed that instead of being done as formerly by contract, there is now an appointed official for that purpose. My information is of such a nature that I think it is correct.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman has been misinformed.

Mr. BENNETT. Have any statutory additions been made in his department this year in the chief offices here?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These estimates provide for increases in all cases where the salaries are less than $800 a year. As to cases of salaries exceeding $800, all that we propose to recommend will appear in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. Then everybody with a salary of less than $800 is to be advanced?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Only those who are deserving.

Mr. BENNETT. How many cases are there which he considers deserving?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not exercise any judgment upon that point at all. When the fiscal year is closed the superior officers will make their reports and the increases will depend on those reports.

Mr. BENNETT. How many clerks in the department will come under that system?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Every clerk in the service will come under that system, that is, his increase will depend upon the recommendation of the proper officers. There are nearly 2,000 of a staff, and many of them are at a maximum. All who are not at a maximum will be considered.

Mr. BLAIN. Are all mail carrying contracts let by tender now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Not all, but as a rule they are. There are some exceptions for small distances, but as a rule we try to live up to that system.

Mr. BLAIN. Do country postmasters receiving these small salaries give bonds to the department for the fulfilment of their duty, and what kind of bonds are given?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The lowest amount exacted is $200. A post-

master such as the hon. gentleman refers to would give security to the extent of $200.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did Mr. Matheson put in a written application ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And furnished medical certificates ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mail service, $2,344,700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the minister explain with reference to the matter of parcels, what arrangement he has made with railway companies for transmission from one part of Canada to another ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The railways are paid in some instances per track mile, in other cases per train mile, and there is a different rate according to whether it is a postal car or a baggage car service, and in accordance with the frequency of the service. Where there is an insignificant amount of mail matter there is a reduction in the rates. The rate varies from one cent to eight cents a mile per car mile. I do not remember the smallest rate per lineal mile, but, I think in the case between Ottawa and Smith's Falls we pay about $320 a year per mile of railway. There are cases on the Grand Trunk Railway where we pay $160 a mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Could the hon. gentleman say how the revenue derived from parcels of merchandise compares with the amount paid to railway companies or other common carriers for the transmission ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You mean the gross amount the department derives from the total amount of parcels.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I mean, is that particular class of business paying, and if not, what is the loss ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As I said some time ago, weights are now being taken throughout Canada, and I am told by the accountant, will not be completed until the month of June. We are ascertaining the exact weight of parcel post matter being carried, and that will form a basis upon which to make a calculation. We are ascertaining the exact weights of mails of all classes, that is, of letters, newspapers and other things. These data may enable us to form some estimate as to whether we are carrying merchandise parcels at a loss or a profit.

Mr. KEMP. Speaking of the $320 per mile per annum between Ottawa and Smith's Falls—presuming that is the approximate amount—you are paying exactly the same amount as between Ottawa and Vancouver. That kind of matter has increased very rapidly in the last few years, until it is said the post office has come into competition with other carriers or express companies. Is it not fair to assume that in a country like this, so long and narrow, this system will have to be changed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. What does my hon. friend suggest ?

Mr. KEMP. I was going to say that in a country like Great Britain where the population is dense, whether the distance is short or long, it does not make so much difference. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether that feature has been considered, and if it has been considered, even before the report to which he refers is complete, had he anything in his mind as to how it might be remedied ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am quite cognizant of the fact that our distances are vast but I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kemp) to give me a suggestion. I have had a great many questions put to me but I would like to put some questions to other people. What would my hon. friend propose ? My mind is in a receptive condition. Has he a policy to propose, because if he has, I shall welcome it. I would be thankful for it.

Mr. KEMP. I quite appreciate the position of the hon. Postmaster General in regard to this question. If I were in his position and had to deal with the finances of the country I might put such questions as he does, but, I never expect to be in that position. I cannot formulate a policy for the hon. gentleman this evening. I do not feel called upon to do it. I have thought of it the same as he has. I think he will have to solve that problem, because I think the problem will have to be solved. I dare say there may be shipped out of certain places in this country daily a carload of parcel post merchandise. If the government is paying too much for the delivery of parcel post merchandise at great distances from the centres from which it is shipped, is it fair that that should continue ? It is a fair thing to deliver letters and postal cards but when you are coming into competition with freight carriers and express companies it seems to me that some readjustment should take place. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he knows whether merchandise is carried in the United States at as low a rate as it is carried here. If it is marked 'sample post' it is carried at the rate of one cent for four ounces, while if it is merchandise it costs a cent an ounce. A large amount is carried at the rate of a cent for four ounces.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think the post office gets the profitable end of the traffic. I fancy that if merchants can despatch their parcels more cheaply for a short distance by express they will do so and give us the non-paying business. That is one of the questions that is causing

this inquiry to be made. In answer to the question of my hon. friend I would say that the best rate given to the public in the United States is two ounces to be carried for one cent. In Canada we have a lower rate than that, carrying four ounces for one cent. The Bill which I have before parliament purposes to deal with that subject.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to suggest to the hon. Postmaster General that he should instruct his officers at Toronto to weigh during one week all the parcels that come from the two large departmental stores, that of the Simpson Company and that of the T. Eaton Company, and then count up the revenue that he receives for carrying these parcels, because I am informed that there is practically a carload going out daily from these two stores and being distributed all over the country from Halifax to Vancouver.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are having a more extended investigation than for a week.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well then, take it for a month ; instruct your officers to weigh the whole output of the goods coming from these stores and which ought to go by express.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I do not wish to interfere with the hon. Postmaster General's desire to get a revenue out of that class of service, but I wish to say that there are a great many people who live in the North-west Territories, as the hon. gentleman for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) knows, as well as in Ontario, long distances from the railway stations, and it is a very great convenience for these people who cannot go to town more than once or twice a year to be able to send for samples and get parcels back by mail. As long as the rate is not too low this traffic should not be interfered with. I know that the hon. member for Selkirk will agree with me when I say that it is a great benefit to the people living in remote parts of the North-west Territories to receive mail matter in that way.

Mr. McCREARY. It is a question to consider as to how far this privilege should be curtailed. I have been on the Gilbert Plains and I am familiar with the custom there. The Timothy Eaton catalogue comes once a year and the people order their goods from that catalogue. They tell me they can order goods at from 25 to 50 per cent less than the price at which they could buy them in Dauphin. Consequently, they get the balance of the people in Canada to pay the postage on their goods from Timothy Eaton's store to Gilbert Plains and if they get these goods so much cheaper I do not know that there is any great wrong in that. I think the poor pioneer on the prairies ought to make a little out of the people of Canada in a legitimate way as long as he can. If the pioneer who is carving out a home for himself on these plains and prairies can get his goods a little cheaper in that way and if the people have to pay for it through the postal system I do not think he should be prevented from doing so. It will work out the other way when he comes to ship his hogs and wheat down to the seaports in the east. In regard to the postal department the hon. Postmaster General seems to have adopted a picayune policy. He is a little bit niggardly. In my opinion, at the present time, the department should not be considered only from a revenue point of view. It should be considered from a public point of view and it should be made easy for people to get their mail. In regard to the eastern provinces very few farmers occupy more than 50 or 100 acres of land and they get their mail along the old and regular lines. In the North-west, where the people have 320 acre farms, they live a mile or two apart and they have great difficulty in getting their mail. One of the greatest drawbacks to immigration in that western country is the want of post offices. I know people in the Swan river district and the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Hughes) knows this to be a fact, who have been there for a year or more and who are from thirty-five to fifty miles distant from a post office. I know a gentleman named Mr. Richard Lyons, who lives thirty-five miles from Swan river. That man came from the north of Ireland, he lived in that district for nearly two years and he told me that he thought he would go back to Ireland because he could not get his mail.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was he 'agin' the government ?

Mr. McCREARY. No, he was a good Orange Conservative. He said : If I cannot get my mail oftener than once in six months it is pretty nearly time to move away from this country. There are other places where they feel this same drawback, and I do think that in our western countries the hon. Postmaster General should exercise more generosity than he does in the east. I believe that if the postal service runs behind there it should be charged up to immigration or provided for in some other way so that the people would have a sufficient number of post offices. I hope the hon. Postmaster General will look into this question.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to call the hon. minister's attention to the fact that I see that at page 145 of the civil service list the name of Thomas Robinson Garrett as a third-class clerk in the Toronto district, being among the railway mail clerks. He was apparently born on the 15th September, 1845. May I ask the hon. minister if the date is correct as to his age ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what his age is, but I assume the record is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. Assuming that the date is correct, the hon. Postmaster General has informed us that on account of age and infirmity he retired Mr. LeSueur and Mr. Matheson, whose superannuation allowance will amount to about $2,000 a year each. The Postmaster General retires a gentleman who is 61 years old, and he appoints another who is 55 years. The life of a railway mail clerk, under ordinary circumstances, is not very long, because of his arduous work, and does the Postmaster General think that it is in the interest of the country to appoint a mail clerk at such an age ? Where does Mr. Garrett come from ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He comes from East Northumberland. He was appointed in 1900, and is therefore not entitled to superannuation.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it the policy of the government to appoint men at such an age.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. BENNETT. The point arises, that if a man has a retiring allowance it is easier to dispense with his services, because it may be a case of hardship to throw him out on the street if he has no superannuation. Have any other appointments been made of men 55 years of age.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot recall the ages of all these we have appointed, but I can say that in the Bill which I have submitted I ask parliament to fix the age limit at 30 years.

Mr. BENNETT. The Postmaster General is not alone in inconsistency, because a few years ago the government introduced the Bill to retire judges when they reached 70 years, and a judge was recently appointed at the age of 71 years. Is George G. Anderson now a permanent railway mail clerk?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the information to-morrow.

Mr. CLARKE. On a former occasion the Postmaster General promised that he would consider the question of reducing the postage rate on drop letters in cities. Has the hon. gentleman given that matter consideration ? It is a fact which must be well known to the Postmaster General and his officers that a large number of local letters are distributed by leading concerns in cities by messengers employed for that purpose at a lower rate than the 2 cents that the post office charges. That would seem to prove that the drop letter rate is altogether too high.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The 2 cent letter rate is only in force in cities where free delivery exists, and elsewhere people have to walk to the post office to get their letters. To charge a 1-cent rate would be giving an unfair advantage to people who live in cities.

Mr. CLARKE. In what respect ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They would be getting their letters at a less rate than would be charged our friend the farmer who has to walk to the post office. I do not think that the people who live outside of the cities would be very anxious to adopt the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman. The free delivery is very expensive, and those who get the benefit of it might be expected to pay the extra expense, either in the way of an extra rate or by contribution of a bulk sum.

Mr. CLARKE. The Postmaster General forgets that postal cards and circulars now require only a 1-cent postage, and are delivered in cities just as letters and newspapers are. My contention is that a 2-cent rate is too much for this service, and that is proven by the fact that large legal and mercantile firms can employ messengers to distribute their letters and circulars at a less rate than 2 cents each. In view of that fact, it is not an unreasonable request to ask the minister to take this matter into consideration.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. member for West Toronto has raised a very important question with reference to the postage on newspapers. What revenue does the Postmaster General get to-day from postage on newspapers, and what does their circulation cost him ? We get some newspapers in the western countries that are all right, but we also get a lot of terrible Tory sheets that are not worth paying for. They have a bad effect on our western people and some limit should be put upon their circulation by an increased postage rate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the Postmaster General made any change in the carrying of the mails from Round Hill, King's county, N.B., to Armstrong Corner, Queen's county ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The officers will make a note of the question, and I will give the information to-morrow.

Mr. BENNETT. As to the rent paid to the postmaster at Midland, I wish to state that it is not at all adequate for the accommodation afforded. My recollection is that the rent is only $70 a year, and it is only fair that that rent should be increased. The post office is in a building erected by the postmaster and has an equipment for the service equal to that of many of the public buildings that are owned by the government and which have cost the country a very large sum. I think there is a space for the general public who come to transact post office business about 40 feet by 20 feet. These facts should be taken into consideration in the rental paid.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This report shows that it is $160.

Mr. BENNETT. I am pleased to see that that is the amount. I understood that it was much less than that. However, even at $160, when we consider the cost of maintaining other places where there are caretakers, and having regard to the expense for fuel, lighting and rental, I am pleased to see that the Postmaster General is prepared to advance it still further.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a matter which I want the Postmaster General to be prepared to deal with at some time before his estimates are disposed of. It is a matter that was brought to the attention of the House, I think, two years ago. That is, the refusal of the government to grant petitions of right to a number of persons who claim that their contracts were cancelled without authority in law by the Postmaster General. They have been applying for petitions of right for two years or more, and I understood from the Postmaster General two years ago that there was to be a report made in writing by him to the Minister of Justice, and that was to be laid on the Table of the House, or the House was to be informed in regard to it. Up to the present time the House has not been informed in regard to it, and I understand that these people have not been able to get the slightest satisfaction except such as may be derived from a letter from the Department of Justice stating that as the matter had been discussed by the late Minister of Justice with the Postmaster General, the present Minister of Justice was not prepared to open it up again. I am prepared to say that there is a perfectly fair and arguable case for submission to the courts on the facts in my possession, and it seems to me a most unfair and tyrannical thing that this matter should be postponed from time to time, and that these people should not be allowed to assert their rights, if they have any, in the courts. The refusal to grant a petition of right simply amounts to this, that the Postmaster General constitutes himself the judge as to whether these people have any arguable case or not. These people have been advised by counsel of high standing that they have a proper case against the government for argument and decision in the courts; and under these circumstances what possible reason can there be for refusing them a petition of right? I was very much surprised indeed at the action of my hon. friend the Postmaster General in regard to the matter. If he has made a mistake in cancelling these contracts, when he had not the legal right to do so, surely, if he is a fair-minded man, he would be the very first person who would be anxious that they should have redress in the courts. I do not think that is a proposition which my hon. friend would controvert. If he has not made a mistake, if he is right in the position he has assumed, what possible risk can there be to the government or detriment to the public interest in allowing the men to go into court and obtain the satisfaction of finding out that they are wrong? In doing so they would subject themselves to the costs which every man has to pay who takes into court a claim that is unfounded. I hope the Postmaster General will be prepared to deal with this matter, which I will discuss at greater length, going into the merits, if necessary, when the supplementary estimates come before us. At present, I cannot possibly see why claims, having a prima facie standing at least, should be kept so long out of court, and why these men should be so long debarred from having their rights adjudicated upon by an independent tribunal.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not often agree with the leader of the opposition, but in this proposition I certainly do agree with him absolutely. The theory that the King can do no wrong is in this democratic country absolutely exploded. The Crown, as represented by the government of the country, can do wrong just as any private individual can do wrong, and there should be no petition of right at all. An individual having a claim against the government should have a right to bring an action in court against the government just the same as he would against a private individual. If he fails in his action, he is mulcted in his costs; if the government succeed, they get their costs; and there is no reason on earth that I can see why an individual should not have the same right against the government that he has against anybody else. I would like to hear some reasonable argument against that proposition. I am prepared to support the proposition laid down by the leader of the opposition now or at any other time. There should not be, and will not be within a very few years, the problem of a petition of right in this country.

Mr. McCREARY. Do the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) endorse the statements made by the hon. member for Welland?

Mr. CLARKE. Certainly. Surely every hon. member of this House will endorse the position he takes, that if a man has a just claim he ought to be heard.

Some resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1902, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, 30th April, 1902.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message of His Excellency together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 1, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

LAND TITLES ACT, 1894.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 149) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894. He said: This Bill deals with the registration of properties in the North-west Territories, and is intended to remove certain small technical difficulties in the working of the Act. The first clause is to make clear the meaning of section 87. There has already been one amendment but there appears to be a difference of opinion between some members of the legal profession and the judiciary in regard to the effect of the clause. It appears to have the effect as drafted, of preventing the owner himself with dealing with property which he has authorized an attorney to deal with, while the power of attorney is still registered. This will make it clear that the owner can deal with the property as well as the person appointed by power of attorney. Clause 2 is to save the owner of land unnecessary expense in obtaining a certificate of title in lieu of one which has been destroyed. It does away with the necessity of advertising.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER.

QUESTION.

MONTREAL HARBOUR BOARD — APPOINTMENT OF MR. W. E. DORAN.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Is the government aware that there is and has been for some time past a vacancy on the Montreal Harbour Board?
2. What is the reason of the delay in making the board complete by filling said vacancy?
3. Has the position been offered to any one?
4. When will said nomination be made?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The government is aware that there was a vacancy, but that vacancy exists no longer. It has been filled by the appointment of Mr. W. E. Doran.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER moved:

That, commencing with Monday next, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet on that day, and on each subsequent sitting day, at eleven (11) o'clock in the morning; that, in addition to the usual intermission at six (6) o'clock, p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day from one (1) to three (3) o'clock, p.m., and that government Orders shall have precedence at all such sittings. Members having still the right to ask questions on Mondays, Wednesdays and Thursdays.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman has come to any conclusion about the Bill which was introduced by the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, (Mr. Roddick), I know that Dr. Roddick is very anxious to have this Bill discussed in this House, and if possible to have it go to the Senate. If this motion carries I do not see that there will be any opportunity to do that. There is another matter; what time will this leave for private Bills?

The PRIME MINISTER. It was my intention to leave Monday for private Bills, and I suppose we can understand it in that way, that on Monday we shall have private Bills, then questions, and then government orders.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that if the House understands the motion in that way, it will not be necessary to modify it. There is another matter which I should like to mention to the right hon. gentleman, and that is that I do not think there has been any meeting of the Committee on Public Accounts during the present week, owing to the absence of the chairman. While the engagements of the chairman elsewhere are no doubt entitled to great respect, it would be a simple matter, if he is obliged to leave Ottawa on any other business, to arrange with some other member to act in his absence.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I

may say that the chairman before leaving spoke to me, saying that he had consulted some of the leading members of the Public Accounts Committee, and they had told him that they did not wish a meeting of the committee this week, but that if they did, they would notify us. So that it is not on account of his absence that there has been no meeting.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He is entirely mistaken.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I am only stating what the chairman told me. He mentioned especially that he had asked the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) if he wanted a meeting of the committee this week, and that hon. gentleman had told him that he did not, but that if he should want a meeting, he would notify us.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I can only say that when I was asked what meetings we would want this week, the memorandum I sent back stated that we would want a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. I do not know whether the chairman received that message. I do not think you can arrange such matters by negotiation without consulting every member of the Committee on Public Accounts. I know that one member spoke to me on the subject who did very much desire to have a meeting. When the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee feels compelled to leave Ottawa for the space of a week or thereabouts, an arrangement should be made for some member to act in his place. I had this same complaint to make last session, and what I said then, I repeat now, that there is no excuse for meetings of a committee being put off on account of the absence of the chairman. I do not object to the chairman going away if he has business to take him away, but I do object to his paralyzing by his absence the meetings of the committee by neglecting the very simple precaution of having some one act as chairman in his absence. I am not finding fault with the chairman so much as with the system, and I will continue to find fault with it so long as it continues.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I fear that I may be somewhat to blame in this matter. I quite agree with the leader of the opposition, that there is no reason whatever why there should not be meetings of the committee in the absence of the chairman; and in this case there must have been some misunderstanding between some of the members of the committee and the clerk, because when the chairman left he mentioned to me personally that an intimation would be made to the clerk if any of the members wanted a meeting, and he asked me if I would be kind enough to attend to it for him, and see that a meeting was called. The naming of a chairman to preside at the meetings is a matter simply in the hands of the committee; that has often occurred. In this case if there has not been a meeting, it is certainly because of some misunderstanding, and is not the fault of the chairman. If any member intimates to the clerk of the committee that he wants a meeting, the committee will be called at once.

Mr. C. F. McISAAC (Antigonish). The chairman of the Public Accounts Committee requested me to state on his behalf, in case this question was brought up in the House, that before he left he had gone to the hon. member for Hamilton and told him that he would be absent for a few days, but that if he wished a meeting to be called this week, a meeting would be called, and another member would be appointed to act as chairman in his place; but the hon. member for Hamilton expressly told him that he did not wish a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee to be called this week; and that is why a meeting has not been called.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). If this motion passes, it will be impossible for the committee to meet unless it has permission to meet during the sittings of the House. I think the motion should be followed by another to allow all committees to meet during the sittings of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will attend to that to-morrow.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox). I wish to call attention to the fact that it has been arranged that the binder twine men shall come before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization on Wednesday to give evidence, and unless it has permission to meet during the sittings of the House, it will be unable to hold a meeting.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). I have been waiting a whole week to finish up a little matter before the Public Accounts Committee. I am informed that the chairman is away in western Ontario stumping in the interest of the party of which he is an ardent supporter, and consequently we can have no meeting this week. It is very unfortunate that the chairman did not stay here and attend to his duties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It is not fair to the chairman to have it put in that way, that no meeting of the committee could be held because of the absence of the chairman. If members are obliged to leave, the work of the House must go on. The hon. member for Guysborough distinctly told me before he left that he understood that there was no desire on the part of hon. members opposite to have a meeting this week.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the Minister of Finance says simply shows the truth of the observation I made, that some one should be designated to act in the ab-

sence of the chairman to whom the members of the committee could go. My hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) was probably away when the chairman left. While certain members of this side of the House might say they did not desire a meeting, some others might desire a meeting. Would it not be a simple matter to arrange that if the chairman is absent, a deputy chairman shall be appointed to act in his place? It is not likely both will be away, and if they should be, we can have a third one. Let us have, in matters of this kind, the simplest and most elementary business methods, such as are employed in all corporations throughout the country, and avoid little disputes and differences that would disgrace the proceedings of any business corporation. I dislike to have to speak about this thing so often, and I trust that the Minister of Finance, or whoever is responsible, will see that we need not have occasion to make similar complaints again.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There would have been no difficulty if the hon. member for Toronto had been good enough to intimate his wish to have a meeting of the committee. There would have been means for calling it together, as there is no lack of machinery.

Mr. BROCK. The chairman had left the city.

Mr. W. SCOTT (West Assiniboia). I do not wish to offer opposition to the motion of the Prime Minister, but I think this is a proper time to draw the attention of the House to the almost absolute lack of opportunity for dealing with legislation introduced by private members. I have a Bill standing in my name on public orders, which it is quite evident I shall not be able to proceed with. For reasons beyond my control, it was impossible for me to be present at the beginning of the session, but I took the very earliest opportunity, after my arrival, to introduce a Bill for the purpose of remedying what is a very serious grievance in the territories. The object of the Bill is to compel railway companies to construct proper fire guards and thus prevent the starting of prairie fires, which every year do a great amount of damage. I do not believe that I missed any occasion when there seemed to be reasonable hope that the Bill would be reached, but so far it has not been reached, and cannot now be reached. Were there any reason to hope that a delay of the present motion would result in my Bill being reached, I would be disposed to ask that the motion be not passed now, but even were we to set two months with a private members' day each week, the Bill would not likely be reached. It seems to me that those who control the business of this House show considerable lack of interest in the legislation proposed by private members. On government days the sessions of the House last as late as 1.30 a.m., and on the average last to midnight or 12.30 o'clock, but on private members' days, the House is usually adjourned at an early hour. On the last private members' day the House sat until 1 a.m., and as regards that day there is no complaint, but on the previous private members' day it adjourned at 11 p.m., 9,45 p.m., 9.25 and 10.55. I am a very young member of this House and hesitate to offer suggestions as to the conduct of members, but it does seem to me that some amendments of the rule would be advantageous to the conduct of business in the public interest. I think that public Bills and orders should be put on an equal footing with notices of motion. For instance on one private members day, notices of motion might have precedence, and on the next public Bills and orders. At present experience shows that it is impossible for public Bills and orders to be reached. To show that the grievance I complain of is not an insignificant one, I might mention a few of the prairie fires started from railway trains during last year——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not permitted, on a motion such as that before the House, to discuss a Bill which is on the Order paper.

Mr. SCOTT. I have no intention of discussing the Bill, but may I not be allowed to state some reasons why the motion before the House should or should not pass.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman may refer to the fact that he has a very important Bill on the Order paper, but he should not proceed to discuss the merits of the Bill itself.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is quite competent for hon. members to ventilate any grievance on the motion to go into supply, and I think my hon. friend would do better to wait for that motion.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not intend speaking on the Bill which stands in my name on the Order paper, but am simply endeavouring to urge some reasons which may appeal to hon. members as reasons why this House should, or perhaps should not, be held in session two or three weeks longer and this particular motion should or perhaps should not be adopted at present.

Mr. SPEAKER. The suggestion made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior is the one which the hon. gentleman should accept under the circumstances. It would be much more regular for him to deal with the grievance he complains of when the motion is made to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is also perfectly in order in showing the grounds why the mo-

tion before the House should not pass, until the government has made provision for the discussion of a particular measure.

Mr. T. O. DAVIS (Saskatchewan). In the earlier days of this session, we had several private members' days when the House had adjourned in the afternoon because we had nothing to do. It seems to me that a great deal of time has been taken up with private members' days when the legislation proposed by the private members was not ready. Now other members than the gentlemen who have proposed these measures have their rights. If we keep the House sitting until October, somebody will be late with a Bill and will want more time. There are members who are anxious to get home, and there is no reason why we should be delayed all summer because some members have not their Bills before the House.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Marquette). The First Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not given the leader of the opposition an answer as to the disposition he proposed to make of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Roddick). That is a very important measure, and one that has been before the House for three successive sessions. It went through Committee of the Whole three or four weeks ago, and it was at the Prime Minister's own suggestion that it was laid over, with the express stipulation that it would be proceeded with this session. I know that the hon. member who introduced the Bill is very anxious to have it proceeded with. It affects the medical profession throughout the whole country, and also the public generally, and it would be too bad to have it laid over. If he cannot extend the same courtesy to the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, as he did to the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), with his Cattle Guard Bill, it would probably be better to have another private members' day.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think the House will be disposed to have another private members' day merely for one Bill. I informed the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal, that I would endeavour to give him a day for the discusison of his Bill. I cannot say anything more at the present time. I will investigate further, and, if the business of the House permits, I will see to it that a day is allowed when this Bill can be taken up.

Mr. SPROULE. Let the government take the Bill up and put it through.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not intend to take the Bill up and make it a government measure, but I am not averse to giving a day for the consideration of it. I cannot say, however, at the present time, whether that can be done. I think I am voicing the opinion of hon. members on both sides when I say that we should have prorogation at an early day. I think the members from Ontario particularly are interested in an early prorogation, and, perhaps, I am consulting their wishes better by insisting on this motion. I shall consult with my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick), and if the business of the House permits it, I shall endeavour to meet his wishes and the wishes of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) as well.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSED NEW LOAN.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House to-morrow go into committee to consider the following resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by parliament by any Act heretofore passed, the Governor in Council be authorized to raise by way of loan :—

(a.) Such sum or sums of money, not to exceed in the whole, the sum of fifteen million dollars, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of Canada, and of meeting any expenditure authorized by the parliament of Canada ;—and

(b.) Such sum or sums of money as may be required from time to time, over and above any available sinking funds, to pay and discharge the funded debt of Canada, or any portion thereof, as the same matures and becomes payable, either in England or in Canada ;

Such sums to be raised in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the public debt and the raising of loans authorized by parliament, and the sums so raised to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada ; the rate of interest to be paid on any such loans not to exceed three and one-half per cent per annum.

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

Motion agreed to.

CLAIM OF J. & C. NOBLE.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). In connection with a certain amount placed in the estimates to pay what is known as the claim of J. & C. Noble—page 9 of the supplementary estimates—I would ask the government if they will be pleased to lay on the Table of the House all the papers in connection with the submission to the court, the evidence and all the documents. It will be too late now to move for the papers, and if they are laid on the Table, it may perhaps expedite the discussion of the items.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Yes.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 112) to amend the Immigration Act.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). When the House was in committee on this Bill reference was made to statements emanating from the United States immigration service as well as to satements made by the chief officer of that service in the Dominion of Canada. Some very emphatic contradictions were given to the statements which that officer made as to the character of the immigration that is coming into Canada. The United States officer is, apparently, prepared to stand by his statements. It is a matter of vital public interest that our people should know exactly what kind of immigrants are being sent over to this country by the agents employed in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, or are being brought here by the steamship companies whose vessels reach our ports. I will take the liberty of reading a letter which the United States special immigration inspector, at Montreal, Mr. Watchorn, has sent to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson). It is dated, as hon. members will observe, just two days ago :

United States Immigrant Service.
Office of Special Immigrant Inspector.
Port of Montreal, Canada,
233 St. Antoine Street,
April 29, 1902.

Uriah Wilson, Esq.,
Member of Parliament,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—I desire to thank you for six copies of 'House of Commons Debates,' containing your speech on immigration, delivered on the 17th instant. I note that the editions are still marked 'unrevised,' and I would like to state, that if the revised edition contains any material alterations, I should be very pleased to receive the revised edition of this debate.

I have noted with considerable surprise, and not a little amusement, the statements made by the hon. Minister for the Interior, and I venture to suggest that the investigation he made at the hospitals here, was not likely to afford him the information he thought to obtain, because the people diseased as immigrants usually are, are almost invariably enumerated amongst 'outdoor patients,' so that the mere fact that they were not to be found stretched out on hospital cots, &c., is not a serious answer to the statement that they are here in large numbers, and are afflicted as stated to you, when you were here.

During the month ending to-morrow, the rejections at this office alone, for favus and trachoma, will not fall short of sixty persons. At the very moment I am writing to you, there are more than one hundred Greeks, Syrians, and Italians, at this office, seeking permits to enter the United States. Every one of them was refused passage to the United States, by bona fide lines sailing to United States ports from Europe, and the line that carried them to Canada, refused to sell them tickets, until they had changed their destinations from United States points to points in Canada.

I mention this, in order that you may observe how creditable a thing the hon. minister has done, in introducing the measure alluded to in his speech, contained in the above mentioned debate, and how important a thing it is, that it should be passed as speedily as is consistent with the usages of your honourable parliament.

If I am not asking too much, I would esteem it a favour if you send me a draft of the bill in question, in order that I may observe whether it is calculated to accomplish all that is desirable in this connection.

Thanking you again for the copies of Debates, and for your letter, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT WATCHORN,
Special Immigrant Inspector.

I think the attention of the minister should be directed to the specific statements that this gentleman makes as to the people who are being brought here by the steamship lines, to whom bonuses are paid by the government, people who, this gentleman says, would positively not be admitted into the United States. Certainly, if these statements are correct, they are not desirable immigrants. This gentleman says :

At the very moment I am writing to you, there are more than 100 Greeks, Syrians and Italians at this office, seeking permits to enter the United States. Every one of them was refused passage to the United States by bona fide lines sailing to United States ports from Europe, and the lines that carried them to Canada refused to sell them tickets until they had changed their destinations from United States points to points in Canada.

The letter is not written, as is evident, in any unfriendly or hostile spirit. The gentleman who writes the letter approves and endorses the action of the minister in preparing this Bill and he urges its speedy passage. But surely the passage of this Bill is not sufficient. There must be more definite instructions given to the immigration agents of Canada on the continent of Europe and in the old land ; there must be a stricter supervision exercised over the immigrants before they go on ship board on the other side of the Atlantic so that this country may not continue to be, as has been asserted again and again, a dumping ground, or a place from which immigrants who could not go from European points direct into the United States may scheme to obtain entrance into that country. That condition of things will no be a benefit to Canada if it is permitted to continue. I direct the attention of the House and of the minister to this letter in order that he may be apprised of the statements which are being made by officers who have been sent here by the United States government, who have endeavoured so far as possible to implement the inspection which is made by our own officers, and to prevent undesirable immigrants going into the United States through the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. CHARLTON. What is the place as well as the date of that letter ?

Mr. CLARKE. The heading of the letter is 'United States Immigration Service, Office of the Special Immigrant Inspector, port of Montreal, Canada, 233 St. Antoine Street, April 29, 1902.' This is addressed to Uriah Wilson, member of parliament, Ottawa, Ontario. I direct the attention of the minister to these statements in order that he may take whatever steps are necessary to put a stop to this class of immigrants being brought here by steamship companies and left in the country until such times as they may be able, if possible, to get through Canada into the United States.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). When the statements were published that the result of our present system was to leave in Canada a considerable number of persons who started from their place of abode with the intention of going to the United States, and were rejected by the United States inspectors, by reason of disease or otherwise, I did cause an inquiry to be made ; and the result of the inquiry was that out of 25,000 persons who had passed through Canada in a year, there were, of those who had been rejected by the United States commissioner, some 39 people in Canada. Of these 39 people 21 or 23, I am not sure which number, consisted of Germans who had been rejected on account of some trifling complaint in the children of the family. Our medical inspectors, after examining them, permitted them to go to the North-west, being satisfied that these complaints were not of a serious character, and that there was no just reason to compel them to be sent back. That leaves altogether, according to that inquiry, the difference between 39 and 21, or 18 persons. That is the result of the inquiry made by the officers of my department. When the statement was made that there was a large number of persons in the hospitals of Montreal who had been rejected by the immigration commissioners, I caused an inquiry to be made there, and I read the result of the inquiry to the House a few days ago, which showed that according to these reports from the superintendents of the hospitals, there was no foundation for the statement that had been made. I should be surprised to learn that when an inquiry of that kind had been officially made of the superintendents of hospitals in the city of Montreal, these gentlemen would deliberately send misleading reports to the Department of the Interior, leaving out a class of patients which they would know if the facts were as stated in this letter, were the very class of patients in regard to whom the inquiry was made. I say I should be surprised to learn that gentlemen occupying the position of medical superintendents of these hospitals would have made such misleading reports. It is, I venture to say, improbable, although not impossible. Now the fact that I have brought this Bill before the House is, I think, sufficient guarantee that the government realize the importance of the subject, and that we propose, as I said before, to take every possible care and precaution for the purpose of carrying into effect the views the hon. gentleman has expressed as being desirable to carry into effect in the general interest of the country. As to the statement made by Mr. Watchorn, the United States inspector, having heard the statement only now, I cannot say further than this, that recognizing that it is essential that the statement which he has made should be thoroughly, exactly and strictly inquired into, I shall take immediate steps to have that done, and I shall apprise the House of the result in the fullest possible way.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the minister, when he is giving us the report as to the accuracy or inaccuracy of these statements, to bring down a copy of the instructions he issued to his officials to make the inquiry from the superintendents of the hospitals in Montreal as to the serious allegations that were made.

Mr. SPROULE. In discussing this subject the other day I made reference to the fact that a good many of these immigrants were affected with dangerous or contagious diseases injurious to the human family. The minister rather denied my statement, and said there were, it is true, a few instances of such people coming in where they might have trifling ailments, but they were comparatively few in number. What I had reference to at the time was a kind of sore eyes, what medical men call granular opthalmia. I was credibly informed that a large number of them were affected by it. I have in my hand at the present time the 'Canadian Journal of Medicine and Surgery,' printed in Toronto, the number for November, 1901, and I see there an article by Dr. W. Gordon M. Byers, assistant oculist and aurist of the Royal Victoria Hospital, Montreal. Speaking of this ailment, he says :

> Two summers ago there came to our clinic at the Royal Victoria Hospital, a young girl from Glengarry county, Ontario, affected with the most intense condition of granular lids I have ever seen in Canada. The conjunctures were covered with heaped masses of succulent granulations, and the cornese showed a condition of highly vascularized pannus.

Then he says later :

> A year later, while away on my holidays, I was asked to see a young boy in the county of Leeds, Ontario, for a chronic disease of the eyes. The appearance was at once suggestive, and on everting the lids I found them covered with typical trachoma folliciles. Here too, in spite of the fact that the parents had put themselves to pains, they had been unable to ascertain the real nature of the condition of their boy's eyes, and at no time had they been advised to adopt even the most elementary precautions against the spread of the disease.

Since these patients came under my notice I have thought not a little of the trachoma problem as it touches our country, and I am persuaded through information and investigation that there is a fairly large number of unrecognized and untreated cases of granular ophthalmia scattered here and there throughout the Dominion. Thus, for instance, I have been informed by medical friends that the disease is comparatively common in certain districts of Manitoba, and even at our hospital the territory from which our trachomatous patients were drawn was extremely broad, our clinics having been visited by patients from the counties of Glengarry (two centres), Stormont, Dundas, Leeds (two centres), Renfrew, Lennox, and Carleton in Ontario; and Brome (two centres), St. Hyacinthe, Missisquoi, Huntingdon and Ottawa in Quebec.

To those acquainted with granular opthalmia, the years of distressing annoyance to be passed by those affected, and the debarment from ordinary work, let alone the higher pursuits and pleasures of life, it must be a matter of apprehension that cases such as I have spoken of should exist unrecognized and unisolated to act as centres of infection throughout the country.

Then he goes on to say:

It still remains for me, however, to speak of one strong prophylactic measure. There is no doubt whatever that the number of our trachomatous patients is being yearly added to by immigrants to this country. Fifteen per cent of the cases of granular opthalmia at the Royal Victoria Hospital Out-Patient Clinic, during the past six years, was of foreign extraction, and among our patients with this condition were Russian and German Jews, and a resident each from England, Ireland, China, Italy and Syria. And I scarcely think that the above percentage properly represents the facts, as the people most likely to suffer from this trouble are settling largely in our western districts. As an example of what I say, I may mention that I had it on good authority that the cases of sore eyes among the Doukhobors were probably trachomatous in nature.

A trachomatous patient is a highly undesirable, for the most part a useless, and a dangerous citizen, and I see no reason why these individuals—or others for that matter suffering from certain diseases different from that under discussion—should be admitted to our country where only strong, active people are needed, no matter how slow the tide of emigration may be.

It was in reference to such patients that I spoke and when our attention was drawn to the fact by the American agent that large numbers of these immigrants had been refused admission to the United States, that they were in Canada only waiting an opportunity to cross the line and that our government made no effort either to prevent them coming, or to send them back, I thought it was proper to call the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to it and to draw the attention of the country to it as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say that so far as the statement of the American inspector is concerned possibly the communication to the hon. minister's officers in Montreal and the hospital authorities might have been so worded as not to include out door patients and a misapprehension might have occurred in that way. This gentleman seems to speak from actual knowledge and I should hardly suppose that he would make any misrepresentation of the facts and I am sure the hospital authorities would not misrepresent the facts at all. I quite agree with the hon. minister that this is a matter for investigation. I think the facts must present themselves to him in a somewhat more serious light now than they did the other day when he spoke upon this subject. This inspector says that during the month of April alone sixty persons were rejected by him in Montreal. That would amount to a very considerable number in the course of a year. I think, as he is speaking from a knowledge of the facts which took place in his own office, his statements may be a little more accurate than the reports made to the hon. gentleman in respect to the persons who still remain in Canada and who have been rejected by the United States officers. Assuming that sixty persons were rejected in Montreal by the American authorities would it not be difficult some months afterwards to trace these people and find out how many of them were in Canada? I have no doubt the reports which the hon. minister has received are perfectly bona fide, but it would seem to me that the statement of a man who has had actual experience of these facts every day in his office might be relied upon a little more closely than investigations made afterwards in regard to the number of these persons who still remain in Canada.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will agree with me that the only kind of a report that could settle the question at issue and give the House that satisfactory information which it ought to have is a report which will set out the names of the persons that are alleged by this gentleman to have been rejected and the grounds upon which they were rejected, with an exact statement as to what the facts are in each case. Then we could look at the report and ascertain what the facts are. So far as the remarks of the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) are concerned, I desire to say that the class of diseases which is referred to in the communication which he has read is a class of diseases with which we have not hitherto had, legally, power to deal, and it is that class of diseases with which we desire to deal under the Act which I have before the House at the present time.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

CHINESE CAPITATION TAX.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that, after July 1st, 1902, one-half of the net proceeds of all taxes paid by Chinese immigrants shall, at the end of every fiscal year, be paid to the province wherein they were collected.—Minister of Trade and Commerce.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) The object of this resolution is simply to deal with the percentage at present paid by the Dominion to the various provinces. At present the provinces receive one-fourth of the capitation tax. We have been very strongly urged by hon. gentlemen from British Columbia and the government have thought fit to consent to their request to make this percentage one-half instead of one-quarter. That is the sole object of the resolution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the percentage fixed on any particular basis ? What are the grounds for fixing the percentage ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Members from British Columbia have complained that their province is put to certain extraordinary expenditures more or less on account of Chinese immigration. It is a matter which has been more or less a burning question for a good while between these gentlemen and the various governments, ourselves and our predecessors. When we increase the capitation tax to $100 a very strong request is made to us, that, at least, if we would not increase the capitation tax to $500 we would give British Columbia and the other provinces a little larger slice of the capitation tax and after very fully considering the matter we have agreed to do it. I do not know that there is anything else to be said in regard to the matter.

Mr. CLARKE. Is there any legislation to be introduced this session respecting this Chinese question ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. No.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) what the intention of the government is in regard to those immigrants who come into other provinces ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. All fare alike.

Mr. BOYD. These Chinamen land in British Columbia and they are to be found in almost every town and village in Manitoba and the North-west Territories taking the places that might be filled by our own people. I wish to know if we are to receive a share of this benefit that is being extended to British Columbia, or is it just the port where these immigrants land that is to receive the benefit.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The tax on those who land in British Columbia will be divided equally between the province and the Dominion. The tax on those who come to the other provinces will likewise be divided, but the number is comparatively speaking very small.

Mr. BOYD. But what is the intention of the government regarding those who afterwards flow into the other provinces ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We cannot trace them after they once land.

Mr. BOYD. It is the place where they land that receives the benefit ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes.

Mr. BOYD. The government should take the suggestion I made into consideration, because these people are to be found in every village and town in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That brings up the question of what the pecuniary loss to the province is, upon which this Bill is based.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The vast majority of these Chinamen are residents in British Columbia. There are no doubt a few scattered here and there throughout the various provinces, but I should say that probably nineteen-twentieths of them are in British Columbia. The number elsewhere would be almost infinitesimal by comparison.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—INCREASED CAPITAL.

Bill (No. 116) to amend the provision with respect to tolls of chapter 1 of the statutes of 1881 respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway (the Minister of Justice), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has already stated that a measure in these terms has been submitted to the committee.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). By agreement.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it a usual provision to insert, that the new stock shall not be sold at less than par ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The company agrees to it. It is done in order that we may have the full benefit by way of expenditure of the total amount of authorized capital.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it a new principle in legislation ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is not a new principle in legislation, but it is confirming an agreement entered into practically between the company and the government.

Mr. CLARKE. Was that agreement made contingent on their being permitted to issue the stock ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is made contingent on the Order in Council authorizing the issue.

Mr. CLARKE. I presume that principle can be applied to other legislation ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is a matter for the House to determine.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the government that an Order in Council had been passed by which the cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was to be submitted to the courts for determination. Has the minister got the Order in Council ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, I will hand it to the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is a different submission from what the minister stated when the Bill was introduced. This is as to the effect or interpretation of section 20 of the company's charter of incorporation, as found in 44 Victoria, chapter 1, schedule A. The statement was made to the House that the actual cost of the construction of the road was to be determined by this submission in order to find out whether the 10 per cent earnings of the road had been effected or not upon the actual cost of construction. I see now that what is submitted to the courts is only an interpretation of the clause.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 114) to amend the Exchequer Court Act (the Minister of Justice).

PETITION OF RIGHT ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 135) to amend the Petition of Right Act (the Minister of Justice), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. CLARKE.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Justice to state on what principle the Crown proceeds in withholding or granting fiats for petitions of right. I have had my attention directed to a large number of petitions which were submitted for fiats about two years ago. They relate to contracts between the Crown and persons who carried the mails. The Crown undertook to cancel the contracts under some supposed power contained in the contracts. Counsel have advised the persons interested that the Crown had no right under the circumstances to cancel those contracts, and that they have good cause for claiming such damages against the Crown as would arise by reason of its having broken the contracts. These matters have been standing about two years. I brought them to the attention of the Postmaster General last evening, but, as the Minister of Justice as well as the Postmaster General is concerned in matters of this kind, I would like to ask him for more information on the subject. I have looked into the cases somewhat hurriedly; but it seemed to me that there was a fair case for the consideration of the courts in respect to a large number of claims, I think thirty or forty—at all events, over twenty; and these people have been held up, so far as any proceedings are concerned, for nearly three years. It appears to me that where there is an arguable case, there should be no difficulty placed in its way, and I think the House might very well hear from the Minister of Justice at the present time what the policy of the Crown is in regard to the matter. I have looked into the rule in England, and I do not see anything that would justify the government in keeping these people at bay so long. It seems to me that if there is any tendency at all in this matter, it is to allow the subject the freest possible right to proceed against the Crown. The Postmaster General may think that these claims are groundless, and that he was perfectly justified in cancelling the contracts; but the real point for the consideration of the House and the country is not what the Postmaster General thinks about it, but what the courts will think about it when these claims are put before them. It amounts to a denial of justice to these people—because their claims cannot be regarded as frivolous—that they should be held up in this way for a period of nearly three years.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My attention has not been directed, so far as I can recollect, to the cases which the hon. leader of the opposition refers to, and therefore, I would not like to say anything at the present time in reference to them. If they have been before the department for three years, they have probably been disposed of by my predecessor. But the hon. leader of the opposition, I presume, not only wants

to know what the reasons may be which necessitated the long delay of the government in granting fiats in the cases mentioned, but a statement of the principles which the present Minister of Justice intends to apply in all cases where applications are made for fiats for petitions of right. My hon. friend will understand immediately that that is a question of policy, and therefore, I should not like to state what my personal views are on the subject until such time as I have an opportunity to have those views confirmed by the government. I should not like to say that I would grant a fiat if an arguable case were submitted, if that were my view, because before I state my view, I should like to put it in writing and have the government approve of it, and then place it before the House not merely as my personal view, but the view of the government. I will therefore ask the committee to rise, and when I bring down a statement with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway matter, I will also make a statement on the point to which my hon. friend has referred; because I quite understand that it is important that the House should have some authoritative statement of the views of the government on that subject.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think what the hon. gentleman has just said is perfectly fair and correct. The rule, so far as I have been able to gather it in placing petitions of right before the provincial government and before this government, is this, that when the claim on its face is not frivolous, or when a prima facie claim has been made out, or when there is nothing improper in the claim, the Minister of Justice recommends that a fiat do issue and that a petition be lodged in the court. I think that is the proper rule, which has always been followed in England. My learned and hon. friend the Minister of Justice knows that is the view laid down in Clode on petitions of right. I do not agree with the minister when he says that he does not give his own advice to the House, but would rather submit his views to the government to see whether the views of his colleagues coincide with his own. It seems to me in a matter of this kind that his colleagues should be to a great extent swayed by the Minister of Justice, because after all the thing to be decided is not a question of policy. The question to be decided is not a question of policy. The question is not whether, in the interest of such and such a party, it would be right to grant or refuse the petition, but, whether or not, the petition bears on its face, that stamp of bona fides, which should recommend it to the Minister of Justice as the legal adviser of the government. I have every confidence in the judgment of my hon. friend, and I know that if it were left to him alone, whenever I or anybody else had a bona fide claim before the government, the petition would be granted, but if my hon. friend submits the question to the administration it will be hard for him to get a unanimous opinion. If this is the rule which is to be followed, in many instances those members of the cabinet who do not belong to the legal fraternity and cannot see with the same pair of eyes as my hon. friend, would likely set up some other reasons than reasons of law against the granting of the petition. I submit that when he comes down again with this Bill, he should give his own views, as Minister of Justice, as to the course he will follow, and the rule he will carry out when petitions of right are lodged with the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I recollect hearing a very eminent authority in the British House of Commons, say, on a question somewhat analagous to this, that the government could have no opinion except the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. My hon. friend holds a position which corresponds with that of the law officers of the Crown in England, and, as has been well pointed out by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Casgrain), this is not so much a question of policy, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, as a question of what is right, from the standpoint of justice, with regard to these petitions. I entirely concur in the view that in respect of matters of this kind the government should adopt the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and, I should also like to point out that, the provision in this Bill making it necessary, when security for costs is ordered, that somebody should give security, goes in the direction of granting the fiat with more liberality than in the past. The only reason why so called frivolous petitions were not allowed in the past was that it was not in the public interest to allow a claim to go to litigation for which there was no foundation and public moneys should not be wasted in contesting such claims; but, by the very proper Bill introduced by the Minister of Justice, providing that in certain cases, where it seems expedient to the Governor in Council, security for costs should be given, the fiat should be issued, as a matter of course, on that condition being complied with.

I have no objection to passing the Bill, as I think it is a proper one, but it is understood we are to have a statement from the Minister of Justice on the subject later in the session.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My view, of course, is that of the government, and my hon. friend has correctly expressed my own view with respect to this question, when he says that this Bill was not introduced merely for the purpose of adding something to the legislation already in existence. The object I have in view is to widen the gate, so far as I can, consistent with my duty to the Crown.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When the Bill was first introduced, the argument advanced was that it would assimilate the law in Canada

to the law in England, where the fiat issues as a matter of right. I understood the Minister of Justice, when introducing this Bill, to say that the fiat would, upon some fixed principle, issue as a matter of right. I think that that is the correct principle. It should not be left to the Governor in Council or the Minister of Justice to say whether a fiat should issue or not, but there should be some fixed rule or principle on which it would issue as a matter of course. In England it is issued almost always as a matter of course, and when the law was made in Canada the same as that in England, that was done on the understanding that unless there was something very objectionable in the petition for a fiat, the fiat should issue as a matter of course. I understood from the remarks of the Minister of Justice, when he introduced this Bill, that it was intended to facilitate the granting of fiats. Why should not a man have an action against the Crown just the same as against an individual ? It may be necessary for him to furnish security for costs in the interests of the community, which he might not be required to do in a case against an individual, but, upon his so doing, I contend that the fiat should issue as a matter of course, upon a praecipe being filed, just as in the case of an ordinary writ.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE YUKON.

Bill (No. 137) to amend chapter 41 of the statutes of 1901, respecting the Administration of Justice in the Yukon Territory, (the Minister of Justice), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The intention is to appoint a third judge of the High Court who shall perform the duties of the magistrate at Dawson. The living allowance now of a police magistrate is $3,000 a year. The intention, as my hon. friend will remember from the amounts in the estimates, is to increase the salary to $4,000 and reduce the living allowance to $1,800.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Bill (No. 138) to amend the Act respecting the judges of Provincial Courts (the Minister of Justice) was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. What salaries are these judges receiving now ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). There are only two of them now, and they receive $5,000 each. The intention is to add a third at a salary of $5,000.

Mr. CASGRAIN. May I ask why this section only applies to judges of the County Courts ? Does not my hon. friend think that some amendment should be made to the law which would apply also to the judges of the Superior Courts ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If my hon. friend will look at the law respecting provincial judges he will find that the judges of the High Court or of the Superior Court, as we in Quebec call it, are entitled, if they become incapacitated after their appointment, to retire at any time upon an allowance equal to two-thirds of the salary, and, at the end of fifteen years they are entitled absolutely to retire on that allowance, whether they are able to perform their duties or not. But the position with respect to County Court judges in Ontario—and elsewhere where they have County Court judges —is such that if a judge has served less than ten years and becomes unable to perform his duties he is obliged to retire and get absolutely nothing. It is to meet one case—it is unnecessary to mention names—that exists in the province of Ontario that this Bill is introduced, a case of special hardship. We think it unfair, that if a judge has served this country during a certain number of years and becomes incapacitated through illness before he has served ten years, he should receive nothing.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I was not explicit enough in the question I put. I should have made myself clearer. The purport of my question is really this : My hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) knows that there have been and are still some judges who have rendered good service to the country and who have reached an age when they should be able to retire, not merely with a pension but with an allowance equal to the salary they are now receiving. I need not mention names, but my hon. friend, I am sure, knows as well as I do that there are judges of the highest courts of this Dominion and also judges of the Superior Courts of the different provinces who, after serving their country for many years have arrived at an age when it is impossible for them to give the time and assiduity to the fulfilment of their duties which they would wish to give. These gentlemen would willingly retire if it were possible for them to do so. But, because of the smallness of the salary they have received for a number of years—I am not at all in sympathy with those who think salaries of the judges are sufficient—they are not able to retire, but go on in the performance of duties more onerous than those which men in other positions generally undertake at the ages to which they have arrived. I would ask the hon. minister if he does not think that at this stage it would be good policy and further the ad-

ministration of justice to amend the statute so as to provide that when judges have arrived at an age at which men in other professions generally retire, they would be able to retire with a full pension equal to the salary they are now receiving. I am sure my hon. friend is in sympathy with the opinion I have now expressed. I hope that if he is not able at this moment to do what I recommend, in a short time he will be able to see his way to carry out this policy.

Mr. WADE. I concur in the remarks which have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I know that what he says with regard to the position of a number of Superior Court judges is absolutely correct, and what he says applies more to our province than to Ontario, because our Superior Court judges receive only $4,000 a year, while a Superior Court judge in Ontario receives $5,000 from the Dominion and $1,000 a year from the province, a total of $6,000 a year. Now when a judge is in receipt of only $4,000 a year, it is impossible for him to retire under the present provision of the statute. I think the salaries of the judges are too small. Certainly, in the province of Nova Scotia they are much too small. The duties of judges in Nova Scotia are the same and the amount of work is the same as that coming before judges in Ontario. These judges have the disposal of matters of life, liberty and property, and I do not think their salaries should be as low as they are. A judge may become incapacitated, yet he is not in a position to take advantage of the Act as it stands because of the shortness of his term of service. I hope the government will take into consideration this proposed change and will place the judges in a position of absolute independence so that they may know that after they have served a certain time, if they are compelled to retire, they will have a proper retiring allowance, and I think that amount should be equal to their salary.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The hon. gentlemen who have preceded me are in the happy position of being private members and so are free to speak their minds. If I were a private member I would like to say that I am in favour, and always have been in favour, of giving proper consideration to the judges of the land. I think the salaries ought to be increased; I think also that when a judge has served his country for a period of years—say twenty or twenty-five years—and if he has reached an advanced age as some of our judges have, he should be allowed to retire on full pay. I would have absolutely no sympathy with those who think that our judges now are paid, beyond the value of the services they render. I think the judiciary of this country are entitled to every possible consideration at our hands, and we ought to promote in every way their interests, and especially to provide for their declining years. I know that it is a maxim of the Bar that we live well and die poor. That is a principle with us. Probably there are a good many in this House who are not in sympathy with what I have said; but as I said a moment ago, when speaking as a private member, one can speak more freely his own mind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my hon. friend is the second member of the government who has said what he would do if he were a private member. It might be interesting to consider what would happen if all the members of the government were private members. Apparently some very notable reforms would take place in the affairs of this country if that happy consummation could some day be achieved. There is a great deal in what has been said—I am speaking entirely as a private member in this regard—there is a great deal in what has been said in regard to the salaries of the judges. They are very inadequate, because they were fixed years ago at a time when the cost of living was very much less than it is now. In addition to that general increased cost of living, there is a necessity for the judge to keep up a certain appearance, he has to do entertaining, and all these things make the cost of living for a judge very great. I know the judges in our own province have found the salary which is provided for them very inadequate indeed. I should be glad to know that this matter will engage the attention of my hon. friend.

Mr. COCHRANE. Not being a lawyer, I do not understand this question perhaps as well as the hon. gentlemen who have been speaking. But there is one thing to which I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Justice, and which I think is very pertinent in discussing this question. I would like to ask him—I know he has not been very long in his position—if he has any trouble to find gentlemen in the profession who are willing to take a position of judge when it is offered to them? I have every respect for the judges, but I do not understand why, if they are such a long-suffering community, there are so many in the legal profession who are willing to take a judgeship and to go through all the sufferings and to perform the onerous duties which that position entails upon them—and even to live on starvation allowance. Now, I want to see the judges properly paid, but I do not believe in holding out inducements to them or encouraging them to live extravagantly, to live beyond their means, and then, after a few years, to retire them on an allowance sufficient to keep them in extravagance all their days. I am satisfied in my own mind that there are a great many gentlemen on the bench who receive a great deal more money than they could earn in the practice of their profession.

Although they should be enabled to live respectably and all that sort of thing, there should be no encouragement held out to a judge or any other person to live extravagantly. They should be taught to use economy and save up money for their declining years, the same as I have to do, as well as the people of this country generally.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My experience has been of very short duration, but during the few months that I have been at the head of the Department of Justice, I can say for the information of my hon. friend that I have already found considerable difficulty in finding men to take some positions of judges. The fact is that during my short career as Minister of Justice I have been face to face with that difficulty twice. I have found it impossible, for instance, to get a judge from the High Court to take a position in the province of Ontario on the Court of Appeals. I could give other cases, but it is not necessary to do so at the present time. I simply mention this fact as an answer to the criticism of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Cochrane). There are dozens of lawyers in this country who in one year make four times the salary of the judges; I could mention dozens of them.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I am not quite sure that I understand this section. Does it mean that from the passing of this Act every county court judge may retire at any time and receive a pension ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If a county court judge retires before he has served ten years because of physical infirmity, illness of any kind, he is entitled to a pension. But if a judge is retired for cause, he does not receive a pension.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think the statement of the Minister of Justice that some lawyers earn four times as much in one year as judges are paid, is an evidence that the judges are not sufficiently paid; it may be an evidence that the lawyers are paid too high.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Look at the salaries of some bank cashiers and presidents of railway companies.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister remarked that he was unable to get a judge to take some position. I may remind him, that is possibly owing to the fact that he was making his selection from amongst Reform lawyers. When the Reform party are in power the Reform lawyers have a cinch on the situation, and can make a great deal more money by remaining off the bench and working through party affiliations.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. If the hon. gentleman was acquainted with the extravagant administration of the Department of Justice previous to 1896, he would not make that remark.

Mr. CLARKE. Do I understand that this is a reintroduction of the superannuation system and its application to the judges?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It provides that the judges of county courts who have not served ten years on the bench and who become physically incapable of performing their duties may receive a pension.

Mr. CLARKE. It is optional ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, if they become physically incapacitated they may receive a pension; otherwise, if this Bill is not passed, and they have not served ten years, they will not receive anything.

Mr. CLARKE. Why not apply this principle to men in other situations in the public service who get much smaller salaries, and who have less opportunity to put by anything from their meagre incomes ? Why not provide that men getting $600, $800, $1,000, $1,200, and who are compelled to retire on account of physical disability before having served ten years, should likewise receive some consideration ? Surely if judges who receive $4,000, $5,000, $6,000 a year should be looked after, and I think they should, it is equally incumbent on the government, on the same principle of justice, to look after those in receipt of much smaller salaries who spend their lives in the public service, or who have to retire incapacitated before they have served ten or twelve years. If this superannuation system is to be applied to judges, and I think it should, I submit respectfully that it ought to apply to other departments of the public service.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want it understood that I am opposing the Bill from any remarks I have made. I think the principle is sound.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Although I represent a rural constituency, I am not at all afraid to advocate an increase of salary for the judges. I live in the city of Montreal, where I practice, and I may say that out of twenty or twenty-five bank cashiers, all but two or three receive greater salaries than our judges. The judges in the city of Montreal receive $5,000 a year, and I know at least ten or twelve cashiers, some of them in small banks, who get from $10,000 to $15,000 a year.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. A cashier has to work.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think a judge is as much entitled to a good salary as a bank cashier. I have known a chief justice, I will not mention his name, who to my knowledge refused to accept invitations because his salary would not enable him to

reciprocate. That is the position in which some of our judges are in Montreal.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow some of the remarks that have been made to pass without a protest on my part. I am not speaking because I think I will ever be a judge. The time seems to be pretty far off if I were ever likely to be called to such an exalted honour. I am speaking because I think that some information should be given to the House on this question at this time. This is a question which has been brought up several times. It was brought up by me two years ago and again last year, and it seemed then to be the sense and the opinion of this House that the judges of this country were not paid high enough salaries. I do not mean to say that is always the case in respect to judges living in rural towns, for instance, as in the province of Quebec, who get the same salaries as the judges living in cities. In the city of Montreal the judges receive $5,000 a year. I would ask any hon. gentleman who knows anything about the cost of living in Montreal if it is possible for a man to occupy the position of a judge and maintain his position on such a salary. He has naturally, from the position which he occupies to reciprocate many kindnesses, to appear in society, to live up to the position he occupies, and I would ask hon. gentlemen if it is possible for him to do so on a salary of $5,000 a year? Being a citizen of Montreal, living in that city, I venture to say that it is absolutely impossible for a judge to live upon that salary if he wants, as we say in French, to do honour to the position which he occupies. When these salaries were fixed a few years ago the cost of living was not anything like it is to-day. The cost of living has increased by at least 30 per cent since these salaries were fixed by statute 15 or 20 years ago. At that time it was not thought that the salaries were too high; it was thought that the judges were simply getting what they were entitled to. Let me call the attention of the committee to the fact that judges, unlike the managers of large railways companies, or of banks, as my hon. friend for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) said a moment ago, are not only dealing with the fortunes of the people but they are also dealing with the life and liberty of the subject in this country. The duties which they are called upon to fulfil are the most difficult, the most onerous and the most responsible duties that any man could fulfil, and this has been recognized all over the world. I will not mention the salaries paid to judges in England, which run from $25,000 to $35,000 and $45,000 a year, but take the salaries paid to judges in the British colonies, in Australia, in New Zealand and in the Cape of Good Hope, I venture to say there is not one colony where the judges are paid such low salaries as they are paid in Canada. I call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is becoming a danger to the public at large to have the salaries of judges fixed at the amount at which they are fixed to-day. I shall not call the attention of the committee to any particular incident, but let me just suppose this case for example; let me suppose the case of a man who, from misfortune, or for some other reason, is in debt. Suppose he is a judge upon the bench, suppose he has a case before him, which happens every day in the city of Montreal, involving $50,000 or $100,000 or $200,000 or $500,000; then, you see the danger there is that this man, being a poor man, being in debt, should be called upon to deal with such large interests. It is not only in the interest of the judges themselves, but it is in the interest of the public as well that proper salaries should be paid. It is not because I think I will curry any favour with them that I am constantly advocating an increase in their salaries, but it is because I think it is in the interest of the administration of justice in this country, and in the interest of litigants that the paltry sum which the judges are receiving should be increased, and that decent salaries should be paid them.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that in the province of Ontario the complaint is not that the Superior Court judges are paid too much, but rather that there are too many judges in the country tumbling one over the other. When hon. gentlemen now on the government side of the House were in opposition, there was one plea they always put forward and that was the plea of economy, and if there was any one question on which the government of that day were attacked it was the question of judges and their salaries. The records of this House will show that when these hon. gentlemen were on the left of the Speaker they assailed from time to time the appointment of county court judges as being unnecessary and superfluous in the province of Ontario. What does the record show? Here we find, in the province of Ontario, that there are 45 senior county court judges and 23 junior county court judges, making in all 68 county court judges in that province. I say it is simply a burlesque and travesty that in the province of Ontario there are county court judges who are simply sitting around and waiting for something to do. We remember the abuse that was heaped upon the Conservative administration in times past, but, hon. gentlemen opposite have gone on doing the thing which they condemned. Take, for instance, the county of Ontario. In the county of Ontario a little time ago there was a vacancy in the junior judgeship. The government, in obedience to the demands of party friends, appointed a junior judge in that county. What do the records show there? I will not state from memory

the exact number of cases that were dealt with in that county, but I am bound to say that there were less than six cases tried in the county of Ontario in one year by the two judges.

Mr. CLARKE. What are the salaries which they receive ?

Mr. BENNETT. I suppose they get the regular salaries—the senior judge, $2,600, and the junior judge, $2,000. The country is not paying enough salary to the Superior Court judges of the province of Ontario. I will not make any invidious distinctions. There are some gentlemen who occupy places on the Superior Court bench of Ontario, the value of whose services is placed at $7,000, while it is a well known fact that these gentlemen, if they were active in their profession, would earn from $15,000 to $20,000 a year. At the same time, let me tell the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that there are gentlemen not only in the county courts, but on the Superior Court bench as well, who, I fear would fall very far short of the salaries which they are receiving if they were standing shoulder to shoulder in the ranks and practicing their profession. Therefore, in Ontario, I think any lawyer who is not afraid to speak out his mind, and I am speaking out my mind, knowing that election protests are far ahead—of course saying that in a jocular way—will agree with me that we should endeavour to have fewer Superior Court judges and that we should increase the salary of these judges to $10,000 a year. Then, you will bring the best men in the profession to the bench. Take Mr. Aylesworth, of Toronto, for instance; he is a gentleman who would not look at a position worth $7,000 a year. I assume that Mr. Aylesworth makes three times that, and probably more. This business of the county court judges is simply a farce. They are falling over one another in the province of Ontario, and yet they are paid the salaries which I have mentioned. I know one gentleman who is receiving annually $2,600 as county court judge. In addition he will have the fees commuted to him from the Surrogate Court, the fees from arbitrations, revision of the voter's lists and other matters. That gentleman's salary will run up to $3,500 a year, and I will be bound to say that in days past, when he was practicing at the bar, he never saw $1,500 a year, and would not have seen it had he continued to practice at the bar. Some means should be taken by the government, in so far as county court judges are concerned, to see that there shall be fewer county court judges and fewer Superior Court judges, particularly in the province of Ontario. I do not speak for any other province because I know nothing about other provinces, but in Ontario let us have fewer county court judges, let us have fewer Superior Court judges, and let the Superior Court judges be paid salaries that will be commensurate with the abilities they so fittingly bring to the positions which they occupy. The Minister of Justice could have told the House that had one of the judges of the other courts gone to the Court of Appeal, he would have forfeited $1,000 a year. These judges, who are only human like other men, weigh up the dollars and cents, and so prefer to stay where they are. Once again, let me place myself upon record as a lawyer in saying : We should have fewer judges in the province of Ontario, and the Superior Court judges should be paid a higher salary. Start at the root of the matter, and that is the county court judgeship business.

Mr. LEIGHTON McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Inasmuch as I entirely dissent from almost all my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has said, I think it my duty to say a word or two on this question. I do agree that the Superior Court judges of Ontario are not paid as they should be paid, and I believe their salaries should be greatly increased. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that the number of Superior Court judges in that province should be decreased. I believe that if there was a lesser number of judges they could not discharge their duties properly. They now work harder than most men do at the bar ; they get behind their work, and it would be impossible for fewer judges to do the work. To talk of reducing the number is entirely out of the question. The salaries paid to our judges are so meagre that I agree with the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) that it is dangerous to the public at large to allow the remuneration of judges to remain at so low a figure. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say that if some of the judges were practicing at the bar they would not earn a sum equal to their present salaries, but it is a fact that we have on the bench of this country, men who did not become eminent as members of the bar, but when in some cases make better judges than those who before their elevation to the bench had a very large practice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY. If a judge occupies the position with dignity and gives perhaps better satisfaction as a judge than his brother judge who was eminent at the bar, surely that man is entitled to receive at least equal compensation to him who was the more eminent practitioner if he discharges his judicial functions equally well. Comparisons between men on the bench and men at the bar are not always a fair test of the standing on the bench. This is true as regards the judiciary in all British countries. The smallness of the salaries paid to our judges is a grievance recognized by the members of the Bar throughout Canada, and the sooner it is

remedied the better for the country. In England, eminent members of the legal profession are able to go on the bench without making such a pecuniary sacrifice, because the salaries paid are so large that a man can maintain his rank and dignity in the eyes of the public. I agree with the statement that certain members of the Bar in Ontario are earning three times the salary which is paid to a judge. That is an anomaly which should not be allowed to exist in any country. I trust that the government, and especially the Minister of Justice, will take this matter in hand, and that before long Canadian judges will receive such a salary as will enabe them to maintain the dignity of their position. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) said regarding our county court judges is to some extent correct. There are some county court judges who have pretty nearly nothing to do, but there are others who are overworked. To adjust this state of affairs is a task of considerable difficulty, because we are bound by county boundaries, we are bound by appointments which were made years ago and which have been repeated, and the present occupants of the office have certain vested rights which I do not suppose that even my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) would argue should be interfered with. Might I throw out the suggestion, that the junior judge could be taken from a county where there is not much work, and when a vacancy occurs in a county where there is a great deal of work transferred there, and no new appointment made in the county which he left. In this way no injury would be done to the individual and there would be a saving to the country.

Mr. J. H. LEGRIS (Maskinongé). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, were we to take any stock in the predictions made by some hon. gentlemen who have just addressed the House, we would be led to believe that the country is threatened with unheard of disasters if the salaries of judges are not increased. The hon. member from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) have assumed the role of prophets, but they are by no means the only ones who have taken that position, as several other gentlemen who belong, I think, to the legal profession, have spoken to the same effect. I do not wish to impute any motives to the hon. gentlemen and to insinuate that some of them are expectant judges——

Mr. T. C. CASGRAIN (Montmorency). (Translation.) Let the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that even were I offered a judgeship now, I would decline the offer on the very ground I have mentioned.

Mr. J. H. LEGRIS. (Translation.) No fear of that. My hon. friend says what the fox did of the grapes.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) That's too old.

Mr. LEGRIS (Translation.) Let him possess his soul in patience ; maybe the time will come when the grapes will be ripe enough ; for instance, when his party climbs into power again ; but, of course, that is a very remote contingency.

There is a very important consideration that was lost sight of by those who are in favour of increasing the salaries of judges, and it is that they are paid a retiring allowance when they retire from the bench. However, I agree that the salaries of judges are below the emoluments derived by leading members in the practice of the legal profession ; but those lawyers are an exception to the rule, and besides, the question of income should not be the sole test of efficiency or fitness for a seat on the bench. So long as the leading members in the practice of their profession, and so long as even members of this House, as is often the case, will be ready to give up their positions in order to accept judgeships, there is no reason to take alarm if their salaries are not increased.

Some hon. gentlemen have contrasted the salaries of judges and the salaries given to bank cashiers ; but there is no comparison at all between those positions. I admit that we have bank officers, bank presidents and bank cashiers, and others who are paid much higher salaries than even the highest salary that is paid to judges of the land. But one must not jump to the conclusion that, because higher salaries are given in commercial life and monetary institutions, the salaries of judges must be increased.

So long as leading men at the bar, who are most renowned for their accomplishments and their integrity, men who are successful in the practice of their profession, and who, therefore, are fit to discharge the duties of the judiciary will be ready to accept judgeships ; so long, I say, as there will be such a keen competition as is now the case, among those who wish to rise to the bench, and who are all well qualified for the position, I think there is no reason of taking alarm and to fear disasters for the country and for those who are amenable to the tribunals of justice, if the salaries of judges are not increased.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) alluded to the judges who live in the rural districts of the province of Quebec, and he said that these judges are sufficiently paid. Perhaps they are, but there are not any of them left so far as I know.

Mr. CASGRAIN. What does my hon. friend mean ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Because they are all living in the cities ; in violation of the law.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Those who live in the cities live there because they choose to do so.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They ought not to be allowed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps not. Hon. Judge Choquette, who used to be a member of this House, lives in Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There are others.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY—THE SEARCH FOR THE NORTH POLE.

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

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a matter, the importance of which I deem will warrant its consideration for a short time. I had intended originally to bring it in the form of a motion, and, had I done so, I should have asked the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Clarke) to second the motion. I presume, however, that it will answer just as good a purpose to discuss the question without putting into your hands a motion in relation to it. The question I desire to bring to the attention to the House is in regard to the advisability on the part of the government of rendering aid to a Canadian expedition for the purpose of discovering or seeking to discover the north pole.

The question may perhaps be raised as to the advisability of making the expenditure which would be necessary for this purpose. I shall endeavour to show that such an appropriation would serve the public interest and would be worth to the country more than the sum of money required. We are, of course, making large expenditures; the country is bearing a considerable burden; but, in a growing and young country like Canada, it is necessary to make appropriations which perhaps the future will derive the benefit from, and will be called upon to liquidate; and the question is whether the expenditure which I shall urge on the government on this occasion is an expenditure of that character or not. We have recently awakened to the possibility of having an active and aggressive national life in Canada. We no longer feel like apologizing for being Canadians. We no longer have that sense of provincialism, possibly I might say of inferiority, that was once entertained by citizens of this country. We have found, in bringing back the sheaves of achievement from South Africa, which have cost us some blood and tears, that we have gained an enviable position in the world, a position which has drawn the attention of the world to Canada, a position which is worth infinitely more in the results which it will bring in the present and the future than all the sacrifice in money and life that has been given to purchase it. Now, Sir, it is probable that the expenditure which I shall urge upon the government on this occasion is one which will bring to Canada a large meed of reputation throughout the world, and will give to ourselves the idea that we are progressive, that we have capabilities, that we may aspire to be a nation. The proposition to send a Canadian expedition to the north pole is not a visionary one. The discovery of the north pole in our case would not be a fruitless one. Aside entirely from the reputation that would accrue to this country from the settlement of a geographical problem which has engaged the attention of maritime nations for generations, we would establish our right to all the territories and islands and seas that might lie between our present northern boundary and the north pole itself—all that vast region between the 141st parallel of longitude on the west, and Baffin's Bay and Grant land on the east. And these possessions may be of value. They may contain enormous mineral wealth. Our impression as to the worthlessness of these arctic lands is perhaps an erroneous impression. The temperature of all this great region to the north of latitude 75 is not much, if any lower than that of Dawson.

This prize has been sought for by many notable and daring men—by Scoresby in 1806, by Parry in 1827, by Sir George Nares in 1876, by De Long in 1879, by Greeley in 1882, by Nansen in 1895, and by the Duke d'Abruzzi in 1899-1900; and there are at this moment two polar expeditions in progress—that of Peary, who will attempt to reach the pole from Greenland, by means of sledge journeys over the ice, and that of Baldwin, who, following the theories of Captain Bernier, of Canada, will attempt to reach it by Franz Joseph Land. It may be that these two American expeditions will forestall us in the discovery of the pole; but even if they did, the credit that would accrue to us from an expedition would be quite sufficient to compensate us for its cost.

I think it may be asserted without any question that Canada is peculiarly well fitted for this work. We have hardy and daring seamen in our maritime provinces; we are constantly exploring the wilds; we have exploring expeditions in progress every year—Tyrrell in the North-west, Low in Labrador, Bell and others to the north-east and east of James Bay, and other Canadian explorers; and the accomplishments of these men warrant me in saying that we have an aptitude for this kind of work—hardihood, courage and aggressiveness—that specially fits us for undertaking it. The whole history of Canada back to the time the first French colonists landed in this country is a history of adventure and daring. While the English colonists explored the country

only as far west as the Alleghany Mountains, the French colonists penetrated into the far interior, to the valley of the Mississippi, and up the Ottawa river to the great lakes. La Salla explored the great west almost to the mouth of the Mississippi. Duquesne founded a post on the site of the great industrial centre of Pittsburgh and Alleghany city, near which subsequently a British army under Braddock was overwhelmed and annihilated. These explorers established posts at Detroit, Mackinaw, St. Louis, and other points in the west. These daring hardy men led the van in the march of the empire and were perfectly well aware of the great value of the possessions they had secured by their explorations, but the supine, effete dynasty in power at Versailles had not the courage, the grasp or the prescience to avail themselves of these explorations, and so Canada fell into the hands of Britain, and we are to-day in the position to utilize in the same race these admirable qualities which marked the early explorers of the North-west.

We want, I imagine, to add to the exploits of the past. We want to do something to keep up the prestige of the past, and we can do this, in my opinion, with as little expense, and as easily by reaching the North Pole in advance of all other maritime nations as in any other way. The accumulations of knowledge and experience with regard to Arctic voyages and conditions will place whoever commands a Canadian polar expedition to-day in a position far more favourable than that in which any previous navigator has been placed.

We have various theories with regard to the Arctic basin. We have the old and exploded theory of an open Polar Sea and various other theories. We have discovered various facts which have an important bearing on explorations, and one of the most important is the ice drift first discovered by Gustave Lambert in 1866. Careful investigations have shown that there is a regular movement of ice from that portion of the Arctic Sea, situated next to Behering Straits, and extending across to the east coast of Greenland, so that a vessel, packed in that ice will drift across the Arctic Ocean. It was in consequence of that theory that DeLong placed the 'Jeannette' in the ice drift, and later on wreckage from the vessel was found thousands of miles away on the coast of Greenland. In persuit of this theory the 'Fram,' under command of Captain Nansen, entered in the ice near the north-east coast of Siberia nearly north of the mouth of the Lena river and drifted on to within 285 miles of the pole. This knowledge of the ice drift was taken advantage of by DeLong and Nansen, and we now have experience and knowledge more full and complete and more likely to lead to a successful result than has ever been possessed by any Arctic navigator at any previous time. This experiment of Nansen's enabled him to reach latitude 86·13, within 227 miles of the pole. Following him, the Duke d'Abbrezzi approached the pole 20 miles nearer, or within 207 miles. This theory of the ice drift simply amounts to this, that an explorer, by his knowledge of the direction of the currents, can place his vessel in the drift and trust himself to nature and nature's God to drift towards his destination. There has been a theory propounded regarding the possibility of reaching the pole by means of vessels similar to the one now used in the Baltic, which are able to crush ice of the thickness of 14 feet. This is, however, probably an impracticable method. The information I have sought to place before the House with regard to the knowledge now in the possession of those who have given attention to the matter, will warrant our coming to the conclusion that it is worthy of our consideration at least as to whether we shall avail ourselves of the services of some one thoroughly competent to pursue and profit by the investigations, and invest a little money in the hope of placing Canada at the head of all maritime powers in the search for the North Pole.

I wish now to state that we have among Canadian navigators a nautical man, whose experience, whose courage, whose length of service in seafaring life, and whose knowledge of all the conditions pertaining to Arctic exploration, probably render him better fitted than any other man in this country, and as well fitted as any in the world, to take command of an expedition and attempt to reach the North Pole. I refer to Captain Bernier, who belongs to the race of La Salle, which has penetrated to the heart of the continent, and who has the courage to undertake to penetrate to the North Pole, and will do it if the government will afford him the means. Captain Bernier is 50 years old. If the government had done their duty and sent him at the time they should have, he would have started on his trip at 48 years of age. He was in command of a vessel at the age of 17. He has commanded 46 ships. He has crossed the Atlantic 174 times. He has never lost a vessel except in one instance, when he ran the 'Quorm' ashore to save her from going to the bottom, she having sprung a leak, and the investigation of the underwriters exonerated him from all blame, as also did the owners of the vessel. He was for twenty years with W. H. Ross & Company as captain, overlooker, and repairer, filling these various capacities in the service, in all quarters of the world. He was eight years with P. Baldwin, ship builder at Quebec. In the summer he took the vessels across to their destination, which were constructed, and in the winter he acted as superintendent of the ship yard and superintended the construction of twelve ships. He was with the Richielieu Company two years, and adjusted the compasses on all their vessels, eleven in number. He sailed on the government steamer 'Eureka' with the

Minister of Public Works, on a tour around the gulf and the coast, and no doubt the hon. minister will give a good testimonial as to his capacity and qualifications.

His theory of reaching the North Pole, which is to place his vessel in the ice north of Behring Straits and drift to its destination, has been endorsed by Lord Minto and Lord Strathcona, and I consider the endorsation of Lord Strathcona as one of particular significance, because Lord Strathcona spent many years of his life in the far north and is thoroughly conversant with the conditions of the Arctic regions—probably better fitted than any man who represents Canada to give an intelligent opinion as to the probability of Captain Bernier succeeding in the expedition he proposes to take. The Captain's theory has been endorsed by the Colonial Institute. His theory was accepted and endorsed by the Institute and Sir Clemens Markham, on January 16th, 1901. It was endorsed also by the Royal Society, by resolution of 23rd May, 1901. The Canadian Institute of Toronto endorsed it in 1901, and it also received the endorsation of the Ontario Surveyors Association. Captain Bernier has addressed members of this House in Room 16 on two occasions—once in the year 1900, at a meeting of which the Minister of Finance was chairman. I believe that Capt. Bernier then succeeded in convincing every one who listened to him of the feasibility of his plan for reaching the North Pole. He again addressed the members of this House on March 23rd, 1901, at a meeting of which my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Edwards) was chairman, and again enlisted the sympathy and commanded the confidence of the great majority of those who listened to him. He has a certificate of competency from the American Consul Henry at Quebec, and he has a great number of testimonials that universally and emphatically assert that he is a sea-faring man possessing the qualifications, the capabilities and the knowledge that peculiarly fit him for the position he seeks with regard to this matter. He has I believe, the endorsation of one hundred and thirteen members of this House, who have signed a petition to the government asking that the necessary appropriation shall be made to enable him to carry into effect the plans that he has promulgated and laid before us.

Now, with regard to the plans for this expedition, I think it is as well to enter into these in some detail. Captain Bernier proposes to build a vessel of wood. A vessel of wood is much better adapted to the purposes of Arctic navigation and navigation among ice floes than is a vessel of steel. The vessel will be built upon the west coast as it will enter upon its service by passing through Behring Straits. It will be of the same plan as the 'Fram,' which was commanded by Nansen, but ten tons heavier—being three hundred tons net measurement. She will be of the same general plan as the 'Gauss,' now being constructed at Kiel, for the German expedition to the south pole. It will be built with the utmost strength in order to resist the 'ice nips' as they are called—that is, when a vessel is caught between fields of ice which either crush her like an egg shell or lift her out of water. The vessel will have a system of water-tight compartments, six in number, which, no previous Arctic vessel has had, and which will add enormously to her strength and power of resistance. She will be 120 feet keel, 35 feet beam, and 18 feet deep, and will have a flush deck, which is a new and desirable feature, in the opinion of the captain. The vessel will have a draught of 14 feet; she will have three masts and will be top sail schooner rigged. She will have triple expansion engines, a 10-foot wheel, two boilers, each 10 feet of diameter and 8 feet long, and will be of 200 horse power, and able to steam at full steaming capacity on three tons of hard coal for every twenty-four hours. She will have a spare rudder and a spare wheel and will be fitted with a diving apparatus, which, no other Arctic vessel has had. The captain himself is a practical diver, and can examine his vessel if she has received an injury or spring a leak, and can ship a new rudder or put in a new wheel. The vessel will carry 300 tons of anthracite—not bituminous—coal. It is found that bituminous coal will not do for Arctic navigation; the cold converts it into slack, and so its steaming qualities are greatly reduced. Anthracite will remain intact and perfectly good for steaming purposes for the period he would require to use steam. She will have—and here is a new feature—two wind-mills for the purpose of pumping the vessel and running the dynamos, and she will have electric light and electric heating apparatus. The old fashion was to illuminate the vessel by means of lamps. One lamp would consume in an hour as much air as a person would consume in three hours. The result was that Arctic vessels were invariably dark, damp and uncomfortable. The plan of Captain Bernier would light the vessel without the consumption of air, and enable him to keep the vessel dry, getting rid of this feature of dampness and securing cheer and comfort in place of the conditions that have hitherto existed in Arctic vessels in the six months darkness of a polar winter. This feature alone, as compared with the old condition of things, might give an advantage that would just measure the distance between success and failure. The vessel will carry a complete Dr. Dawsing's electrical apparatus, including an X-ray apparatus which will be most useful in cases of rheumatism swelling and other ailments. The expedition will carry—and this perhaps, is the strongest feature that could be named as tending to ensure success—a wireless telegraph apparatus. The captain will communicate with Dawson regularly, and,

if conditions are favourable, he will be able to communicate with Hamervest in Norway. He will also be able to communicate with sledge parties that leave the ship, and would be constantly in communication with the base of supplies and headquarters. These sledge parties equipped with wireless telegraph apparatus would have an enormous advantage as compared with the conditions that existed under the old system. Under the old conditions, when a sledge party was sent out, the ship might be moved with the field of ice in which she was imprisoned, or the parties might lose their course owing to the storms, and, when they returned, perhaps might not find the ship in the position in which they left it, and might search for it for days before they found it. With the wireless telegraph apparatus, these parties will know the position of the ship at any moment, and the vessel will know where the sledge parties are, and can be kept informed as to their operations and their needs. The vessel will carry a water distilling and filtering apparatus. Hitherto vessels engaged in Arctic exploration have depended for their water upon melted snow, which is often impregnated with salt. Often the crews are compelled to use water with a solution of five per cent of salt. But with an apparatus I have mentioned there will be a means of distilling and filtering the water, which is a matter of the utmost importance—it is a guarantee against scurvy and various kinds of sickness, Captain Bernier will take 100 tons of provisions, sufficient for six years. There will be fresh vegetables and fresh meat in fifty pound cans or boxes, square in shape to facilitate packing; kiln dried flour, kiln dried oatmeal, beans biscuits containing 10 per cent of albumen, coffee, tea, cocoa—an abundance of healthful, wholesome provisions of all kinds. With such an outfit of provisions, that scourge of Arctic expeditions, scurvy will be entirely avoided.

Captain Bernier's crew will be so organized as to combine efficiency and economy. The crew will consist of fifteen men. There will be the commander himself, without pay. There will be two officers, captains of experience, who can take the wheel, go to the mast-head and look-out, or perform any duty regarding the navigation or care of the ship in case of the captain being incapacitated. There will be a first mate who will be what is termed an ice master, a man who is thoroughly conversant with everything pertaining to the dangers of ice and of being caught between ice floes. There will be two engineers; one will be a machinist who can do any work in connection with the machinery or apparatus, the telegraph apparatus or fixtures; while the other will be an electrician and wireless telegraph operator. Two men will be surveyors and astronomers who will also serve on sledge journeys or in almost any other capacity on the vessel. There will be one doctor who will be a botanist and seaman. There will be one naturalist, who will be a botanist, photographer and artist and assistant to the surveyors and electrician, and who also will go on sledge journeys. There will be one cook, who, in addition to being a cook and steward will be an able seaman. There will be one seaman who will be a whaler and sealer and stoker, and who will combine the qualifications of all three and be able to serve in almost any capacity. There will be a carpenter who will be also an able seaman, and one stoker who will also be an able seaman. These will be his crew of 15, men combining the qualifications and different kinds of capacities that, if confined in each case to one man, would require a crew of 50 or 60 men, an efficient crew, and yet a compact crew of small number. In addition to these 15 men, the vessel will carry 30 sledge dogs.

Now, the government can fit out this expedition with all the instruments that are necessary by merely lending them to it, and they can be returned when the vessel completes its voyage. Captain Bernier will obtain letters from the Russian government to the Siberian officials and to the tribes on the Siberian coast. Had the DeLong party been armed with letters of that kind none of the members of the expedition would probably have been lost. As it was they landed upon an inhospitable coast, they had no credentials to present to the Russian officials, and all the crew were lost except two or three men, who could not obtain assistance to get back to those they had left to rescue them until it was too late. Letters such as the captain proposes to obtain will command the services of the officials wherever he can find them, and will command the services of the native tribes upon the coast as well.

The captain proposes—there is a map upon the Table which hon. gentlemen can examine—the captain proposes to enter Behring Straits and to sail nearly due north until he reaches the ice pack, and he will enter the ice pack between longitude 170 and 175 west, as the openings may dictate to be the proper thing to do. When he enters this ice pack—at a point where his experience and investigations tell him he will probably be able to drift to within 100 or 150 miles of the pole—when he enters this ice pack his vessel will simply be committed to nature to carry it on its course. While in the ice pack drifting towards the pole, and past the pole towards the eastern coast of Greenland, Captain Bernier proposes to send out sledge parties on each side of the vessel for 50 miles and to survey a strip 100 miles in width, to take soundings, and obtain all the information it is possible to obtain by these investigations. When arriving at the point where he is nearest to the pole, he will then organize sledge parties for approach to the

pole; and he will rely, as he has relied before in these lateral investigations perhaps 50 miles each way—he will rely upon dogs, and upon a new feature never before introduced in Arctic sledge explorations, that is, an automobile motor run by a petroleum engine weighing 100 pounds, the sledge weighing 100 pounds; and where the ice is favourable, he will make progress with this motor at three times, perhaps, the rate of speed that dogs would enable him to do. He will have the frames of boats with a canvas covering to launch when he reaches the openings in the ice. Nansen made the mistake, in his expedition, of leaving his boats covered and the covering exposed to the weather, and to the hard usage which rendered the boats useless. Captain Bernier will have the coverings of these boats carefully folded and ready for use, and the frames ready to be covered any moment when he reaches a place where a boat is needed. He will take fur clothing for all the members of the party. The mistake made by Nansen, and to which the failure to reach the pole was largely due, was that they discarded fur clothing and attempted to make the journey with warm woollen clothing, which they found entirely unsuited for the purpose. Captain Bernier will be enabled to profit by all the mistakes that Nansen made, and enabled to profit by all the experience that Nansen acquired, and will enter upon that race for the pole under circumstances much more favourable than any explorer has enjoyed before.

He will have in this sledge journey regular communication by wireless telegraphy with his vessel. Every half mile, or mile, a hole will be bored in the ice and a hollow tube inserted which will serve as a landmark, and when it is necessary to return there is a line of landmarks one mile apart, and every one of them a storehouse of supplies. He has the advantage of availing himself of an instrument which is being perfected, an instrument which I believe has not yet received a name, an instrument which may be termed the guide for the wandering and the lost, an instrument that can be adjusted with another instrument that is adjusted with it. Two parties separated from each other, carrying each of them one of these instruments, though they may be lost in a blinding snow storm, with their points of compass lost, and themselves lost hopelessly, can yet travel towards each other by the use of these instruments; or they can be gauged with an instrument on board the vessel; and this little monitor carried by a member of the sledge party, will direct him with as unerring accuracy to the vessel as a needle will direct to the pole. Now, this itself is a matter of great importance indeed, and with all these up-to-date appliances, with all the resources of modern science up to the very day that he starts, at his comamnd, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Captain Bernier, in his race for the pole, has the conditions all in his favour.

What will be the expense? The captain has secured contributions to the extent of $20,000. He cannot tell, perhaps no one can exactly, what he will require, but the probability is that the government would require to supplement that subscription by a sum of at least $100,000. Now, it may be said: Why should this money be appropriated? Here are two polar expeditions under way now; perhaps one of these will get to the pole first, and Captain Bernier will be cut out. Well, sir, even if another expedition did reach the pole before Captain Bernier got there, if he succeeded in reaching the pole on the first attempt made, if the first Canadian polar expedition was successful, the credit that would be due to Captain Bernier, the credit that would come to the country from that achievement, would be vastly more valuable than the amount of money required to fit out that expedition. But suppose he got there first, and I believe that will be the case. I do not believe that Peary will get to the pole by a journey from Greenland over the ice; I doubt whether Baldwin will get to the pole from Franz Josef land. Captain Bernier will go to the place where the currents will set him towards his destination, he will plant his vessel in the ice where the currents, the existence of which he knows perfectly well, will carry him to the place he wants to reach and then bring him out. He has been investigating this matter for 23 years. His knowledge with regard to this matter has been availed of by Nansen, by Baldwin, and by other explorers, and it is time now, Mr. Speaker, that Canada should have the credit of an achievement that will result largely from the investigations and the knowledge possessed by one or our own sons. If he gets there first, this country will be glad, you will be glad, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad, the premier will be glad, every citizen of Canada will be proud over this achievement of Captain Bernier.

It would have the effect, Mr. Speaker, of a first-class advertisement, one of the finest that could be obtained. It would bring us probably into better odour in Great Britain, it would make us better known there. I suppose at this moment that one half of her population would be just as ready to believe that Canadians wear snow shoes all the year, except during an occasional thaw in July and August, and live on blubber and bear meat, as they are to believe that we have 500,000 spuare miles of the finest wheat land in the world, ready to occupy, that we raise the finest grapes, the finest peaches and the finest apples in the world, and have room for 100,000,000 people to be supported from the products of our own soil. We want to draw their attention to this country, we want to draw their attention a little more fixedly to this Dominion. We would like the

United States people to have their attention directed to this country with a more sincere desire to obtain an intelligent knowledge as to the conditions that exist to-day, as to the physical features of the country and various other things and by means of expeditions and expenditures of this kind that we might enter into we would certainly bring Canada into prominent notice more readily and at less expense than in any other way. We would like to have the attention of the world in general and the world at large, not that we are self conceited, not that we desire to indulge in any vain boasting, but we want the attention of the world in order that Canada may be understood and justly appreciated. We want the attention of the world directed to this country which is now swelling with aspirations of national life, which is now deciding upon the course which will lay the foundations of a national future and which must win that position and win it by earning it. We have, Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, asserted ourselves. We have taught the world something and we have done something more important than that; we have taught ourselves something. We have taught ourselves what our resources are, what our capabilities are, and this polar expedition would be a nationalizing factor in our experience. It would be an expedition undertaken and joined in by both races and it would be an advertisement to the world and more than this it would be an incentive to aspiration, to great achievements, to high resolves, to self-reliance and to development in national character that would be worth infinitely more than it will cost. I urge, Mr. Speaker, upon the government the advisability of giving the money to place this expedition on foot, to draw the attention of the world to the fact that Canada has sent a polar expedition with the good hope that in due time Canada's effort will be crowned by success and that Capt. Bernier will reach the pole.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I desire to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the very elaborate and convincing presentation of the case which he made this afternoon on behalf of Captain Bernier. I join most cordially with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) in urging the claims of that hardy mariner upon the government. Twelve months ago, when the estimates of the Marine Department were under consideration, I took the liberty to draw the attention of the government to Captain Bernier's project, and I then urged that it was worthy of their serious consideration. I expressed the hope that the government would be able to see its way to make some appropriation to aid Captain Bernier in the construction of a vessel and the furnishing of its equipment for the expedition to the North Pole. Since then I have had no reason to change my mind. I have been more convinced than ever after listening to the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk. I believe that the great bulk of the people of Canada would most cordially sustain the action of the government if it decided to make a substantial grant, say $100,000, to aid Captain Bernier in what I conceive to be little short of a national enterprise. Captain Bernier it seems to me has special claims upon us and upon the government. He has acted most unselfishly in this matter; he has given years of his time, and he has spent considerable of his money in elaborating every detail of the expedition which he proposes to take charge of. He has prepared plans and has submitted them to the most eminent scientific authorities; he has had consultations with the most prominent Arctic explorers, and so correct has he been in his calculations that I think I am right in saying that they have received the approbation and endorsation of the foremost scientific and geological societies of the world. Captain Bernier comes from a family of mariners; his ancestors before him were mariners; he is a mariner himself. Since he was 17 years of age he has had command of ships; he thoroughly understands his business; he is actuated by the highest of motives, and if it is possible for any man to succeed in this arduous undertaking, that man is Captain Bernier. He has patriotism; he has capacity; he has knowledge; he has intense zeal. These are qualifications which make for success. As the hon. member for North Norfolk pointed out: If the first Canadian expedition to the Arctic regions should prove successful; if the men who compose that expedition should succeed in reaching the goal that has been vainly striven for by many daring adventurers in the past; great honour will be reflected upon Canada. From the time the expedition leaves our shores intense interest will be taken in its progress and its welfare by the people of Canada as well as by those of the civilized world. And if it should turn out that Captain Bernier—taking the precautions he has taken; providing for every possible contingency—should succeed in the accomplishment of his great mission, Canada will be placed in a higher position in the estimation of the world than Canada now occupies. Speaking as the representative of an Ontario constituency; speaking as one of the representatives of the city of Toronto, I believe I am reflecting the public opinion of the great majority of that city when I say: That they would desire most cordially to co-operate with the government in giving the necessary aid to Captain Bernier to enable him to equip his

expedition. Every Canadian worthy of the name would rejoice if in the course of two or three years Captain Bernier should return to us safe and sound having accomplished his great object. I cordially support the proposition of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and I hope that it will receive the most favourable consideration of the right hon. the Prime Minister.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth). It is impossible not to be deeply interested in Captain Bernier, because of his personality, and because of the political considerations connected with his mission as well. As the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) has said, Captain Bernier has remarkable qualifications for undertaking an expedition of the kind spoken of by the hon. member for North Norfolk. The subject of polar exploration has been so long before the people of Canada and of the civilized world, that such a mission as this requires very little commendation from the lay members of society. Polar exploration in the past has been largely confined to men of scientific attainments, and with strictly scientific objects in view. Should Captain Bernier succeed in obtaining the endorsement of the government and parliament of Canada, he will probably be the first Arctic explorer whose reputation has been established chiefly as a navigator. Hitherto the scientist has taken advantage of the knowledge and skill of the navigator, and the scientist penetrated as far as possible in the Northern Polar seas. But the expedition of Captain Bernier will be in charge primarily of a navigator, and any one who has studied this most interesting subject cannot but think, that under the guidance of a great navigator and a thorough sailor, as Captain Bernier is, aided by scientific men, there is a chance of accomplishing something that has not been accomplished in the past. It is certain that Captain Bernier has the advantage of the experience of the past, and from the addresses which he has delivered as well as the criticisms which have been made upon his plan, it can easily be seen that he contemplates a thoroughly careful attempt—not to discover the North Pole, as some people imagine the object of the expedition to be—but a thoroughly careful attempt to circumnavigate the polar sea, and to report the conditions in these regions and what they indicate as to the nature of the scientific deductions that may be made from them. It will be recollected by hon. gentlemen who have read Captain Bernier's brochure, that he contemplates a different course from any taken in the past. His idea is to enter the polar sea at the Behring Straits, and taking advantage of the drift and passing as near as possible to the pole, when reaching the point nearest the pole, he expects to make expeditions, aided by the most scientific assistance, to endeavour to reach the pole, and then continue his drift until he enters again the Atlantic ocean on the eastern seaboard of Greenland. I happen to have in my hand an address delivered before the Geographical Society of Philadelphia, by Commander Melville, describing the drift of the 'Jeannette.' He says :

> I believe that the proper place to put a ship in the ice will be through Behring Strait. We should keep along the east edge of the pack in about longitude 165° W., attaining the highest possible latitude, and westerly longitude, culminating together. Then we should push the ship into the pack as far as possible to the northward and westward, and await the fulfilment of the prophecy of one of the jolly whalemen I met at San Francisco. He said : 'Melville, push her into the ice at about the point I have mentioned, and you will either go to the pole or to hell, and I believe the chances are about even.'

I do not adopt the language of the whale man but no doubt it comes within the measure of truth. I trust that if Captain Bernier takes this course his chances will be on the side of coming out on the Atlantic ocean. Of course the idea conveyed by this very strong language is that the expedition is one of great danger and difficulty, and these add to the interest and importance of the expedition. It is of course a cheap criticism to make on effort of this kind to say that they are visionary, that they are the results of enthusiastic fads and so on. Perhaps it is not the duty of any lay member of this House to understand all the reasons why the scientific mind of the present age is so deeply interested in this matter. There can be no doubt that scientific inquiries which have evaded the clear apprehension of even the most intelligent laymen, have resulted in the greatest possible benefit to humanity. In addition to these arguments in favour of a generous support to Captain Bernier, there is the argument that the project is a patriotic one.

There can be no doubt, from a fair understanding of our position as the controller of the northern half of this North American continent, that the jurisdiction of Canada extends to the pole. At any rate, if we are the first to circumnavigate the sea and establish the British flag on any point of land discovered there prior discovery and prior occupation will give Great Britain through Canada absolute jurisdiction for all time forward over those regions. From a patriotic standpoint, therefore, there is much to be said for the project. The amount the gallant captain asks for may appear large, but in proportion to the expenditure which is incurred in the solution of other questions it is relatively small. We find all the great nations of the world to-day striving to be foremost in scientific discovery, particularly in the arctic and antarctic regions, and I think it is a worthy ambition for the government and the people of Canada to take a prominent part in such enterprises, particularly in those regions

which presumably are or ought to be under our own jurisdiction. I therefore support the idea of favourable and careful consideration being given to Captain Bernier and his plans by the administration of the day. No doubt there are questions of detail and other questions which the administration may desire to discuss with him, but I believe the general idea of a handsome support to this enterprising French Canadian will be approved of by the people of Canada, and I believe that the result will be, if he comes safely through the ordeal, not only to place him at the head of all polar explorers, but to enhance the reputation of the Dominion of Canada as a country devoted not only to utilitarian purposes and the increase of its wealth, but to the higher purposes of scientific discovery and investigation.

Mr. W. C. EDWARDS (Russell). Mr. Speaker, I cannot add much on this subject to what has been said by the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, further than to concur most heartily in what they have said, and to urge upon the government a compliance with the demand of Captain Bernier to provide him with a sufficient sum to carry out the object he has in view. It may be said, that from the successful carrying out of his project nothing of intrinsic value to Canada will accrue. But from the patriotic standpoint there is certainly this to be said, that it has been the aim of many of the important nations of the world to achieve this object. Every effort has thus far failed, but from the failure of previous efforts a great deal has been learnt, and my firm conviction if that it is possible to succeed in this project, Captain Bernier is the man to do it. Some may say that it would have been more desirable if some highly scientific man were engaged in the project. Well, Mr. Speaker, from my knowledge of the man, if for the carrying out of this project you offered me all the scientists of the world on the one hand, and offered me Captain Bernier as against them, I would take Captain Bernier. So far as the necessary accomplishment is concerned, the characteristics of the Canadian voyageur are the most necesssary elements for the success of such an undertaking. If scientific research is necessary Captain Bernier can have scientific men to accompany him. If he succeeds, and I firmly believe he will succeed, it will certainly be a great accomplishment for Canada, in view of the fact that so many nations have failed in their attempts. As to the intrinsic value of such an expedition to Canada, it is impossible for us to speak. There may be properties in that northern country which it may prove highly desireable to take possession of in the name of Canada or of Great Britain. It is impossible to tell what minerals may be discovered, although Captain Bernier is not going for that purpose. But, taking it all in all, I believe that aid given to Captain Bernier will prove a good investment for Canada, particularly if he succeeds. I have paid great attention to the two lectures which he delivered here ; I have observed closely his plan, and I believe it is a feasible one. I do not believe there is any great danger or great difficulty surrounding it. I believe there are no difficulties that a man of the perseverance, determination and accomplishments of Captain Bernier will not overtake. I believe he will succeed, and it will be a proud day for Canada if he does succeed. I sincerely trust the government will entertain most favourably his demand.

Mr. M. K. RICHARDSON (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much interest to the presentation of this case to the House by the several speakers who have addressed it, and I have no doubt that the encomiums that have been bestowed upon Captain Bernier are well deserved. But it does not necessarily follow, because we recognize his courage, daring, skill and general fitness for an enterprise of this kind, that we should give encouragement to an enterprise fraught with so much danger and having so little practical utility in view. When we look at the history of polar enterprise in the past we must concede that it has been one long sad story of disaster, suffering and loss. Nothing so far has been attained. The loss of Franklin and his crew, the voyage of Captain McClintock in search of Franklin, the expeditions of Scoresby, Kane, Greely and others down to Nansen and the ill-fated Andrée, fill out a long story of disaster and intense suffering. What is gained by it all ? What is proposed to be gained for Canada by this enterprise ? Nothing more than empty fame ; and I hold that at this period of our country's history this is not something that we should strive very hard to attain to. We have much more practical things to give our attention to. It has been urged that it might add largely to the territory of Canada; but I hold that additional territory is not one of the pressing wants of Canada. We have now more territory than we know anything about. We have large regions practically unexplored and as yet untrodden by the white man. If our attention is given to utilizing what we have without aiming beyond that it will result in greater benefit to the people of Canada. There are immense fields of enterprise opening up in this country in all directions—enterprises that are full of promise and practical utility for this new country, and that offer rewards far more certain than polar expeditions.

What advantage would accrue to this country, even supposing the North Pole were discovered ? Would it bring us more immigration ? Would it attract more capital ? Would it open up new avenues for trade and commerce ? Is there anything practical to be got out of it—anything ex-

cept empty fame ? I am not denying that some practical results from a scientific point of view might be attained, but we have not reached that period of our history when we can afford so much attention to questions of this nature. There are many other practical questions with which we have to deal. It is said that the discovery of the North Pole would be a great advertisement for this country. Well, we unfortunately have too much advertisement of that character—too much advertisement of Canada as Our Lady of The Snows. What we require to do is rather to dispel the ignorance which exists regarding Canada's present territory and her climate, resources and productions. In doing this, we would be doing something which would produce practical results. I need not mention the hundreds of openings there are for practical enterprise in this country —openings in all directions. Everywhere appeals are made for government assistance to legitimate enterprises. I quite admit that to men who have a surplus of wealth, the project of Captain Bernier is an interesting one, and by all means let them expend some of their surplus wealth upon it. In older countries, such as Great Britain and other European countries, which have exhausted at home all the new avenues for enterprise, this scheme may be a legitimate one on which to spend government moneys. But in Canada I think there are far more practical objects demanding our attention and lying right within our reach. Appeals are made to this government again and again for assistance, which the government does not feel warranted in granting, extensive as are our resources. I did not intend to say but a few words on this subject, and I would only add that we should not forget that in contributing out of the national exchequer to a scheme of this kind, we are voting the money of the poor as well as the rich, the money of the toiler as well as the money of the man of affluence. I do not see how we can well defend an expenditure of this kind, which can only result, at the best, in our acquiring a little empty fame, and which is far more likely to have the same fate that other similar enterprises have suffered, and furnish another sad story of a nation's folly.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I fully concur in the remarks fallen from the lips of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon. For many years back, Captain Bernier has shown that he has the skill, the technical knowledge, the pluck and the perseverance which fit him for such an arduous enterprise as that of the search for the North Pole ; and to my mind, that should induce the government to receive favourably his demand. The hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House (Mr. Richardson) told us that this enterprise had very little practical utility in view, and that he failed to see what advantage would accrue to the country, even supposing the North Pole was discovered by Captain Bernier. Let the hon. gentleman allow me to tell him that but a few years ago the men who ventured to approve of the exploring expedition sent by the government to the Yukon were looked upon as visionaries. And who would now maintain that the country has not greatly benefited by those explorations of the Yukon ?

It is said that if the enterprise undertaken by Captain Bernier were brought to a successful issue, it would be a great advertisement for this country, and that if a son of Canada were to plant the flag of his country at the North Pole, it would be a proud day for Canada. But aside altogether from the reputation that would accrue to Canada from this polar expedition, it must not be forgotten that this enterprise has a scientific object in view, which will be appreciated by all scientists and navigators. Moreover, the discovery of the North Pole in our case would not be a fruitless one, as it would enable us to establish our right to the unknown territories of the Arctic regions.

Captain Bernier was heard before several learned societies, the members of which are by no means visionaries, as my hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) would have it, but practical men. Captain Bernier delivered addresses before the Royal Society of Canada, the Colonial Institute in London, the Geographical Society of Quebec and several other learned bodies, both in the United States and in Great Britain. The captain's theory has received the endorsation of all those learned societies, after they had fully considered its merits.

It often happens that the government encourages the projects of foreign scientists. Not long ago Signor Marconi's system of wireless telegraphy was adopted by the government, and we shall soon be called upon to vote for that purpose a sum of $70,000. Is there a gentleman here who would venture to predict that Captain Bernier's expedition will be a barren thing for Canada, and that no tangible advantages will accrue to the country from it ?

On these several grounds, Sir, I think it my duty as a Canadian and as a representative from the province of Quebec, to endorse the demand made by Captain Bernier, and to express the hope that it will receive the favourable consideration of the government.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Canada has acquired some fame by sending her men to South Africa. She can add to that fame by assisting Captain Bernier's expedition to the north pole. Great Britain has spent a great deal of treasure and a great deal of blood in acquiring territory, and if we wish to be conspicuous in history, we must follow her example. I suppose that, even when we do discover the north pole, the market gardeners about Montreal will

hardly go there to grow fruit for sale. But, if you consider everything, I think it will be manifest that the discovery of the pole will be a valuable asset for the Dominion of Canada. It will elevate the history of the country and give us prominence in every country in the world. Our children's children will look back with admiration upon the history of the brave man who discovered the north pole and added this territory to the Dominion. Captain Bernier has my entire sympathy in the enterprise he is undertaking, and I hope that the government will treat him in a generous broad-minded manner.

Mr. ROBERT HOLMES (West Huron). The speakers who have preceded me, and have favoured this request, seem to assume that Captain Bernier is going to be successful in his search for the pole, I think. I have read nearly all the records of polar exploration, and I am not satisfied in my own mind that Captain Bernier—and I will admit all that has been said concerning his bravery and ability—will come nearer to a solution of the problem than those who have preceded him have done. The argument put forth that it will be an excellent advertisement for Canada, is, to my mind, an exceedingly specious one. It is an advertisement that will cost the country altogether too much, in my opinion. I fail to see any good that will be accomplished by another polar expedition. And I do not think the people of this country would justify the government in the expenditure of anything like $50,000, or more for an expedition of that nature. We are told often in this House, and especially by hon. gentlemen on the other side, that the government is spending money too freely. The idea prevails, however, apparently, that the government has money to burn. It seems to me if they are disposed to use a free hand in the disposition of the revenues of the country, we can find a great deal more worthy objects and objects that will do a great deal more permanent good to the country than the discovery of the north pole. There are various ways in which the money could be utilized either for colonization purposes or otherwise. But I think that Canada is too new a country and has too limited resources to justify the government in contributing any sum towards this expedition.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I have no desire to detain the House by repeating the many arguments that have been advanced by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in support of the expedition of Captain Bernier in search of the north pole. The hon. gentleman has placed the question so fully and completely before the House that nothing be need said along that line. Captain Bernier's energy and the zeal he has displayed in this matter, not only in Canada, but also in his visits to the old country during the past two or three years, to say nothing of the many years previous when the people of Canada were not taking notice of him, must have commended him to every true Canadian. To my mind, if the north pole is to be discovered—and I am one of those who believe that it will be dicovered—Captain Bernier is the kind of man who will discover it. I have given very considerable attention to the plans along whose lines Captain Bernier proposes to move in this expedition, and I think those plans will commend themselves to every man who informs himself upon the subject. Briefly, Captain Bernier is going to follow natural law. He is not going in opposition to nature, as he himself explains. Many of the explorers in the past who have attempted to find the north pole have failed because they went towards it from the wrong direction. But Captain Bernier, takes advantage of the discoveries with regard to the currents and the movements of the ice floes and of all the experience and the observations of others who have sailed in these northern seas, and I think he has a plan by which he will discover the pole, if it is ever going to be discovered. Now, some may think that the north pole will never be found. I understand that one man came within 230 miles of the pole, and another within 219 miles of it. If one navigator can come within 219 miles of the pole, why cannot another reach the pole itself? One thing is as reasonable as the other. Captain Bernier is of the opinion that Dr. Nansen went too far before putting his boat in the ice. The result was that he passed within 230 miles of the pole. Had he entered the ice 230 miles nearer, he might have floated over the pole and to-day have had the glory of being the man who discovered the north pole. Now, are there any advantages to be gained by this expedition? I hold that, even if it is an absolute failure there will be great advantages accruing to Canada from it. As an immigration advertisement nothing in the world that we can do with the same amount of money would bring Canada so prominently and favourably before the world as this expedition of Captain Bernier to the pole. It will be commented on by every newspaper throughout the world, and attention will be called to Canada on every side. This will be a better way of spending money than some of the plans adopted by the Minister of the Interior at the present time. If there are any hon. gentlemen in the House who think we ought not to spend any sum for the purpose of assisting Captain Bernier I would suggest to them that, instead of spending $400,000 on immigration, by spending $300,000 on immigration and $100,000 to aid Captain Bernier, we should bring more immigrants to the country than if we spent $400,000 on our ordinary immigration service. What will the thing cost? If we do give Captain Bernier's expedition $100,000—and I am not aware that he asks even that much—that sum will simply

amount to two cents per head of the population of this country. Where is the man, woman or child who would grudge that money in order that a Canadian may have the glory of being first to place the British flag at the pole. I am sure there is not one. We would all be proud as Canadians if one of our fellow countrymen could accomplish this great feat. In any case, we are not sending this money out of the country, I understand that the expedition will be fitted out here and every dollar spent in Canada. So, we are not losing the money, but are simply transferring it from one hand to another. We hear a great deal about the Alaskan boundary and the trouble we have in settling the disputes between ourselves and the United States. Suppose that Captain Bernier fails to get sufficient assistance to enable him to undertake this expedition. If he goes to Washington—he is too patriotic to do so, but he would be justified, if he were turned down by this government, in seeking to secure assistance from some other country—if he goes to Washington, there is not the slightest doubt that, within twenty-four hours he will have all the money he wants. And the next thing we know we shall have another Alaska boundary question away near the north pole, with commissions sitting at Washington to settle question of our northern boundary. Is it not better to spend $100,000 and settle that question for ever ? The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) recommends various things that we might undertake instead of spending the money on this expedition. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that there is only one pole, and if we lose the opportunity now of sending Captain Bernier we may lose the opportunity for ever.

My own impression is that if Captain Bernier reaches the pole—there is only one North Pole, for we care nothing about the south, we have no possessions there—if Captain Bernier succeeds in reaching that pole and has the pleasure of wiring to us over the Marconi system the particular day on which he has discovered the pole, I doubt very much if there will be another expedition going out there for years to come, because the ambition of every one is to be the first to find the pole. Now, I make this statement to show the government where I stand. I am not ashamed to say that I am prepared to stand by the government in any reasonable expenditure which they may make in assisting Captain Bernier. I know perfectly well that my constituents will support me. I do not believe in parish politics, I believe in taking a wide view of all these matters; and I am convinced that those who live after us will remember with pride that the parliament of Canada assisted Captan Bernier in being the first man to place the British flag upon the North Pole.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk.) I am sometimes surprised at the consistency or inconsistency of some hon. gentlemen opposite. They complain a great deal of the expenditure this government makes year after year, and decry the large increase in the expenditure, and yet here they come now asking us to spend $80,000 or $100,000 on an object purely visionary or sensational. I think some of the older countries, such as Russia, France, Sweden, England and the United States, might possibly be justified in going into a little experiment of this sort; but for a new country like Canada to spend $100,000 of the people's money on such a visionary project as the discovery of the North Pole would be abject foolishness. I have no doubt that the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken on the other side would be glad if they could get the leader of the government to commit himself to such a project so that they could ridicule him afterwards on every platform in the country. That is exactly what they want, and I know it. A few years ago this country discovered what is known as Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That country they are trying to develop, that country they are not able to develop because they do not devote sufficient money to develop it properly. A few nights ago in this House grievous complaints were made by members from the territories that only a paltry sum of $357,000 was given them to govern 160,000 to 200,000 people. We have the same cry in Manitoba, the very same cry, that we cannot get sufficient money properly to run our government. Later on this country made another discovery, the Yukon territory. Now, I think we have done about enough discovery for some time to come. The North Pole will keep, it is in cold storage, and let it remain there awhile. I believe that if that pole was discovered it would prove to be one of the greatest curses to the premier of Canada. He would not know what to do with it, there is no doubt about it. There is a country around the North Pole, and the first thing we would see would be a big map of the country in the railway committee room here, with railways wanted by some great corporation. I have no doubt the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Edwards) would want a cinch on the water power to be developed, and some other hon. gentleman would want to run railways to Spitzbergen and Greenland. I think the premier of Canada should take hard facts into consideration, and leave these chimerical schemes entirely for the future, until we become a big nation, until we have a surplus of funds on hand to undertake such a project. In the meantime, let us try to develop the countries that we have already discovered within the last 25 years, and which need more funds.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). If this scheme involved the expenditure of any considerable amount I would certainly hesitate before asking the government to undertake

it. But we are told that all Captain Bernier expects from this government is $60,000, or one cent per head for every man, woman and child in this country. When we remember that some patent medicine companies expend three times that amount in one year to advertise their goods, I believe that if we looked on the expedition to the North Pole merely as an advertising scheme the money would be very well invested indeed. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a broader question than the mere question of advertising this country. Canada has contributed her share in the past towards making the history of this continent; Canada, I hope, has not arrived at that position where, for a paltry sum like the one now involved, she will stop in her course of progress, of discovery, of scientific research, deterred by so small an amount as the one in question. We have had to-night testimony in favour of Captain Bernier from disinterested members on both sides of the House, from all parts of the Dominion. As a member from the province of Quebec, I am pleased and grateful for the tribute which has been paid to the valour and devotion of Captain Bernier. I believe Captain Bernier will reach the North Pole if that pole can be reached by the means which we have now at our disposal. He is a self-made man. At 17 years of age he commanded a ship sailing from ocean to ocean. He has since given his country a record of which he and his people have reason to be proud. His project has been submitted to and approved by learned societies, not only in Canada, but in Great Britain. The Society for the Advancement of Science, the Geographical Society, the Colonial Institute, and other learned bodies in Canada have approved of his idea. The list of subscriptions which has been shown us is headed by Lord Strathcona, one of the greatest of all our great Canadians, by Lord Minto, and by almost every distinguished man in this country. I believe that the government should give this matter full consideration, and not turn Captain Bernier away from this House as, in years past, discoverers of his stamp and value have been turned away in other countries. The course of Captain Bernier during the last two or three years, running from Ottawa to London, from Toronto to Quebec, from Montreal to other cities of the Dominion, reminds me of the efforts of Christopher Columbus some 400 years ago when he was asking Spain and the countries of southern Europe for assistance to enable him to discover a new world. Men were found by hundreds who failed to realize the value of his undertaking, but Providence inspired a woman, who will remain famous for all time, with the idea of contributing towards the discovery of this new world. What the intrinsic value of this discovery may be none of us are at present able to say; but there is not a Canadian who would not be proud to tell his children in years to come that Canada contributed its quota to one of the greatest scientific discoveries in the world's history.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I assume that I am a fairly practical man. I do not want to throw away my own money or the money of the country. But I think a country is not worth being called a country, a nation is not worth being called a nation, that is not able and willing to expend a little of its money in adventures. This is an adventure that, if successful, will bring, perhaps, not much practical result for the country, but will bring it a good deal of glory. The hon. member from Winnipeg (Mr. McCreary) thinks that Canada has done enough in discovering Manitoba, the North-west Territories and the Yukon .

It has been a great discovery and so far has been fairly costly. It will, I think, and I know in the future be enormously profitable, but it lacks one thing that is necessary in a man's life or a nation's life. It lacks any possible idea of romance, it is purely and simply practical—beef, wheat, pork and other things. I believe that if the small amount of money that is asked to help Captain Bernier in this expedition, it will not be an extravagance for Canada. I believe the amount can be saved ten times over to the people of the country by the reduction of many items in the estimates which we have had before us this session and which represent money that will be expended without profit or glory to the country. I believe that if this money is granted to Captain Bernier, it will, at all events, show the world that we Canadians are not altogether so wedded to what is only the practical side, but that we have with us a little of that old romance that caused our forefathers to go to all parts of the world on voyages of discovery, and, as a rule not of profit to themselves. I think, we, in Canada, as the most northerly nation and the nearest to the North pole, might very properly grant the small sum that is asked to help on this expedition, which, if successful, will redound to the credit and glory of Canada and from a purely practical standpoint will be of no small advantage.

Mr. GERMAN. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) if he is in favour of the present government granting the bonus to Mr. Bernier for his expedition to the north pole ?

Mr. OSLER. Certainly I am in favour of the persent government granting the bonus that is asked for.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I would regret, I think, in future, if I allowed this opportunity to pass of speaking upon this great and important question. When Captain Bernier does discover the north pole, either with the assist-

ance of Canada, or with the assistance of some other government to which he will necessarily apply if Canada fails him, there will be many hon. gentlemen in this House who will regret that they had not some part in endeavouring to assist in this great project. I notice that two hon. gentlemen, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. McEwen) and the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) tried to introduce a political question into this matter, and one of these hon. gentlemen went so far beyond the record as to suggest that those of the opposition who are now advocating the expenditure of this money would be the first to decry the government in case they had acceded to the suggestion.

Mr. McCREARY. So you would.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCreary) says: So we would. I particularly got upon my feet to speak, so that there will be no question about the position which I occupy upon this matter. I have, as a rule, the courage to say what I believe to be right and to act in accordance with what I believe to be right. Whether I may be right in this instance or not, is of course another matter. The people whom I have the honour to represent sent me here not necessarily to vote for one political party or the other but to exercise the best judgment I possess upon the various questions that come before this parliament. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may laugh because I understand them to dissent from that proposition. Perhaps they do not understand an hon. gentleman acting upon that basis. I have confidence that if the people who sent me here to represent them should come to the conclusion that in the attitude I now take I have made an error of judgment, believing that I have done it sincerely, they will forgive me, but I do believe that this project will be successful. I believe that if there is a man in the world to-day who is likely to reach the north pole he is Captain Bernier. He is a native Canadian, he is a very intelligent and progressive man, a man who has faith in what he undertakes and it is a pity for Canada to fail to respond on this occasion to the opportunity which now presents itself of enunciating to the world the capabilities of the Canadian people. On the field of South Africa, the one characteristic that distinguished our noble citizen soldiers above all others, except their bravery, was that they were the people for an emergency, that they were capable people all round and that is the type of man who asks us to invest $100,000 in order to see if we cannot accomplish this great scientific discovery and incidentally advertise Canada in a way that nothing else could do. I want to say distinctly that the hon. member for South Huron and the hon. member for Selkirk, hardly appreciate the point when they talk about the opposition carping at the expenditure of public money. There is a great and broad distinction between the opposition objecting to specific expenditures, because they are not judicious expenditures, and the suggestion of these hon. gentlemen. We are not saying on this side of the House that we cannot pay our way, we are not saying that Canada cannot pay for all she needs, that Canada is not in a position to pay money for anything that is in the interest of Canada, but the opposition do criticise, and it is the proper attitude of an opposition, expenditures of money in some instances because they think they are not wise or judicious expenditures. This is not a political question. It is a question for every man to exercise his honest judgment upon. It is a question for every hon. member to feel that whether it exactly suits his constituents or not he will, at this juncture, have done that which he believed to be right in saying that this small sum of money, comparatively, should in all reason be voted in support of this measure. I have little doubt that we will within a few years have the honour of having discovered the north pole.

Mr. F. B. WADE (Annapolis.) Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose making any speech on this occasion. I suppose that will be pleasant to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, but I wish to take my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) to task, because, when he saw the first suggestion of reformation upon the part of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, he should not have chided them with their past errors. They have complained, it is true, about the expenditures made by the government and we have not only stood by these expenditures, but we say that the government should go on and make increased expenditures, doing all things necessary for the welfare and benefit of Canada. I do believe that a small expenditure in connection with this matter would be an expenditure in that direction. We are not living in this world alone for the few dollars we may gather together; there are other things which we have to live for as individuals. There are other things for us to live for as a nation; as a Dominion, and one of these other things may be possibly accomplished by the sending out of this expedition. It is not possible for any man to tell to-day what the result of it may be. Whether it will add to the material interest of Canada; whether it will demonstrate a great scientific problem or not; but it is worthy an attempt. I regret that an hon. member on the other side of the House robbed me of one of the strongest arguments I had to make when he said, that it would only cost the country from one cent or two cents per head of the population. Now, there are some certain scientific questions which may or may not be settled by this expedition. We have all worried some of them. We have worried as to the reason why the needle points to the north; we have worried

as to the variation of the compass, and why the compass varies more in one section of the globe than it does in another. These things may or may not be settled by this expedition, but I do believe that the country as a whole would support the government if they gave a reasonable grant in aid of this expedition which is being already aided by private enterprise in different parts of the empire. I simply wished to express my views in that direction, and to say that so far as I am concerned I shall be most glad to support the government in any reasonable expenditure for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAM ROSS (South Ontario). If Captain Bernier does not get the bonus he desires for this expedition to the north pole, this debate will at least have done good, for I with others have obtained increased information with regard to the project, and I must congratulate the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the able and eloquent manner in which he presented his proposition to the House. I am very sorry that at present I cannot bring myself up to the idea, that the discovery of the north pole will be of any use to us except from a sentimental point of view. It is not long since I read Nansen's 'Farthest North,' and the privations and trials that he endured are more than any person should be called upon to endure. If the country around the pole is anything like the country which Nansen traversed, we do not want such a country as that. That is my feeling, and I cannot get over it. I cannot help but think that the moneys which we would vote for this expedition could be much better spent in advancing the interests of Canada internally. I quite appreciate the sentiment connected with the project; the glory there would be in planting the British flag upon the north pole. I quite admit that it would be in that respect a grand and glorious thing. I may not be venturesome enough, but after reading Nansen's work I am apprehensive that no man can reach the pole. It is possible that he might, and if so I should be glad to rejoice with the rest; I should be more pleased to rejoice if the discoverer of the north pole were a Canadian, but at the present time I cannot see my way clear to support any appropriation for this purpose.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, personally I am certainly not insensible to the view which has been urged to-day upon the government by those who think that Canada should be the discoverer of the north pole, and that the efforts of Captain Bernier should receive some recognition. I largely share the enthusiasm of those who believe that it would not be a barren thing for Canada, if an enterprise which has combatted the efforts of so many brave and strong men were at last to be brought to a successful issue by a son of Canada. I do not share the views of my hon. friend from Ontario (Mr. Ross). Even if there was nothing in that enterprise but sentiment, that alone is a thing which no nation can afford to be indifferent to.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. There is not only the material prosperity of a nation to be considered; there is also the moral elevation, the sentiment, the enthusiasm—all these go to make up a nation, and no nation can exist unless it proves itself to possess those qualities. But nobody can say that even from a material point of view there would not be something gained by the successful accomplishment of this project. From all accounts the north pole is a desolate part of the world, but we have learned to believe in this age, that no part of the earth's surface however desolate is not productive of wealth. As was pointed out by my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) we have lately found wealth where it was least expected—in the Yukon. I remember very well that some years ago the Yukon was ridiculed; the very name excited scorn; but now we are glad that the Yukon is within our territory. We do not know but that perhaps there may be something in this enterprise if it were successful which would bring to us material profit. However that may be, and leaving aside altogether the idea of the material advantages, if a son of Canada were to plant the flag of his country at the north pole, if he were to achieve what so many brave men have struggled in vain to achieve, there is not a Canadian heart that would not beat with pride at the thought of it. Canada would be only too glad to purchase at a small cost such a glory. In Captain Bernier we have a man who I think is fit to take charge of such an enterprise. He has all the qualities which would lead us to believe that if that enterprise is to be brought to a successful issue, he is the man to do it. He is an experienced mariner; he has enthusiasm, he has pluck, he has courage and he has the technical knowledge of his profession. If these qualities cannot discover the north pole it will not be discovered. At the same time I am not insensible either to the fact that Canada has many useful enterprises of immediate interest to prosecute, and between the two contentions perhaps it is difficult to come to a conclusion. The only thing that I can say is, that personally, and I believe, speaking also for some of my colleagues, I would rather be proud of contributing something to secure this glory for the Canadian people. I would have been more satisfied if my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) who presented this case with great force and great ability, had given us some idea of the amount which it was expected Canada should contribute. I never understood that it was contemplated that Canada should bear the whole cost of the expedition. I always understood that Captain Bernier had some enthusiastic friends who were ready

to help him, and I am told that he has now secured assistance to the amount of $20,000. Well, I must confess my disappointment at that, for I had hoped he would have secured a much larger sum. He has received enconium, commendation and praise, but in the way of substantial assistance he has not received as much as one would have expected. Last year, in giving my personal views and after consulting with only some of my colleagues, I made bold to say that if Captain Bernier secured something of material assistance from private individuals in this country and outside of it, the government might perhaps come to his rescue and supply the balance. But I had no expectation that the sum of $100,000 would be asked from us. I see now that if Canada is to contribute anything at all it must be not less than $100,000. The views of the members of the House have been expressed generally, and if I understand aright, with very few exceptions, the members would be ready to sustain the government if they were to give $100,000 for this purpose. All I can say at present, and it is not to be expected I should say more, is, that the government cannot be indifferent to the views which have been presented here to-day. They shall receive due consideration, and if after having given the best consideration we can to this worthy scheme we come to the conclusion that it should be carried out, then, judging by what has been said here to-day, the government will be defended from the opposite side of the House against the charge of extravagance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I agree that it was not purely in a spirit of ascertaining the material profit that we should deal with a question of this kind. There is a great deal of force in what has been said by some hon. gentlemen here to-day on both sides of the House, that in matters of this kind we have to look a little beyond considerations of that nature. I have had several interviews with Captain Bernier in regard to this expedition. While I have not been able to look into his plans as fully as some of the gentlemen who have spoken to-day, I am fully prepared to assent to what has been said with regard to Capt. Bernier's earnestness and capacity. He comes of a race who have been unsurpassed in past days in Canada in the spirit of adventure, in their efforts to discover and colonize the vast regions of Quebec, Ontario and the great West, as well as a considerable portion of the United States ; and Captain Bernier, I believe, has in himself all the qualifications which are necessary for making a success of that which has been attempted by so many individuals and by so many nations in the past. I do not overlook the fact that there is a great deal of this kind of work for us to do in Canada, or I might say in nearer portions of Canada, if it be true, as hon. gentlemen have stated to-night, that the limits of Canada to-day embrace the North Pole. In the nearer portions of Canada there are a great many unexplored regions as to many of which we have not done our duty. But these are portions of the country which do not attract the attention of the world to the same extent, and I do not think our efforts with regard to these would be handicapped by our giving a moderate measure of support to the enterprise of Captain Bernier. I would therefore say, so far as I am personally concerned—and in saying this I speak only for myself—that I would be inclined to give favourable consideration to a proposal by the government such as has been suggested by the hon. gentleman opposite.

THE BRITISH CATTLE EMBARGO.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion of which I gave notice yesterday, I may in a few words state the case of our cattle trade as it stands to-day in Great Britain. We have heard a good deal about it, but I do not think we have ever considered in this House the exact situation and the legislation of the British parliament as it now exists. Between 1878 and 1893, the British parliament adopted various laws, one after another, with a view to extirpating from the United Kingdom the different contagious diseases that were affecting cattle. Finally, in 1894, all these laws were combined in one statute, which is still in force, except one section, which I shall refer to later. This Act is called 'an Act to Consolidate the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts, 1878 to 1893.' It is chapter 57 of 57 and 58 Victoria. By section 24 of that Act it is provided :

> The provisions set forth in part I. (slaughter at port of landing) of the third schedule to this Act shall apply to all foreign animals other than—
>
> (a) Foreign animals the landing of which is for the time being prohibited by order of the Board of Agriculture ;
>
> (b) Foreign animals the landing of which is allowed by order of the board without being subject under the provisions of this Act to slaughter or quarantine ; and
>
> (c) Foreign animals intended for exhibition or other exceptional purposes, and the landing of which is allowed for the time being by the board subject to the provisions of part II (quarantine) of the third schedule to this Act.

Now, Section 26 of this Act gave to the Board of Agriculture a certain amount of discretion in regard to admittance of foreign animals at the ports of entry without requiring them to be slaughtered. In the third schedule of the Act, in the first part it is provided :

> 1. The animals shall be landed only at a part of the port defined for that purpose by order of the Board of Agriculture, to be called a foreign animals wharf.
>
> 2. The animals shall be landed in such manner, at such times and subject to such super-

visions and control as the Commissioners of Customs direct.

3. The animals shall not be moved alive out of the wharf.

I need not point out to the House the detriment which this caused to importers of animals in the United Kingdom as well as to the exporters. The ports of entry not being supplied with cold storage facilities such as might have been expected, the animals were slaughtered, and the meat was exposed for sale on the different markets in the United Kingdom, in a more or less deteriorated condition, and was of course sold at a much lower price than the meat produced by the local trade. Moreover, the very fact that our cattle were subjected to such a disposition of the law, which was really a law for the protection of the cattle trade of England, but was enacted to prevent contagious diseases spreading in the United Kingdom, caused the meat which came from the abattoirs at the ports of entry to be looked upon as coming from countries where contagious diseases were in existence. Of course, protests were immediately entered by the Canadian government. Two years later, another Act was passed, chapter 15 of 59 and 60 Victoria, entitled 'an Act to amend the Diseases of Animals Act, 1894.' By this Act, section 24 of the Act of 1894, which I have just read, was repealed, and the following section substituted :

The provisions set forth in part in part I (slaughter at port of landing) of the third schedule to this Act shall apply to all foreign animals other than—

(a) Foreign animals the landing of which is for the time being prohibited by order of the Board of Agriculture ; and

(b) Foreign animals intended for exhibition or other exceptional purposes, and the landing of which is allowed for the time being by the board, subject to the provisions of part II (quarantine) of the third schedule to this Act.

This Act also repealed section 26 of the Act of 1894, which was the only section that gave some discretion to the Board of Agriculture. The result of this was that cattle sent from Canada could not enter the United Kingdom unless they were slaughtered at the ports of entry, except in the case of any animals which might be admitted for exhibition purposes. So that from the time of the passage of the statute of 1896, as Mr. Hanbury said last year, and Mr. Elliott, the secretary of the Board of Agriculture, said this year, in a dispatch which I have already given to the House a few weeks ago, the Board of Agriculture has no more power to admit our cattle except under the slaughter schedule.

I need not say how unjust and unfair this provision is to the cattle trade of Canada ; yet in spite of all the representations made by the Canadian government, nothing has been done towards the removal of these restrictions. I need not insist on the importance of having them removed. I quite agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that should the British government and parliament declare in favour of a protective policy for the encouragement of the British cattle trade, we would have no right to make any protest. But what we have a right to protest against is that our live stock should be refused admission to the English market on the false ground that our cattle are diseased. We have the right to protest against our cattle being excluded on the ground of disease when, as has been proven time and again to our British friends, there is no disease among the cattle in Canada. The only cases of disease in Canada were a few that occurred among animals imported from Great Britain, and these were immediately slaughtered at our quarantine ports. As far as the health of our cattle is concerned, we stand in a better position than do the British Islands.

If I have brought up this motion, instead of supporting the one proposed yesterday, my reason is that I consider that the resolution I have the honour to submit is more in the interests of Canada than the one which was proposed yesterday. I submit that it is in the interests of Canadian trade that this question should be dealt with by this House, and presented to the British government, divested of any party spirit whatever, and free from any reflections or criticisms as to the amount of work done by the Canadian government or not, or as to the protective character or otherwise of the policy of the British government. I simply ask the House to support this motion, so that when the First Minister attends the Colonial conference in the city of London, he will be able to show that he has the whole House of Commons at his back in asking the British government to repeal this injustice inflicted on our farming interests and our cattle trade. I have somewhat modified the motion of which I gave notice yesterday, by taking from it everything that might savor of an aggressive spirit, both as regards the Canadian and the British governments. I have added a clause relating to the foreign trade, because the restrictions imposed under the British statute, not only injure our trade with Great Britain but also with foreign countries. When it is known in France, Holland, Belgium and Germany, that our cattle are excluded from our own motherland under the provision of the Contagious Diseases Act, that is certain to have a most injurious effect on our dealings with those countries. From all points of view, I think that the motion and the spirit in which I present it should meet with the approval of the whole House. I would beg to move :

That evidence having been furnished to the British authorities proving that there is no justification for the application of the Diseases of Animals Act (Great Britain) to the cattle of

Canada, this House regrets that the provisions of this Act continue to be applied to Canadian cattle, thereby preventing the sale of Canadian animals in Great Britain on fair terms, and injuring the cattle trade of Canada in all foreign markets.

That this House hopes that the government of Canada will avail itself of the opportunity afforded by the approaching imperial conference in London to urge upon the British government the removal of this unjust restriction on the sale of Canadian cattle in Great Britain.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). As a rule the government does not receive with favour a motion made in amendment to the proposal to go into supply, but there are exceptional cases and this seems to be one of them. The subject which the hon. gentleman invites the House to consider is one of recognized importance, and the terms of his motion are such that I think they will find favour on both sides. Inasmuch as complaint has been made for several years, and a well founded complaint, that the regulations of the imperial government in relation to the cattle trade, are unreasonable and unfair as respects Canadian cattle, it is not out of place that we should express the opinion of the House with the view of bringing about a change if possible. The motion of my hon. friend is a respectful remonstrance against what we all feel to be an unfair condition of things. We do not question the right of the imperial government to make such regulations as may be deemed best in the interests of the mother country, and if these regulations were justified on the ground of what is called a protective policy, if it were declared that their sole purpose was to restrict, in the interests of English farmers, the importation of Canadian cattle, irrespective of disease, I do not think we would have any right to protest, because the question of policy is one entirely within the judgment of the imperial government and parliament. But when these restrictions are imposed because of disease said to exist among Canadian cattle, the government and parliament of Canada may well protest in moderate and respectful terms against any such baseless imputation. The government have from time to time made every reasonable effort to bring about a better condition of affairs. The Minister of Agriculture has done all that lay in his power to impress the British government with the necessity for a change, but has so far failed, and there is no reason why the Prime Minister, when he goes to London, should not bring this matter up in connection with others, and be in a position to show that he has the unanimous support of the House of Commons. Such unanimous support will strengthen his hands and perhaps enable him to convince the imperial government of the advisability of taking a different view from that to which they have so strongly adhered hitherto. We accept the motion in the spirit in which the hon. gentleman offers it, and hope it may be productive of much good.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The motion which the hon. gentleman has just submitted is not at all in the language of that of which he gave notice yesterday, and I think it would have been far better for him to have taken a little more time and given the House an opportunity of considering his motion. The motion of which he gave notice yesterday was very different in its language from the one just submitted. It would have been far better, if the hon. gentleman proposed to modify it in the way he has done, to give notice of it and move it to-morrow, instead of giving us, at the conclusion of his speech, a motion which we really have had no time to properly consider, and which we cannot very well consider on the spur of the moment.

Mr. BOURASSA. If the hon. gentleman will allow me—I do not think there is the slightest difference so far as the sense of the motion is concerned. But representation was made to me that by leaving the word 'protest' in the motion, it might be interpreted as indicating a desire on our part to interfere with the sphere of action of the British government and British parliament. And I thought that was right, so I made the change. I think I made it still clearer by basing the motion on the fact that we had given evidence to the British government that there was no more reason to apply the law, and then I added the part about our foreign trade. As to the rest, the hon. gentleman will notice that it is exactly the same language, especially the conclusion as to the advantage the imperial conference will offer to the government in pressing the settlement of this question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the verbal phrasing is concerned, it is a great improvement on that which the hon. gentleman first suggested. For it would be impossible for us, I think, to pass the motion in the shape in which he gave notice of it yesterday. It would be absolutely inappropriate and undignified for this parliament to pass such a resolution as the hon. gentleman told us yesterday he proposed. As to the present motion, I am not wholly satisfied with it, though I sympathize entirely with the object the hon. gentleman has in view. He says:

> Evidence having been furnished to the British authorities proving that there is no justification for the application of the Diseases of Animals Act (Great Britain) to the cattle of Canada.

Are we not saying rather too much when we venture to suggest that? Would it not be better to express our own opinions instead of commenting on evidence furnished to the British authorities and declaring that that evidence proved so and so? My only desire in making this suggestion is to

have the motion pass in such form as will comport in every way with the dignity of this parliament, so that we may not suffer a rebuke for the wording of a resolution which, I trust, will pass the House without a dissenting voice. The mother country has a right to protect her home productions, either cattle or any other, in any way she sees fit. She has given us that right and she certainly can exercise it herself. The points we wish to make are two. In the first place we do not wish to have any imputation cast upon the condition of the cattle in Canada; and, in the next place, we do not wish our cattle to be excluded from the market of the mother country. I think that the Minister of Agriculture has stated in this House both last session and this session that, from his interviews and correspondence with the authorities in the mother country, he is fully satisfied that this measure is not continued for fear of any disease to come in from Canada, but purely as a protective measure to the producers of the mother country. I have gathered that from the Minister of Agriculture's statements in the past. If I am wrong, I hope he will correct me. That being the case, it is not out of place that we should make representation to the mother country such as are covered by the spirit, if not by the words, of this resolution. I would like to point out to my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and also to the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) two considerations. Have they not given some grounds for the continuance of this embargo by the change of the quarantine regulations which prevailed with regard to the entry of cattle from the United States into Canada? Has or has not that point been made, in the negotiations, by the representatives of the mother country? As I understand it, years ago, before this government came into power we had pretty strict regulations regarding the entry of American cattle into Canada. Since then we have admitted these cattle without subjecting them to stringent examination or quarantine, if we subject them to any at all. The result is that there is more danger to the cattle of the mother country from free importation of cattle from Canada than there formerly was. That is one of the considerations which, I think, should be spoken to by the Minister of Agriculture and as to which we should have some information from him. The other consideration is this—if it was known, as I suppose it was, in 1897 and in 1898 that this was a purely protective measure to British industry, why was it that we did not enter into negotiations for the remedying of this grievance at the time we gave the mother country the advantage first of 12½ per cent, afterwards of 25 per cent and still later of 33⅓ per cent in our markets? Did not the Minister of Agriculture realize at the time that this was a protective measure to British producers? Did not the Minister of Finance realize this? If they did not, what new light have they had on the subject since then? And if they did realize it, why was some negotiations not had with the mother country in order to redress what my hon. friend from Labelle and the Minister of Finance consider a very serious grievance so far as this great Canadian industry is concerned? Would that not have been the proper time to consider the matter, instead of waiting for five years and then having a resolution passed which the right hon. gentleman will take home with him and bring to the attention of the British government? If this is a protective measure, it would have been proper and by no means ungracious at the time when we were giving a considerable preference to the products of the mother country, to bring to the attention of the authorities there the fact that this was essentially a protective measure enforced against Canadian cattle entering the mother country and asking that the redress sought by this resolution should be afforded. I think my hon. friend from Labelle was very enthusiastic in support of these measures brought down by the government giving a preference——

Mr. BOURASSA. Not very.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At least, he was sufficiently enthusiastic to support them by his vote. Of course one cannot always perceive the future, but it might have been better if he had brought to the attention of his friends of the cabinet the considerations he has put forward so forcibly in his speech this evening. Now, I have not had time to scan the language of this resolution very carefully. I submit that it should not contain any statement of facts which it is not thoroughly in order for us to make. I am not satisfied that the wording of the first part of the resolution could not be improved. So far as the spirit of the resolution is concerned, and so far as the object with which it is presented to the House is concerned, I can only say that I am thoroughly in accord with it. If I can be satisfied that the language is in all respects proper and in accordance with the dignity of this parliament, I, for one, shall be inclined to give it my support.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The government have done in this case what they could do in the case of any motion in amendment to motion for Committee of Supply, except one of direct censure—they have agreed to accept the motion as not being one of want of confidence. There have been many motions moved in this House in the past having for their object equally praiseworthy aims with this one which the government have called upon their friends to vote down because they were in amendment to a motion to go into Committee of Supply. The government availed themselves of that excuse, and their friends in justification of their position have declared that they did not want to vote

against the government and so voted against the motion. I am glad to know they have given us another example that it is possible to accept motions made on going into supply without regarding them as motions of want of confidence. This motion seeks to make such an impression on the imperial government that they will amend the statute as to admit Canadian cattle without the necessity of their being slaughtered on landing. We enjoyed that privilege before 1896, and we found it of considerable advantage to the farmers of Canada. For reasons best known to the imperial government they amended their regulations and passed an Act of parliament compelling the slaughter of Canadian cattle at the port of landing.

At that time this question was discussed at great length in this House. It was introduced for two or three years in succession by the present Postmaster General, then in opposition, and the government were taken severly to task as being responsible for bringing about this embargo on Canadian cattle. His contention was that the embargo was due to the fact that the regulations which we had made for transporting American cattle through Canada were laxly enforced, and the British people came to the conclusion that the disease could not be kept out from the United States, and therefore the embargo was put on. The Postmaster General, then representing North York, read a great deal of correspondence that took place between Sir Hector Langevin, a member of the Conservative government in Canada, and the home authorities, regarding this question, and he gave us a recital of the contract that was entered into between Canada and the mother country to ensure the freedom of Canada from importation of diseased cattle. In the first place the quarantine regulations provided that no animals could be imported unless they were detained at the frontier for ninety days so as to satisfy the people of this country that they were not in any way diseased. In the next place application was made to allow the Grand Trunk Railway and the Great Western Railway to carry American cattle through Canada on condition that they were accompanied by an agent on each train, that they should not be allowed off the train except at a quarantine station for the purpose of feeding, at which time the cars were to be run into an inclosure surrounded by a double board fence so there could be no possibility of the cattle in the neighbourhood coming in contact with them. After they were fed they were to be reloaded and passed through the country. All cars carrying cattle were to be disinfected before they were used for any other purpose. The cattle were to be inspected at the boundary line. It was afterwards found that the railway companies desired that the cattle should be inspected immediately upon landing. At first the cattle were inspected in daylight only, but afterwards it was contended that the inspection could be made equally well at night if proper provision was made for lighting and so forth. The railway companies agreed to provide these facilities, and the inspection was made at night, and the business went on. Now, the whole contention of the hon. member for North York and of those who supported him, was that these regulations were not enforced as strictly as they should be on the part of the Canadian government. An endeavour was made to show how much Canada lost by it. It was stated that had the regulations been strictly carried out the embargo would never have been put on. The opposition concurred in those views, and the government were severely brought to task for negligence in carrying out those regulations.

Well, time went on, and there was a change of government. After the present government came into power they gave the country to understand that they would attempt to get this embargo removed. What was the first thing they did to that end? It was to do away with the quarantine regulations providing that cattle coming from the United States should be detained for ninety days to show they were not diseased. That was one of the first requirements to convince the English people that there was no possibility of the disease being imported into Canada, and that requirement was abolished. Then the restrictions which surrounded the transportation of cattle through Canada were relaxed, and we have practically none to-day. Yet the Minister of Agriculture goes over to England and asks that this embargo be removed, after doing away with all the restrictions and precautions that were held to be so necessary by the English people to prevent the importation of disease from the United States, where it was known occasionally to exist. If the arguments that were then advanced against the government for not carrying out our agreement faithfully were of any weight then they have ten times more force against the present government. The present government have done the very thing that they should not have done, and they have left undone the very thing that they ought to have done to convince the British people that there was no danger in importing cattle from Canada into the British market. We were told in 1896 that the reason for this embargo being put on was laxity of enforcement of the regulations. But we find there was another reason.

I have here a report of a conference of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture and Associated Societies held in Edinburgh, on October 9th 1901. This conference took place with the Minister of Agriculture, and the desire of those associate societies was to get this embargo removed. In his reply he did'nt say the embargo was exactly due to the fact that he was afraid of the importation of the disease from Canada, be-

cause he admitted that it had been clearly demonstrated to the Minister of Agriculture as well as to the British parliament, that no pleuro-pneumonia had existed in Canada for a length of time ; and he said that was not the only cause of this Act being passed. But he said an effort to remove the Act would be unsuccessful for certain reasons. What were those reasons ? He explains what they were :

Then there is another idea abroad, that only Canada suffers, and that only Canadian cattle are effected by the present Act. But of course that is not the case. It applies to live animals all over the world, and in that respect Canada is exactly on the same footing as any other country. Oh but, it is said, Canada is the only country where there is no disease, and therefore you should treat Canada specially. But that is not the case. The United States claim equally with Canada to be absolutely free from disease, and the fact is that we cannot differentiate between Canada and other countries. Once any other country shows, what is no doubt very difficult to prove, that it has a clean bill of health, you cannot stop at Canada. You would have to make an alteration in the law to affect every country that could supply us with store cattle.

And why can you not stop at Canada ? He goes on to say why ?

One gentleman talked about undoing, not only the Act of 1896, but also any other arrangement made for putting all other nations on the same footing as Canada. You cannot do it. You cannot revise your treaties at a moment's notice ; and it is under treaties with other countries that we are obliged to afford to them exactly the same treatment as to Canada.

It is a wonder that our government never thought of that when they gave the magnificent concession to the British government of a preference on the importation of their goods. They were allowed a concession which was not granted to other countries. They were allowed a special consideration in our market and nothing was asked in return. Would it not have been an opportune time to have said to them : We give you a consideration which we give to no other country in the world. We give you a special consideration in our market. Is it not proper for us to ask you to give us a consideration which you say cannot be done unless you give it to all other countries ? Would it not be proper for us to ask you to cancel these treaties so as to enable you to give us a consideration which will be equal to the consideration which we give you ? We know that the government made no effort in that direction. They were perfectly indifferent in regard to it because there was not a word said about it. If the British government were right in their contention in 1896 that it was because of the laxity of quarantine regulations and because of the enforcement of other regulations which permitted the carrying of American cattle through Canada, and if this laxity was responsible for the adoption of the embargo, I would remind the House that there are no regulations now at all. If the embargo was due to these causes before how can you expect, having removed these restrictions as to quarantine, without providing other regulations, to convince the English people that there is no danger of the possibility of the importation of disease ? We have succeeded in convincing them that there is no disease in the country. Then, we want to take a step further and convince them that under our quarantine and other regulations there is no possibility of the importation of it. We have not been able to do that, and the government have not addresed themselves to that phase of the question. They seem to be perfectly indifferent to it. I think so long as our quarantine regulations remain as they are, it is almost useless to pass such a resolution as this, because the English people can answer at once by saying that there is nothing to prevent the importation of disease from the United States into Canada where they have had occasional outbreaks of pleuro-pneumonia in that country. They would say : As long as your regulations remain as they are we shall consider it unwise to amend the law which prohibits your cattle from being imported into our country without being slaughtered at the port where they land. Last summer when the hon. Minister of Agriculture was home, when he incidentally mentioned that question and intimated the importance it would be to Canada to have the embargo removed, he did not make the effort he should have done to have it removed. He did not seem to go about it in a business way, in a way to convince the British people that there was no danger of the importation of disease by the admission of Canadian cattle, and that we thought we should have some consideration for what we have done for them. It is all generosity on one side and all laxity on the other side, for while he boasted of giving a preference to the English people, he never took the slightest interest in asking them in consideration of that preference to do something in return, and give us a preference that they were not prepared to give to the United States or any other country in the world.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). In consequence of what the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has said in regard to this matter, I think it would be well for me to make one or two slight explanations. In the first place, I would say in regard to the wording of the motion, that while I did not see it until this evening, I take no exception to it in its general terms or to the statements of fact, which are there declared. The motion says that :

Evidence having been furnished to the British authorities proving that there is no justifica-

tion for the application of the Diseases of Animals Act (Great Britain), to the cattle of Canada, &c.

I have no hesitation in endorsing that statement. The evidence was so completely submitted to the Minister of Agriculture in England, the Hon. Mr. Hanbury, that he first, privately, to myself, when I was interviewing him, acknowledged that there was no disease amongst our animals in Canada against which the provisions of this Act ought to be entorced. When I suggested to him that it would be well to make that statement publicly he shortly afterwards, in an interview, which the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has just been alluding to, made that statement publicly, saying in answer to the assembly of the associations in Edinburgh that he believed to-day that in Canada there was no contagious disease such as they feared the introduction of into England. We therefore say that the evidence has been supplied to Great Britain to show that there is no justification for the application of this Act as against Canadian cattle. Since I have spoken of the interview at Edinburgh, I would refer to the fact that the hon. member for East Grey has quoted Mr. Hanbury's statement about the favoured-nation clause. He seems to think that this favoured-nation clause would interfere with any application of the Diseases of Animals Act. The two things have nothing whatever to do with each other. The favoured-nation clause applies simply to customs duties and has no reference whatever and does not in any way interfere with the application of Animals Diseases Act or of its relaxation. That was brought to Mr. Hanbury's attention shortly afterwards by myself through Lord Strathcona and an officer of his department wrote acknowledging that Mr. Hanbury had made a mistake in making that reference to the favoured-nation clause, because it had nothing to do with this matter at all. As far as this motion is concerned, I have already stated on more than one occasion that I believe the people of Canada are unanimous in regard to this matter. I believe that everybody in Canada who has given the slightest attention to this question of the embargo on our cattle is fully convinced, in the first place, that no disease exists in this country, and, in the second place, that it was not necessary for the protection of the herds in Great Britain. I feel that the parliament and government of Canada can approach the imperial authorities on this question with the greatest force and strength. The line which is proposed by this resolution is exactly the line I took myself last year in Great Britain. It is following up with greater force the line which I took then, having a formal resolution of the Canadian parliament at its back, and with greater force because the representations would be made, not by the Minister of Agriculture of Canada, but by the Prime Minister of Canada, acting in his capacity as the plenipotentiary of this country at the imperial conference. I think it is well this resolution should be passed, that this enforcement and strength should be given to the Prime Minister of this country when he goes as the plenipotentiary of Canada to the imperial conference in London, and when he will be able to take the position which is here taken. There are one or two other matters which I would like to allude to. I feel no hesitation in asking this of the British authorities, because I am satisfied that in asking it we are not asking anything which will, in the slightest degree, hurt Great Britain. I do not wish to ask a favour from the mother country which she might think would hurt her people, but in this case we are asking something which will not only not hurt her, but which will really help her. It is a well known fact that the cattle-raisers of Great Britain do not wish to have Canadian stockers freely imported into the interior of the country, but it is also a well known fact that a very large number of farmers in Great Britain who are feeders of cattle and who buy stockers for the purpose of feeding them are very anxious that there should be Canadian stockers available for purchase. We also know that butchers in the large centres of Great Britain would be glad to have either our stockers or fat cattle permitted to be imported into the interior of the country, there to be slaughtered whenever it was thought best for them to be slaughtered.

They appreciate the fact that these animals, when they land at the six ports in Great Britain which are open to them, have to be slaughtered within eight days after their arrival whatever their condition may be. It not unfrequently happens that Canadian cattle, as well as American and Argentine cattle arrive in Great Britain, and are taken to the lairages after a tempestuous voyage, sometimes severely injured, it would of course be a great deal better in the interest of the food of the people, if these animals could be turned out on pasture and fed for a while before being slaughtered. The butchers of Manchester, Birmingham, Wolverhampton and the inland cities where there are no lairages are all very keen to have Canadian cattle permitted to enter the country free.

My hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) has alluded to the quarantine between Canada and the United States. I have here the representations that were made last spring to the imperial authorities in a formal despatch from the government of Canada to the government of Great Britain. It is distinctly stated in that dispatch that the quarantine of 90 days beween Canada and the United States had been removed in 1897, and it is clearly outlined why it was removed, and the well known fact is mentioned that in the United States for nearly ten

years, there never has been a single case of pleuro-pneumonia. It is stated that in consequence of the fact that in the United States this disease is unknown, and that the American people were fully convinced that this disease was not in existence and never had been in existence in Canada, the authorities of the two countries felt themselves justified in removing that 90 days quarantine. I have also here the answer of the imperial government to that memorandum, and in that answer there is not the slightest reference made to the removal of the quarantine between Canada and the United States. That fact is not given as an excuse in any shape or way for refusing to remove the embargo against our cattle. It was not considered to be a thing which entered into the argument at all, and I venture to think that if it were one of the chief reasons why the imperial authorities declined to remove the embargo as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) contends, the imperial authorities would have put it forward as a reason in their reply to our memorandum.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not say that so much, as I showed that the contentions of the friends of the Minister of Agriculture in 1896 were absurd, because if when the quarantine regulations were restricted it was sufficient to induce the British government to put on the embargo ; it would be unlikely they would remove the embargo when there was no quarantine.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was not in the House in 1896, but I watched the discussion pretty closely, and the contention then was that animals had come across the frontier and had been exported from Canada to England, in which the disease was found. We contended that these animals were not afflicted with pleuro-pneumonia and I think that was pretty fairly proven at the time. Sir Charles Tupper very clearly argued that then, and he thought he had proved it pretty conclusively. But if there was any danger at that time from animals coming through here, since then pleuro-pneumonia has ceased to exist in the United States. I do not remember the year in which these animals were supposed to be diseased.

Mr. SPROULE. 1892.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes. As a matter of fact in 1897, when the quarantine between Canada and the United States was removed, it was clearly shown to me by the Bureau of Animal Industries in Washington, that in the United States there had been no known case of pleuro-pneumonia for four years before 1897. As a matter of fact there were a few isolated cases in the United States in 1892, but from that to the present day there has not been known to be a single case of pleuro-pneumonia in the United States or in fact on the North American continent. I can say this of our neighbours in the United States ; that they have to-day a very complete organization in their Bureau of Animal Industries in Washington for the supervision and control of contagious diseases of animals, which they are working from Washington all over the Union. Under these circumstances I feel that there is not the slightest reason for the imperial authorities maintaining the embargo because of any danger of pleuro-pneumonia coming from Canada or the United States. But I wish to point out, that if the imperial authorities are willing to remove the embargo and make it a condition that we should put the quarantine against the United States, we are perfectly free to do so to-morrow. We are free to do just as we find most conducive to our own profit and advantage. We have removed the quarantine between us and the United States by Order in Council, and we are free to impose it again by Order in Council any day, just as the Americans are free to impose the 90 day quarantine against us any time by an Order of their Department at Washington. If any difficulty might arise from that, we are perfectly free and they are perfectly free to take whatever course we believe to be in the best interest of our own people. Therefore the argument based on that falls to the ground. I would like to add that I am perfectly satisfied that the imperial authorities appreciate and understand that there is no cattle disease in Canada. The reason which Mr. Hanbury gave to me, and gave to the people of England who interviewed him for the continuance of the embargo is : That he believed it better, in the interest of the trade, to have a fixed statute rather than to have a regulation which might be changed from time to time. It is an ingenious reason and it is put forward pretty plausibly. I confess that it does not appeal to me at all strongly, and I think that it does not appeal to a very large number of people in England. He has receded entirely from the position that he was maintaining that embargo as against disease in Canada. I may say to my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, that I do not think that I said anything which would indicate that Mr. Hanbury or any one over there acknowledge that they were doing this because of protection to their cattle industry, or from a protective point of view, as we understand protection in Canada. Neither Mr. Hanbury nor Mr. Chamberlain nor any one I came into contact with, would acknowledge that. Whatever may have been their thoughts or whatever might have been the conclusion we might draw from their action, they have never acknowledged that they were doing this for the purpose for what we call protection in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I said was that the Minister of Agriculture himself had stated that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think I ever stated that. I am certain that I have never stated that, but I have stated this : That I was led to believe myself from their action that they had some such reason for doing it. But I never said that Mr. Hanbury or Mr. Chamberlain acknowledged it, because when I rather taxed them with it they distinctly disclaimed it and refused to acknowledge for a moment that they did this out of a protective spirit.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). All I said was : That the hon. gentleman himself had stated that he was satisfied that the real reason they retained the embargo was because of protection to the British producers.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think I have stated that, but I understood the hon. gentleman to say that I said that they had acknowledged this in England.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad I misunderstood the hon. gentleman, because I would not wish that impression to get abroad.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Gill says in his speech before Mr. Hanbury :

The real question is that it is a battle between free trade and protection.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Oh yes, some of the people in England have said so, but no official and no one in any responsible position has acknowledged to me, or acknowledged so far as I know, that that is the case. I think myself there is a possibility, on such an occasion as the imperial conference between Great Britain and the colonies, of general questions of commerce and trade between the different parts of the empire being taken up ; and I think that is a fitting occasion on which to discuss this question—to approach it on a broad and imperial ground. I think therefore it is well that the Prime Minister should do that, and it is certainly better that he should do it endorsed and supported by a resolution of the House of Commons, which would show that the representatives of the people of Canada feel strongly on this matter, and are unanimous in their opinion in regard to it.

Amendment agreed to.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (South Leeds). I understand that a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee has been called for Tuesday, and Mr. Kemp, who has left for home, wished to ask the Minister of Public Works to have sent to the clerk of the committee the papers, vouchers and correspondence in his office in connection with the question regarding Mr. Boudreau. There was a resolution passed calling for the vouchers and documents which are in the Public Works Department. Mr. Kemp also wrote a letter to the minister a day or two ago about them, but they are not down yet.

Main motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Prince Edward Island Railway, $510,650.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. On the last day that we were discussing these estimates, I was asked to state to the committee what was the departmental estimate of the total cost of the works in contemplation at Sydney. I am able to do that now. The total cost is estimated in round figures at $400,000. We have already appropriated and partly expended $314,000 of this amount. I was asked also with regard to Lévis. Our estimate of the expenditure there, covering the whole period from 1896 down to the present moment, is $340,000, and we require, in addition to the estimates placed on the table, $60,000 in round figures. I do not know that I was asked as to the expenditure at Stellarton, but whether I was asked or not, I have a statement showing that the total expenditure contemplated there amounts to $116,000. Our appropriation for last year was $20,000, of which we have expended, from the 1st of July, 1901, to the 31st of March, 1902, $10,000 in round numbers, which leaves $9,623.49 of that appropriation yet to be paid out. There is about $80,000 yet required to complete the works, but we are not asking for that amount at present. We are proposing to complete the scheme as speedily as we can, according to the plans that have been laid down. I was asked how much of the appropriation of $15,000 for works at Rivière du Loup was for grading and how much for land. Our estimate of the grading is $9,000, which would leave $6,000 for the land. We have not yet made any arrangements for the land or approached the persons who own it, but our officers estimate that that amount will suffice. The total expenditure at Point Tupper is estimated at $113,000 in round figures.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood from the minister that the Hillsboro' bridge is to cost $1,200,000, that to complete the branch to Murray harbour it will cost $1,400,000, and that $200,000 is the cost of extra locomotives on the Prince Edward Island road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that cover all the contemplated expenditure on capital account on the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When do you expect to have it completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In two or three years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the hon. gentleman furnish us with the amount of track already laid on the Intercolonial Railway with the new steel rails of the heavier weight per yard. How much of it is completed and how much remains to be completed ? What will be the cost of the contemplated improvements on the Intercolonial Railway altogether and when they will be completed ? Will the hon. minister bring this information down when we are next on the items of the Intercolonial Railway.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will ask the officers of the department to furnish that information and see that it will be available when we take up the first item in supplementary estimates. I may say now that we laid last year 124½ miles of the new and heavier rails. This year we have laid some 64 or 65 miles, and expect to lay about 40 miles or 50 miles more before the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to make a remark or two in connection with the Murray Harbour and some other railway matters in Prince Edward Island. Any remarks which I may make need not be considered as adverse criticism of the money vote, because that vote is necessary, and the complaint I am making is that there is not sufficient money expended on the Prince Edward Island Railway. This Murray Harbour branch was contemplated many years ago. When the Prince Edward Island Railway was built in 1872-3, this section of country lying south of Hillsborough was left without any railway accommodation. Since then the people have been clamouring for this accommodation, and it is only lately that their request has been granted. This railway runs through an extensive area of country lying south of Hillsboro, some 30 or 40 miles away from any railway communication. The country is an agricultural one, settled by people who are frugal, industrious and honest, and as they have been contributing to the building of railways all over Canada, it is only right that they should receive some consideration. And though this amount may appear large for the building of the railway and the completion of a bridge across the Hillsborough, it is not anything too great in the interests of the people. This branch of railway extends from Southport to Murray Harbour, having a bridge across the Hillsborough to which the people of Prince Edward Island are obliged to contribute. It will become an important feeder of the Prince Edward Island Railway and eventually assist in largely reducing the deficit on that line. There are also other branches contemplated, and I want to call attention to the branch line in West Prince, which was also part of the scheme of building feeders for the purpose of assisting to develop the main line. I refer to the branch line at or near O'Leary station, on the west shore of Prince Edward Island, a distance of some 12 or 15 miles from the main line. The people living in that section have neither harbours nor wharfs nor any facilities for shipping their produce, and are obliged to haul their stuff a distance of 15 miles or so over pretty bad roads. Last year I brought the matter up before the hon. minister, and he said he could not have a survey or an estimate made of the cost of building the line then but he hoped at a future day to be able to obtain these. I hope that this year he will see that a survey is made between O'Leary and the western shore of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between O'Leary and Cape Wolfe.

Mr. HACKETT. I am glad to see that the miniser understands the situation. The building of that branch will prove not only a feeder to the main line but be a great benefit to the farmers and fishermen on that section of the coast.

I want also to call attention to the fact that Cape Wolfe is only about 20 miles distance from the shores of New Brunswick at Richibucto in the county of Kent. From Richibucto to the Intercolonial Railway there is a line of railway known as the Kent Northern Railway, which is controlled by Mr. Brown, at Richibucto. If this branch were built to the west coast, there is commercial enterprise enough in that section of the country to place on a small steamer to open up communication with Richibucto, which is distant 15 miles, and communicates directly with the Kent Northern Railway and the Intercolonial Railway. This would develop trade there and afford greater facilities to the people. The people in the western end of Prince Edward Island have to go all around to the eastern part before they can ship their produce. This railway would very much lessen the distance, and prove of great advantage to the people. I trust the minister will order a survey and an estimate to be made, and I hope that on some future occasion we will find a sum in the estimates to build, this branch line, which is so necessary to the people.

We know that in these days of progress more rapid transportation facilities are required, and the people who have not got these are absolutely out of the race. In the western part of the island, from Summerside to Tignish, in the summer season, for about eight months, we have two trains a day running in that section. During the winter season one train is taken off, and the people are obliged to put up with the accommodation afforded by that one train per day. Realizing the difficulties under which they labour, a large meeting of the electors of West Prince was held in the village of Tignish last November for the purpose of discussing the matter. It was largely attended by the leading men of the district,

including four or five members of the local legislature and the Hon. Senator Yeo and other gentlemen of standing. At this meeting the following resolution was passed. And, if it would strengthen my claim at all I would tell the hon. minister that these gentlemen are strong Liberals and have always been so. One of them, the mover, is a member of the firm of J. H. Myrick & Co., and one of the greatest patrons of the railway, and the seconder is Rev. D. M. Macdonald, who has been for thirty years parish priest of Tignish and that part of the country. The resolution is as follows :

Whereas the train accommodation accorded to West Prince is altogether inadequate to the needs of country, and little if any improvement on that afforded at the opening of the road quarter of a century ago.

And whereas one single train per day for this large and prosperous section of country is in nowise calculated to engender traffic for the road itself, since traffic only follows proper facilities.

And whereas, much if not all the enormous expense of keeping the road free from blockades would certainly be saved by operating two trains in winter ;—

Therefore resolved, that this mass meeting of the electors of West Prince, do hereby urge upon the Minister of Railways, Hon. A. G. Blair, the necessity of running two trains in winter as well as summer over this best paying section of our railway ; and further resolved that the representatives in the Senate and House of Commons be requested to urge upon the Railway Department of Canada, until granted, these altogether necessary improvements.

This resolution was unanimously passed at this large and representative meeting of the electors of all shades of politics in West Prince. The meeting also appointed a committee composed of Rev. A. E. Burk, Mr. McFayden and Capt. Reid, M.L.A., to wait upon the manager of the railway at Moncton and also to see the minister himself with regard to this accommodation. These gentlemen, at great personal expense and at a busy part of the season, did see the manager at Moncton, and I understand also that some of them saw the minister. We expected that as a result we would have last winter this second train per day. Nothing was done. However, the second train was placed on the route a little earlier this year than last year—the 14th of April, as against the 14th of May last year—but the spring has been a month in advance of last year. The minister knows that we have the two trains for eight months in the year, and surely he will see that for the accommodation of the people west of Summerside—some of them sixty-eight miles from Summerside—the two trains a day should be kept on for the other four months of the year. I trust the hon. minister will give the matter his favourable consideration and that he will find himself in a position to say to me this evening that we are to have the two trains a day.

Mr. HACKETT.

Another improvement that is needed on the Prince Edward Island Railway is a new station at Alberton. The minister referred to this yesterday, and said that some day in the future it would actually be required. The station buildings at Alberton, Charlottetown and Georgetown—he provides for a station at Georgetown in the estimates which we discussed last night—are three of the old stations erected by the contractors when they built the railway nearly thirty years ago. They may have been considered first-class buildings at that time. They are not only old, but they are antiquated, out of date. The building at Alberton especially is rapidly going out of repair. The hon. minister will remember there is a 'Y' at the station. If he does not recollect it, the deputy minister and chief engineer, who built the railway and knows all about it, will be able to inform him. The train coming from east or west, is obliged to back up a quarter of a mile or so to take the main line, a matter which involves not merely delay, but also danger to the trainmen and passengers. I trust that when the hon. minister builds the new station, which I hope he will do soon, he will do away with this 'Y' nuisance. I shall be very glad if the hon. minister can give me an answer this evening with regard to these matters.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure the hon. member (Mr. Hackett) that it is not because I have not had the importance of these subjects very urgently pressed upon me that attentions had not been given them before this, and that parliament has not been asked to give us money wherewith to make the improvements. I refer now particularly to the improvements at Alberton, Charlottetown and other points on the main line. I am fully aware of the need of a good deal being done, but we are making such a large outlay with respect to the Hillsborough branch railway that I have not felt that I should be quite justified in taking up these works to the extent we might do if we had not so large an undertaking on our hands. I sympathize fully with the view the hon. gentleman presents, and, for my part, would be well disposed to go as far as it is possible to go in order to meet his views. I have been pressed by other representatives from the island in the same direction, but have been obliged to say to them what I am compelled to say to the hon. gentleman to-night that, they must exercise some patience until a more favourable opportunity offers for taking these things up properly. As to the matter of the train, I think that possibly something might have been done last winter towards establishing a second train during the winter but for a variety of causes. It was late in the season when it was taken up, and then the question was somewhat complicated by the proposal to establish connection be-

tween Cape Tormentine on the New Brunswick side at the end of the Cape Tormentine Railway and the Prince Edward Island road on the other. Efforts were being made in that direction, and, until we knew just how they would develop, I was advised by the officers of the line, the final conclusion to run these trains as proposed, perhaps, had better not be pushed. While it was late in the summer season it was very early in what is called the winter season. Then circumstances personal to myself arose which really prevented me for quite a time from giving any attention at all to the subject. And so the season went by. I am only desirous, and, even at some cost to the country I would be willing to give to the people on the island a reasonably good service. I think they are entitled to it, and I sympathize very fully with their wishes in that direction. I do not think I can say more at this moment. I do not think it would further the object in any way for me to make a more definite statement. The hon. gentleman will have to be content with the expression of my desire to go as far as I possibly can, consistently with all the considerations that affect the question, in meeting the wishes of the people with respect to these trains.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to the second train, I am satisfied to let the matter rest with the minister, and I presume he will do right by the people of that section of the country. I would like to ask what the intention is with regard to the branch line from O'Leary to the west shore ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That subject, though it has not been brought prominently before me, has been debated a good deal in connection with the Kent Northern Railway. Those who are interested in the Kent Northern Railway have in the public press and various other ways been urging it as a desirable road at all events in the summer season and to some extent in the winter for persons who wish to reach the island from the west in a most expeditious way. It would make a quicker and in some sense a closer connection than they now get by either Point du Chêne or Cape Tormentine. But it has not been really urged upon my attention as an urgent question. I would not like to encourage the hon. gentleman to expect that, while we have in hand this Hillsborough undertaking, we would be likely to take up the branch line that he spoke of to Cape Wolfe. I think that will have to remain pending for a time. No doubt it has much to recommend it ; but at present I am not able to express a decided opinion upon it.

Sault Ste Marie canal—To deepen and widen entrances, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to continue the work of deepening and widening the entrance of the Sault Ste Marie Canal. I think it is generally known that we are at a disadvantage as compared with the entrance to the canal on the American side. We have but an inch or two of 18 feet at best, and some serious accidents have occurred. We desire to place our canal upon an equally satisfactory footing with that of our neighbours. The entrance to the lock on the American side is 22 feet, and we would not like to have anything less than that. I am proposing to carry that work on until we have a sufficient entrance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will it cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost for both the upper and lower entrance is in the neighbourhood of $450,000. The lower entrance will cost in the neighbourhood of $140,000 to $150,000, and the upper entrance in the neighbourhood of $300,000. We have not commenced the upper entrance yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman know what he is paying per yard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy minister tells me we are paying $2.95 per yard. It is a mixture of loose rock and earth.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was this by tender and contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Would the department be able to furnish what quantity of it is rock and what is clay, so that we may be able to see whether the price is correct ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is reasonable. I will let the hon. gentleman know whether the information is available.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It ought to be available, because the department ought not to let the contract without knowing that. Would the hon. gentleman tell me what is the average height of water on the mitre sill of the lock now, and whether the water of lake Superior is lowering or rising at Sault Ste Marie ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy states there has been no perceptible fall in the water, if anything it is a little higher. The height is now 20 feet and 3 inches.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In order to make that available to navigation it would need to be a couple of feet more in the prism.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the prism is all right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But there is a prism on the bottom from the lock down, and that ought to be at least 22 feet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what we propose to make it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who are the contractors ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Bowman is the contractor.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Were there many tenders ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were three, this was the lowest.

Mr. SPROULE. When will this be completed ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The lower entrance is completed now, the upper entrance has not been commenced.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose that is virtually to provide accommodation to the people of Sault Ste Marie. If I understood rightly, the contract was made with Mr. Ryan to have the whole of it excavated as far as the American channel, and this money you are expending now is to reach the wharf in the town.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, this is the main entrance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But you say the principal part of this vote is below the lock ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To the lower entrance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood that under the old contract that was provided for, but that there was not sufficient depth to allow vessels coming through the canal to go to the wharf in the town, and that large expenditure was necessary.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is not the fact. There is only 18 feet and 6 inches provided for in the Ryan contract, and also for the general purposes of the canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps it is under the Public Works Department that they are doing this excavation at the town.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it is. We are not doing it.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. minister aware whether the Canadian Pacific Railway boats use this canal or not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think they do. There is a question of coal that arises which may perhaps tend to divert a certain portion of the traffic. I think they use it occasionally.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard it contended that it was owing to the privilege they have of coaling on the American side providing they use the American canal, but I have also heard it contended that it was owing to the unsuitability of the canal for boats to pass through. It would be a matter of importance to know whether or not that is a fact, and if it is a fact it would be much better that the canal should be finished at the earliest possible date.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am given to understand that there is nothing in the suggestion.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the statement of the hon. minister is quite correct as to the coaling privilege which vessels receive on the American side ; in other words, that by touching there they are enabled to coal up without paying duty. Persons who are conversant with the names of some of the larger craft on the upper lakes will notice that many of these American boats go through the Canadian lock and there is no question as to the superiority of the Canadian lock as compared with the American lock. It is always a startling thing to people who recognize the names of the larger American vessels to see how many of them pass through the Canadian lock. The fact that vessels go through the American lock is not a question of the superiority of that lock but it is entirely due to the fact, as I have been time and again informed by vessel men that they desire to avoid the high price of coal on the Canadian side.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is as I understand it.

Trent canal—construction (revote, $300,000), $300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a revote out of the appropriation of last year. We are not expecting to spend more than $315,000 and we are asking that the balance of the unexpended vote of last year be authorized this year.

Mr. BENNETT. I think that the ridings or counties that are abutting on this system of navigation, commonly known as the Trent Valley canal, can hardly find fault with the government for the manner in which they are treating them. Commencing with the year 1896 and down to 1901 there have been very considerable expenditures in connection with the works, running from $400,000 in 1896 to $486,575 in 1897, and amounting to $284,503 in 1901. The work has therefore been pushed with much more vigour within these past five or six years than heretofore. In connection with this work I am sure that if the general public knew the importance of it more attention would be paid to it. Let me tell the committee and the hon. minister that at the town of Peterborough there is being erected now a very large industry that is entirely due to the presence of this system of navigation. I refer to what is known as a factory for the manufacture of cereal foods in which

some Americans are investing an immense amount of money, and I was told yesterday that they intend to start in a few months with a daily consumption of at least 20,000 bushels of grain, so that the extent of the business may be realized. It is intended at this factory to manufacture these so-called prepared foods not only for consumption in Canada but for export to the old country. I was assured by a gentleman in Peterborough the other day that it was likely, that, if the canal had been an accomplished fact to Lake Ontario, they would have secured a very large iron industry a little time ago. I must congratulate the ministry on the fact that they have pressed this work forward and that they have accomplished a considerable amount within the past few years, but while this has been going on there are some sections of the work which, I think, call for some explanation as to why they have not progressed faster. Let me call attention to the construction of the lock a little below the town of Peterborough which I am pleased to say I saw a few weeks ago and which is really a wonderful work. I see by reference to the report of the hon. minister the following statement in regard to this work.

> Section No. 2, Peterborough—Lakefield division. The contract for this section was awarded to Messrs. Corry & Laverdure, on May 21, 1896, and the time for completion was fixed by this contract on November 1, 1897.

Here we are in 1902 and while, of course, a large amount of work has been done, that contract is not finished. I would like to know when that lock will be completed and in running order. The completion of that lock means that from a distance above Fenelon Falls there will be, for 20 miles at least, a stretch of clear water to the town of Peterborough, and yet it is impossible for that long stretch to be utilized until this lock is completed ; not only from there but all the way down to Hastings on the eastern end. Yet, in this report it would seem that the completion of that part of the work was called for on the 1st of November, 1897, and is still in an uncompleted state. Can the hon. minister inform us when the lock below Peterborough will be completed which is covered by the Corry & Laverdure contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A great deal of the delay has been due to the non-execution of the contract for the steel work of the structure. True, the masonry contract has not been carried out very rapidly, but I think it would have been done more quickly if we had felt any confidence that we could have got the steel portion of the structure completed and in shape to erect. I think it is some two years ago since we made the contract and I do not know that we can look with very much confidence to having the steel for the structure ready before next year.

Mr. BENNETT. The report contains the following reference to the hydraulic lock contract :

> The contract for the steel work in connection with the hydraulic lock was awarded to the Dominion Bridge Company. The date in the contract calling for the completion of this work way May, 1900, but owing to the concrete work nor the press wells not being completed it was impossible to commence the erection of the steel work.

By the report it would seem that the steel work was to have been completed by May, 1900, and yet we are two years past it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the hon. minister state approximately when it is expected that the hydraulic lock will be in working order ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not think before next year. We will hardly get it finished during the fiscal year for which we are now asking an appropriation. The best we can hope is at the end of next year.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand that there is to be an hydraulic lock at the end of what is called the Balsam lake section ? How is that work progressing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The work is progressing fairly well. I think it is very near completion as far as the ditching is concerned.

Mr. BENNETT. I mean as to the lock at Kirkwood—not the section below.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We expect the concrete work to be finished this summer. Larkin & Sangster are the contractors and they are getting on very well.

Mr. BENNETT. The report does not state when Love & Aylmer's contract is to be completed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The deputy cannot inform me at the moment, but I will give the information later.

Mr. BENNETT. I would judge from my observations in passing there that the contractors are pushing the work with commendable vigour. The Grand Trunk Railway Company are at present raising the track to obviate the necessity of a swing bridge. As to the general work I hope the Minister will require these contractors to press their different contracts to a completion at the earliest possible date. The possibilities of this canal open up a new field of thought. It was looked upon for many years as being of a local character, but it is now demonstrated that it may be used extensively for the transportation of grain. I may tell the House that I know

from conversation with the owners of a large elevator at Midland with a capacity of a million and a quarter bushels, that they might have built their elevator at Buffalo, but that one strong reason that prompted them to come to Midland was that when this canal was constructed it would be a competitor for the transportation of grain, and that it would hold the railway rates in check. I strongly urge the minister that he should press vigorously the work between Balsam Lake and Lake Simcoe, and as soon as possible let the contract for the section on the Georgian Bay.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have Corry & Laverdure completed their contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not yet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understood they had a claim against the government which was left to arbitration, and that the arbitrators have made an award against the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They had a claim in the neighbourhood of between $320,000 and $330,000 and while the deputy minister could not certify the amount which they claimed or for any amount which would be accepted by them as reasonably satisfactory, we adopted the expedient of having the matter adjusted by selecting reputable and competent engineers who would advise the chief engineer on the subject. It was not an arbitration in the ordinary sense, but it was an advisory board of three engineers who would go upon the work and examine it and state what in their judgment would be a fair allowance to make in respect to the claim. We selected Mr. Hobson and Mr. Surtees, and they suggested Mr. Brophy of the Public Works Department. We thought it would be impossible to have made the choice of any three men who would inspire more confidence or be better qualified to pass upon the question. They went into the subject very faithfully; some items they rejected, with respect to others they made recommendation to the chief engineer, and as a result the claim is practically settled on the basis of an allowance of $126,000. I need not say that result was very unsatisfactory to the claimants.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was the principle item of dispute as to quantities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. It was as to the prices. The work was of a unique character. We could not foresee what was required to be done. It is the first hydraulic lock that has been constructed in America, and I think there are only two or three anywhere. When I was in the old country I went to Brussels to see one of these locks, but our lock is on a much larger scale than that. We sent Mr. Rodgers there to examine it, and yet conditions arose which no past experience enabled us to grapple with. There were difficulties in connection with the prosecution of the work which led to differences of opinion between the officers of the department and the contractors, which had to be settled in some way, and which it will be admitted, I think, were settled in as satisfactory a way as possible. Even a resort to courts would not, I think, be as satisfactory or as advisable.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the council approved of the award?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not yet. It is still open. The stage to which the matter has progressed is this. The recommendation has been received from these gentlemen by the chief engineer, but it has not yet been followed up. It came in since the session opened, and we have not had time to enter into it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the chief engineer of the department mentioned his opinion or pledged himself according to the recommendation of these three engineers?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. It happened that they all three agreed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the chief engineer given his certificate yet?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All I can say is that it is a most extraordinary proceeding. The Exchequer Court was formed for the purpose of settling these difficulties. By the contract the chief engineer is the judge as to the quantities and the work, and upon his certificate the amounts are paid. Then, a board of engineers is appointed, for what purpose? To inform the chief engineer what he ought to know himself, and the other engineers on the work, and they recommend that he shall give a certificate for certain prices and certain quantities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no question about the quantities.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The prices surely are fixed by the contract. There could be no difficulty at all with the chief engineer nor with the engineers in charge of the work, and I suppose there was not any. They certified as to the amount of work done. The contractor is not satisfied. In that case, there is a way of proceeding which we intended should be followed in all these cases, that is, to go to the Exchequer Court. But a convenient way is adopted of referring the question to three arbitrators—for what purpose? To provide a conscience for the chief engineer, to tell him what the prices and the quantities

are, and he perforce has to follow their opinion and give his certificate in accordance with it. I hear that he has not given his certificate, and that the matter has not yet been before council. I hope that such an objectionable manner of proceeding will never receive the sanction of council, but that it will be sent back to the chief engineer for his certificate. If he has not certified to it, there must be a difference of opinion between the chief engineer and the contractors, or the contractors would not ask for a board of engineers to be appointed to look over the works and see what quantities are. The contractors must in some manner have received from the department the prices which the department chose to put on the work; and, if I understand the minister properly, there is a difference in the prices, but not in the quantities. They knew the prices the department was putting on the work, and if there was any difference, there was only one right way of settling it, that was, to go to the Exchequer Court, which was formed for the purpose of deciding such cases.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can only say that, from my experience in the department of the results of appeals to the Exchequer Court, I cannot concur in the conclusion the hon. gentleman has arrived at. The differences which arose were differences respecting the value of the work which these people did. My hon. friend said they should be governed by the prices, which prices would of course be stated in the contract. It does not happen that there were any prices in the contract for the particular work which formed the subject-matter of this claim. The engineers and officers had not foreseen—and that is where the difficulty of this particular class of structure came in—the necessity which arose for many descriptions of work separate from the contract. These claims were claims for extras, and it was necessary and proper that the amount of allowance which could properly be made to these people should be settled in some way or other. It is not unknown to the hon. gentleman in his experience that questions of that kind constantly arise in the department, and you could not ask the chief engineer to act as an arbitrator as between these parties, so that they would feel that they had fair consideration. The chief engineer, having an opinion on the subject, as far as he could form an opinion in respect of it, would not be willing to act, and he has always uniformly since he has been in the department declined to act in any such capacity. The hon. gentleman knows that right well. He says that in that alternative we could go to the Exchequer Court. Could anybody who wished to be fair and reasonable say that an Exchequer Court is an ideal tribunal for the purpose of ascertaining the value of the work that these people did? Or would a better tribunal be a board of engineers in whom you are entitled to have confidence, men of high standing, and men who you know would give you the benefit of their very best judgment. As between man and man, which would any one say was the proper tribunal to go to? I cannot think that there is any room for doubt. If anybody will say that Mr. Joseph Hobson or Mr. Robert Surtees, known as they are by everybody as reliable men as could be found in Canada, are not many times more competent to pass on a question of this kind than a judge of the Exchequer Court, then I will admit that we have gone the wrong way about bringing this matter to an end. You have to bring these matters to an end in some way; you cannot leave them hanging for ever. It is the duty of the minister in the department, and I intend to pursue that course while I am in the department, to have these claims disposed of as speedily as possible. There is no advantage in having men hanging around you from time to time waiting to have this question or that question disposed of. You had better pay a little too much than have that condition of things. If it were my hon. friend's own business and he wanted to protect himself, he could not pursue a wiser or more proper course, and he could not select any men who would be worthier of public confidence in such a trust than the men we chose for the purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the amount of the original contract and by whom was the plan prepared?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You will get the total amount by taking the quantity. The original contract totals up $500,000 and the extras $126,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The contract is not finished yet.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is an estimate based upon the schedule prices in the market.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand the minister to say that the contract is going on still and that this is an arbitration on progress estimates?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it will take some three or four weeks perhaps to finish.

Mr. BENNETT. As I understand the case, the contract is not for a lump sum for the entire work, but an estimate was made that a certain quantity of walls and other work would be required, and a price was fixed of so much per yard for concrete work, labour and materials. These were all placed in a schedule. It seems to me that if plans and specifications were prepared, which showed a superstructure of a certain size, surely one could arrive at a lump sum for the contract, but instead there were

schedule prices fixed, and after the completion of the work and measuring up the entire structure, the amount due was to be arrived at. It does seem odd that on a contract involving approximately half a million dollars, the departmental engineer should be one-quarter out. The minister says that half a milion dollars was what the work was to cost.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was a change made in the work.

Mr. BENNETT. Which involved a cost of $129,000 more. There should have been no difficulty in arriving at a price to be paid for the extra work done. The minister had the benefit of the prices given in the original contract, and surely these would have furnished a basis for estimating the extras. It does seem odd that before the extras were begun, a hard and fast bargain was not made with the contractors. When the extras were commenced was there any basis settled, showing how much per yard or otherwise these extras should cost, or any schedule prices agreed to ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was a material change made in the plan, and in some other respects, and upon this change a claim was based. The handling of the material was made very much more expensive by reason of that change, and that is one of the items.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did the chief engineer certify as to the amount he thought these parties were entitled to ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had his views with regard to what would be a fair price.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did he certify to that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman ask his chief engineer, who is alongside of him ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He certified to the progress estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There has not been a final estimate made out yet ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is $139,000 over what the chief engineer certified to, on progress estimates, that he thought the parties were entitled to.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is going up a little. He has increased the figure from $126,000 to $139,000.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister has not answered the question I put to him, which was this : Before the extras began, were any prices arrived at and submitted to the contractor ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the chief engineer had his views of what was a fair price, but they were not satisfactory to the contractor, and hence the difficulty.

Mr. BENNETT. If I understand the minister aright the position was this. Here was a contract let by the department to a firm of contractors under schedule prices for the work to be done. No lump sum could be arrived at because it was not known what quantities of material would pass into the work and what amount of labour would be required. But schedule prices were prepared and plans and specifications made out and the work began. At a certain stage the minister made up his mind to change the formation of the work to a certain extent, and the contractors were shown a plan of the changes contemplated and asked to go on with the work. The minister had in his own mind an idea of what the prices should be for the extras, but the contractors refused to accept his figures. The minister then said to the contractors : You go on with the work and we will make a settlement afterwards. I think I have put the case fairly.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You put it fairly enough if the facts were as you have stated them.

Mr. BENNETT. I have put the facts as I understood the minister to have stated them. The extra work was contemplated by the minister. He will not deny that. He had information from his engineer as to what would be fair prices.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The difficulty had really arisen long before it first came to my knowledge. The work had been proceeded with, and I did not know it. It is not many months ago when the matter was first brought to my attention. The progress estimates had been going on some time before, based on the ideas of the chief engineer. His ideas did not agree with those of the contractors, and they began to think it was time some agreement was reached. Then the question was put before me, and after talking the matter over with the chief engineer, I agreed that these three men should arbitrate.

Mr. BENNETT. A change was contemplated in the plan ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was actually made in the work.

Mr. BENNETT. Is the House to understand that a change was made in the work

with the consent of the minister or that it was unknown to him until this claim was made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not know about the change when it was made. I never knew anything about it until the question came up as to what would be a proper price.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not understand the minister in that light Now we are in this position—here is a contract for work that will cost approximately half a million. While the work is progressing, the contractor, of his own accord, makes certain changes in the work, the minister knowing nothing whatever about them. After the contractor has performed the work in part he comes to the minister and says : I have made a lot of changes in the work and I demand from you payment for the extra work involved. And it seems that something in the neighbourhood of $125,000 is to be paid for work which the contractor alleges he did but which is entirely unknown to the minister. Is that the position ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was unaware personally of what was being done. As I say the first knowledge I had of any difference between the department and the contractors was when the matter was brought before me, as it were, on appeal between the chief engineer and the contractors. At the time the question first came up a number of engineers had been down there at the instance of Messrs. Corry & Laverdure for the purpose of estimating the character and the reasonable cost of the work. There were some five or six of these engineers, including Mr. Kennedy, of Montreal, Mr. Keefer, Mr. Jennings and a number of others whose names are quite familiar to us all. These gentlemen had written their reports—not jointly—setting forth what they thought this character of work was worth. There was a very considerable difference of opinion between these engineers and the chief engineer of the department. We knew that if the matter went to the Exchequer Court that court would have no means of reaching a decision except by summoning engineers and taking their evidence under oath. Therefore we hit on the expedient of agreeing that engineers who had not previously been invited by Messrs Corry & Laverdure to look at the work and who had no connection with them should examine the work and give their opinion to the chief engineer. This idea we carried out.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For the better understanding of this matter will the hon. minister give the quantities of the work as originally let to Messrs Corry & Laverdure and then the change in the work with the quantities. The hon. minister must see that when extra work is performed by a contractor under the government and the engineers differ as to the prices or quantities —for the principle would apply to quantities also—they would have the same right as Messrs Corry & Laverdure to have an advisory board of engineers selected. I very much doubt that the chief engineer, having given his certificate of the value and quantity of the work, will change his certificate upon the recommendation of any set of engineers in the country. It is an extraordinary proceeding that, after giving his decision, he would revise it on the advice of other engineers. He is the chief engineer and ought to be as capable of forming an opinion as to prices and quantities as any board of advisory engineers can be. And, in view of just such disputes as the present one, this country formed a court to decide such matters, and when such cases arise, they ought to be sent to that court.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand the case, as developed by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) and the hon. Minister of Railways, these contractors performed certain work wholly unauthorized by the minister and without his knowledge. The question is, is the minister, under these circumstances, going to pay for the work ? Is he making these preparations with a view to paying for that work thus done without his authority ? If that can be done by one contractor there is no end to the expenditure that may be incurred in spite of the minister. Surely, there must be some control over public works. These gentlemen, according to the hon. minister's own statement, did work that he never authorized, yet the hon. gentleman is making every preparation to ascertain just what they ought to be paid for it. Surely the only way to deal with contractors who take this view of their position is to let them lie on the bed they have made—not pay them. Then, perhaps, they will keep within their contracts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to know the difference in quantities.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, if he was expecting an answer to-night, I thought I said that we had not the information at hand and could not give it to him.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the hon. gentleman will give it to me some other time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any item on which this subject will come up again ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly, we have supplementary estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we should have some explanation from the minister how it happened that the work for which a claim of $300,000 is made and for which

an award of $126,000 was made subsequently, could be done without the knowledge and authority of the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) who was in the department before me would have more experience than I in that direction. Many changes are made in these works. Either the chief engineer or the engineers under him by his authority may make these changes, which do not necessarily come to the personal knowledge of the minister.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman did not state before that this was done on the authority of the chief engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Undoubtedly, it was on the authority of the chief engineer. And no doubt, the contractors were fully authorized to do it. I have not the slightest recollection of any question at all arising with reference to the canal or the possibility of these claims coming up until they actually arose. My first knowledge of it was when the work had progressed and we were nearing the time when the final estimate had to be paid and the question would have to be settled in one form or another.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In view of that explanation, which I did not understand before, it is clear that the question of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) remains to be answered. He wanted to know, if these changes were made, why the scale of prices was not fixed at the time the changes were authorized, and the minister answered by saying they were not fixed because he did not know anything about it. That might be a very good answer if it were correct. It turns out now it is not correct, because when we speak of the minister we speak of his department, of his officers.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I stated to the hon. gentleman that the chief engineer had his ideas then as to what would be proper prices at the time the changes were commenced, but the contractors notified him that the work could not be done at those prices. I think I said that, at all events I intended to say it.

Mr. BENNETT. Then the position of the matter is this, according to the minister's last statement. When these changes were contemplated a discussion ensued between the chief engineer and the contractors as to the extra work. Now, the minister has not stated whether this was simply a matter of conversation or a matter of record in the department. Can the minister tell us whether these negotiations on the part of the contractors to make these changes, and the statement made in turn by the chief engineer as to the prices which he thought fair, were these matters of record in the department ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know what the hon. gentleman means by negotiations. There were not any until after the work had progressed. The chief engineer stated what he thought were proper prices, and he made his progress estimates and the amount of the estimates was accepted, and payments were made upon them. But the contractors protested from time to time that this work was costing a good deal more than they were being allowed.

Mr. BENNETT. Then it was agreed upon between the contractors and the chief engineer that certain extra work was to be proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was decided by the chief engineer that changes should be made.

Mr. BENNETT. Changes that are commonly called extras. Now when these extras were contemplated there was a difference of opinion between the engineer and the contractors. The engineer said what he thought would be a fair price for the work, that is to say in the gross amount at schedule prices. To that proposition there was demurrer on the part of the contractors, they not acquiescing in the prices proffered by the chief engineer. Now I ask the minister is that a correct statement of the facts ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that is substantially correct, as I am given to understand. Prices were named by the chief engineer, the contractors did not agree with those prices, and from time to time, as the work went on, and it was found what the work cost, the contractors protested, and protested, and protested again.

Mr. BENNETT. Then this whole matter of negotiation must either have been by discussion or conversation between the contractors and the engineer, or by connected correspondence. Can the minister say which was the case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer was not presented with a written protest ; they verbally protested from time to time.

Mr. BENNETT. I am referring to the proffer of prices on the part of the department through the chief engineer, and the refusal of the contractors to accept such prices. Is that a matter of record ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The matter of record is that the chief engineer made his progress estimates allowing certain prices in regard to the extras.

Mr. BARKER. That is after the work is done. You cannot make an estimate of progress until after the work is done. The question is, before they began these extras

did the department offer the contractors certain terms, certain prices for the extras that were contemplated, or did they not ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the chief engineer said : Now we propose to make this change and we propose to allow such and such prices.

Mr. BARKER. Was this proposition in writing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it appeared in the estimates, the chief engineer said.

Mr. BARKER. The estimate cannot appear until the work is done. I am asking, when the proposition was made that they should do certain extras.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are progress estimates.

Mr. BARKER. But a progress estimate is not made until a certain amount of work is done. I am asking as to these extras, how were they done or entered upon ? Did the department propose that these extras should be done, alterations made in the work, and did they offer certain prices, and are those in writing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer says he thinks the first time the price appeared was when the first progress estimate was made.

Mr. BARKER. Then the work was begun without authority ; the extra work must have been begun without authority, if the first time it was brought up was when he was making an estimate for progress work already begun.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were authorized to go on and make these changes.

Mr. BENNETT. Is that on record in the department—anything to show the changes contemplated ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They were instructed to make these changes as the chief engineer suggested, they were bound to make them.

Mr. BENNETT. That is coming to the point. Now the point in this. The minister had decided upon certain changes in the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The department had.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the department is the minister and the minister is the department. These changes being contemplated, without having any record at all or any agreement as to the price to be paid, these contractors went on with the work. Now is that a fair statement of the case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That would be a fair statement. They were instructed to go on with this work, and there were no prices allowed until the first progress estimates came up.

Mr. BENNETT. Then may I ask the minister what was the nature of the extras ? Was it similar to the work under the original contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it was not.

Mr. BENNETT. Then wherein did they differ ? In the changes that were made was there additional masonry work, or in what particular was the change ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am told there was a large quantity of water-tight embankment required that was not provided for in the original contract ; that was in place of steel work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He must have had the written authority of the chief engineer for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was instructed to do it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A contractor is not entitled to any extras unless he has the written authority of the chief engineer to make them. Further, when he does extra work beyond his contract, he has to notify the department within a certain number of days in writing. If he does not do it, no matter what his extras are, he is not entitled to anything under the contract. He must first have the authority of the chief engineer to make any changes in the contract. No engineer on the contract has authority to do it. We ought to have the facts. The hon. minister has promised to furnish them afterwards. We should know what changes were made in the original contract and what the work which was authorized to be done by the chief engineer, together with the quantities and prices allowed.

Mr BENNETT. The hon. minister cannot ask to have this item passed without the information which is the whole basis of the discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think you have all the information I can give you to-night. There will be another item, or if there is not another item in the supplementaries. I will agree that the matter may be discussed on one of the other items.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. minister is willing to discuss the question on another item and have all the information ready when we ask for it I suppose the item may be allowed to pass.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Certainly.

Soulanges canal, construction and equipment, $100,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are the construction and equipment, and what sums are necessary ? I would ask the hon. minister to just tell me at the same time the position of all the contracts upon the canal—whether any final estimates have been passed, and what the final estimates are on the different portions of the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Final estimates have been prepared for sections 12, 11 and 8. The other question the hon. gentleman asked me was what we were doing still in respect to the Soulanges canal work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are finishing and cleaning up throughout the entire length of the work. We are sodding. Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, on which Mr. Onderdonk was the contractor, required to be sodded.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, it is all under contract and this is the completion of the contract. We are putting in the electrical equipment for the gates and valves. That work is pretty well completed now and the vote is for this purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Who has the contract for the electrical work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you mean for the plant ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Canadian General Electric Company.

Mr. SPROULE. At what price ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One hundred and eight thousand will be the amount that will be coming to them probably when the contract is completed.

Welland canal—Improvements at Port Colborne entrance, $300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Of this amount $100,000 is a revote out of the appropriation of last year. We did not expend the whole $300,000.

Mr. BENNETT. How much was spent last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $200,000. When I say last year, I mean the current year. We expect to spend $200,000 this year out of the vote of $300,000. We are revoting $100,000 and we are adding to that $200,000. We think that will complete the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be required to finish this work, and what will be the total expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimate of the total cost of this work is $1,100,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have no idea as to the proportion which the Public Works Department are doing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I have not. I think they stated their portion of the work would cost another million.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When do you expect to have it finished ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will have our part finished just as soon as the breakwater is completed. It is not worth our while to push our portion of the work through before the breakwater is completed.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the nature of the work being done by the hon. gentleman's department at Port Colborne ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are widening the entrance and deepening it. We are erecting piers and extending the piers along the west side and we are erecting two docks so as to afford facilities for the docking of two steamers on each side.

Mr. BENNETT. I have never been at Port Colborne so that I am not very conversant with the position of the harbour. Am I to understand that there is a dock on either side of the entrance ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, only on the west side. There is a short projecting pier on the east side. There is a long projecting pier on the west side, and at the end of that we are making arrangements for two docks on which elevators may be constructed.

Mr. BENNETT. Who is the contractor for this work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Messrs Hogan & McDonald are our contractors.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much are you going to lower the mitre sill at Port Colborne ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Three feet.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the use of deepening the water on the mitre sill unless you deepen the reach.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The mitre sill at the entrance only shows 13 feet and instead of lowering it so as to make sure of a clear 14 feet we have made it 16 feet, because of the effect

of the winds which makes the water shallower at the entrance. We do not propose to lower the other locks because they are able to afford 14 foot navigation, nor do we propose to make the channel 16 feet.

Rapide Plat—Canal, $57,600.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $32,600 of this is a revote.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who is working there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Gilbert Brothers.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is simply work to remove work that was done there by Mr. Broder the contractor under the plan of the present superintending engineer. I do not find fault with the present work, but I do say that it has been become necessary because of work which was done at great cost by the present superintending engineer. We are spending this money to undo work that should never have been done in the first place.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do you mean that the work which is being taken out was authorized by Mr. Rubidge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes. There was a great deal of piering being done there and when it was being done the boatmen complained that the entrance could not be used, but notwithstanding that the engineer persisted in going on with the work and that work has now to be removed. The original work was done by Mr. Broder.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer believes that the work must have been done before he came into the department. He says that since he came in there was nothing done by the Broders.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That may be, but the original work was laid out by the present superintending engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am more concerned, and I suppose the Chief Engineer is also, as to the propriety of doing what we are now doing, and I understand from him that it is necessary that this work should be done.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think it is right too that this work should be done.

Galops canal, enlargement, $293,600.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $55,000 of this is a revote.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I claim that the work that is being done in the Galops channel interferes with the entrance to the canal to a certain extent, because it draws the water away from that. I have always taken the stand that that work in the Galops channel is an outrage, and I would like to bring it to the attention of the minister and make an appeal to him to have it stopped. The work was advised and commenced a number of years ago by the present superintending engineer, and was carried on for a number of years. I think that in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000 has been paid to the contractors who have been working there since the hon. minister has had charge of the department. The work was originally started with a view to enabling large steamers to navigate the Galops rapids. Steamboat men from year to year appealed to the government, claiming that those people could never navigate those rapids, even if the channel was made 17 feet deep. At the same time they claimed that that deep cut through the rapids would lower the water in the St. Lawrence above the rapids. After eight or ten years work in the channel, it was said to be completed and fit for use. I complained myself to the government, and insisted on an investigation, and instead of there being 17 feet of water, it was proved that there was only some 10 feet. Previous to my complaint, it was proved to the satisfaction of the government that the channel would never be of any use, and the scheme of putting a lock below the rapids was entertained, and the work was completed, and that is now being used. Every marine man that I know of on the river will admit that every vessel will go through that lift lock and will never use the channel.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are occasionally vessels that go down.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I live right there and see the rapids every day, and there are no steamers using that channel, unless a very small steamer which is more like a yacht. Even the old propellers, which are now out of date, all go through the canal. The hon. gentleman will find that no marine insurance commpany will take any risk on a steamer that will go down that channel. The firm that was working there last year, from the 1st of May to the 1st of December, were getting $425 a day. The minister said they only received $18,000 last year. That must be an error. They must have received $80,000 or $90,000 for last year's work, and it is currently reported that as soon as this session is over they are going to do it again. I wish to appeal to the hon. minister, as I did before, to have this work stopped, because in the eyes of the people it looks like an outrage to see the money squandered in this way. I do not think the minister has looked into this matter as he should, or he would never allow that work to continue for one hour longer, because it is simply squandering the public money and making a present of $375 a day to that firm. They are not working every day, and you are paying them $425 a day, and they do not work 25 days in the season. Why should

this government pay $375 a day of clear profit to any firm in this country ? The people in my county would rather see you pay this firm a bonus of $30,000 or $40,000, rather than put it in this way, when they know that the whole thing is an imposition on the country. I would like the minister to let us know when this thing will be finished, so that it will be known that it is through, and no more money will be squandered on it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think, from what I am told, that there is something due to these people for work done last year, and I am advised that there will be a sum placed in the supplementary estimates, not a large sum, for the work—not for the purpose of making any new excavation, or taking out any new rock, but simply for the purpose of removing the rock which has already been disturbed and is lying loose on the bottom, and is, I am told, an obstruction to navigation. I cannot say that I see any particular advantage myself in having the work continued, since the canal will afford all the navigation that is necessary. As the hon. gentleman has mentioned the matter, it would be well to have it looked into fully before asking for any further appropriation. This is one of the works that the superintending engineer recommends very strongly.

Mr. BENNETT. Is this work paid for by the day or according to the quantities ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is on the basis of the agreement which was in force when I came into the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like the minister to ask the superintending engineer to give me a list of the steamers which use that channel, and I would like to know the name of any insurance company which will take a risk on steamers that will go down that channel. I intend taking this matter up again next session, and I would like to have the names of any good reliable vessel men who will agree to take any steamer drawing 14 feet of water down that channel. As to the agreement, these people had a contract for so many yards of excavation at $8.40 per yard, and I think it was the minister himself who changed that agreement to $425 per day. That plant is standing there and we are paying $425 per day for nothing.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. My chief engineer says that the price and everything else was settled before I came to the department.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways has a very short memory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman very proud of his ?

Mr. REID (Grenville).

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, I have a good memory, and I know that there was a contract under which these parties claimed a certain amount from the late government. I ordered the contract to cease and refused to pay, and gave them their remedy in the Exchequer Court. The hon. gentleman has asserted again and again that he is only continuing the contract which was made by the late government, and I have again and again pointed out the absurdity of his contention. These gentlemen had a contract per yard for excavation, and in order to find out whether the excavation was done to the proper depth or not, they had Mr. Kennedy, the engineer of the Harbour Commissioners at Montreal, up for the purpose of making an examination. I objected to paying the sum they claimed, because I looked upon it as one of the biggest frauds ever perpetrated by any firm on a government. It is utterly absurd to keep these dredges employed doing work which is entirely useless, and pay them besides this exorbitant price per day which my hon. friend from Grenville mentioned. Look at the enormous sums we have paid these contractors, nearly $1,000,000, and we have the same excuses offered every year. Last year the hon. minister told us that not only were they clearing out stones in the channel, but they had taken a contract to deepen it one foot more. Every year we have the same excuse, and every year we are told by the hon. gentleman that he is simply continuing the contract which his predecessors made. Even if that were true, that is no justification whatever. The engineers of his department might tell him that the work is entirely useless. As my hon. friend from Grenville says, the vessels that navigate the ordinary depth of the canal never use it at all, but utilize the canal altogether, and it is only light crafts that go down. Very seldom does a boat go down this channel, and yet these parties are year after year continuing this contract and being paid large amounts. I see that in the supplementary estimates he is asking $50,000 for work that was done last year in excess of the vote parliament gave.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not get any vote last year at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the hon. gentleman must have been carrying on this work without any vote or authority. Is the $293,000 for the enlargement of the Gallops canal principally ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister says he had no vote last year, yet he proposes to spend to the 1st of June next, $50,000, for which he is asking a vote in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman propose to continue this way ? If

the statements be correct, this expenditure is a burning scandal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The great trouble now is that if they do dredge out any more there, no matter how small, they will be drawing the water away over to that island and across the rapids and really interfering with the entrance of the present canal. If that water is to be drawn off by this dredge, something will have to be done. Since the minister has had charge of the department, $240,377 have been paid this firm, according to the Auditor General's Report, and then there is this $50,000 more, making a total of about $300,000. Previous to that there was $1,000,000 sunk right in that rapids, simply thrown away entirely.. I am quite satisfied that the minister cannot produce a man in his department, other than Mr. Rubidge, who will say that that channel is of any use. I am quite satisfied that if the chief engineer were put under oath, he would have to admit that the channel would be of no use at all. Why it should be continued, I cannot understand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does seem rather an extraordinary condition of affairs that this dredge is employed at $425 a day to do work, according to the statement of my hon. friend, which is not only of no value to the country, but is actually a detriment, as it draws water from the mouth of the canal and makes it more difficult for vessels to get through. I do not suppose that any of the small craft that go down the rapids would have any difficulty in getting through the canal, and yet the minister expended $50,000 last year without a vote, in doing this work that is of no advantage at all. I notice that in the supplementary estimates the hon. gentleman has $50,000 for deepening and widening these rapids. I suppose that this is to pay for the work for which a vote should have been taken last year, and which the hon. minister says is not yet paid for. I may be wrong in my understanding of what the hon. gentleman said, but if my construction is the correct one it seems an extraordinary way to administer the department. He proceeds with this work at $425 a day, and then asks for a vote of about $50,000, and that for work which my hon. friend says is useless.

Mr. REID (Grenville). These small craft I may mention, never use this channel, but go down the regular steamboat channel on the other side, which has been used for forty years, because it is a very difficult matter to get into the channel. I do not believe that any large steamer can get through it. I remember the first trial made by a steamer to get through. She was one of the old Welland Canal steamers. Owing to the way the current runs she turned around and went backwards. After that, there were one or two small propellors tried it, but they tried it only once.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Do not the Richelieu steamers go through ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Not one goes down that channel. They come up that channel, as they always did. The hon. gentleman knows there is not one of the Richelieu steamers running the St. Lawrence that draws more than seven feet, and that 25 years ago there was nine feet of water there. The Richelieu steamers went up the identical channel thirty years ago. So, the fact of deepening that channel is no help to them at all. Ever since this new lock has been there they go into the lock on the way upwards. But on the downward trip they go along the old channel they have been using for 25 or 30 years. I was speaking with the gentleman who has charge of the Woolvin fleet. They have chartered 20 steamers, the first of which is to sail from Duluth on the 5th of May.

Mr. BENNETT. What capacity are they?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Sixty thousand bushels. But there is not one of these steamers that the insurance people will allow to go through that channel. And I am satisfied that next session the minister will not be able to stand up in this House and say that one single steamer of the Woolvin people's fleet has gone down through that channel. The lockmaster in charge of the lock right opposite can give the names of all the steamers that have used that channel this year. If the hon. minister next session can name one steamer of the size of those of the Woolvin fleet—and this was supposed to be made for vessels similar to those of that fleet—that goes down that channel and gets through safe, I will not say a word further, and he can go on paying these people $100,000 a year as long as he is minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They will draw fourteen feet, will they not ?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, the channel was supposed to be fourteen feet safe. It was made seventeen feet so that a vessel drawing fourteen feet would go through safe. Though it was seventeen feet, and they were paid in full for the seventeen feet, they were paid one hundred or two hundred thousand extra to make it one foot deeper, so that there might be no possible danger to vessels drawing fourteen feet. But will the hon. minister have a vessel sent down drawing fourteen feet, and assume the responsibility of accident, instead of asking the companies to do so ? I feel quite justified in laying this matter before the minister and trying to get the expenditure stopped. This is not the first appeal I have made, for I have spoken of the matter year after year. If the minister wishes to continue the contract I will

have to continue making this appeal every year to try to get the matter straightened out, so that this $100,000 a year may not continue to be divided among a few people, with profits of about $80,000. If it is to go on, I would rather have it put in straight as a charitable grant than to have it the way it is.

Mr. SPROULE. What explanation has the minister to give for the expenditure of this money without a vote of parliament? And how does he manage to satisfy the Auditor General?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Last year when the question came up as to whether or not I should ask for an appropriation for this work, in view of what had taken place in parliament and the strong opinions that had been expressed by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House about it, I declined to ask for any appropriation. I understand from the chief engineer that he informed Mr. Gilbert that there was no appropriation and that the work could not be continued. There is no appropriation in the main estimates, as hon. gentlemen can see, nor is there an appropriation for next year. But there will be found, as has been said, an appropriation of a small amount in the supplementary estimates for the current year. The appropriation, I am advised by the chief engineer, is necessary—not for the purpose of continuing the work, I do not propose to ask parliament for any money beyond this, a part of which is needed to pay the drawback. There is the amount of the drawback which we have to pay out of that $50,000. Then, I understood from the chief engineer that some rock had to be excavated which had been carried down into the channel, and which would impede navigation, and perhaps cause injury to vessels using the channel; and I have asked in the supplementaries for a small sum in addition to the drawback in order to clear this out, so that there would be no ground for a claim for damages. There is nothing in the estimates inserted with any intention to continue this expenditure or to continue this work. Mr. Rubidge and his assistant engineers are all strongly of opinion that this is a very useful work. They do not agree with my hon. friend. But I do not propose to take the responsibility of continuing this work this year, and have nothing in the estimates for that purpose.

Mr. SPROULE. Has this company been going on earning money during the year, or are they putting in a claim for money earned which was not voted, and after being notified by the minister that he does not intend to continue the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If they have done anything they have done it without any authority. My decision was last year not to proceed with the work. The chief engineer was advised of that, and he notified the contractors that there was no appropriation for the purpose and therefore the work would not be continued. If they have gone and done any work they certainly had no authority, and it would be against my view that they should go on with the work of last summer.

Mr. SPROULE. Are there any claims put in?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer said they did some work without his knowledge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This firm started work a year ago this spring and they worked until the close of navigation, up to December, 1901. Therefore I can hardly believe they were working there for fun. I think they were getting $425 a day, at least they will put in a claim for that amount. For that reason I was under the impression that they had been authorized to do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer says he gave them no authority to do it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, they were working there right along. Were they only paid up to the expiration of that vote?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then they worked on afterwards and got nothing for it. Have they put in any claim for it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They certainly have got nothing.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, have they put in any claim for work up to December?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer says that he has received no claim from them, though they have asked for an estimate.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government engineer that was in charge of that work remained there until December, lived right there on the boat, I know, until navigation closed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer advises me that he does not know that to be a fact, and that if these people did work, they did it at their own risk without any authority from him, and they certainly had no authority from me.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I may say for the benefit of the minister that the story of the rocks washing in there is the same old story we have been told year after year. I understand that this story has impressed him with the need of going ahead. But I cannot see where the rocks come from that were washed into this channel. The bed of the river is flat above and I cannot see

where the rocks can come from. But that excuse has been given year after year to the minister in order that they may go on with this work. If the minister will take any thorough marine man and send him there, I am satisfied he will report that the channel is not navigable for any large steamer. Why cannot the minister simply wind up the work. I am afraid—because it is not the first time we have heard this story, not only from the minister but from others, that it would be ended up—I am afraid that next session I will come here and be told the same old story. Could the minister tell us now if that work is to be continued ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think I have come pretty near making that statement. I do not want to commit myself too positively as to the future without hearing all that is to be said and considering it. But I have certainly decided not to ask for any appropriation for next year, I decided last year not to ask for any appropriation for this year, and I have put in that item of $50,000, and am advised that one-half of it at least is a drawback that has to be paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is your engineer attending to the work if you are not going on with it, and who gives a certificate for the progress estimates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer says there has been no progress estimates sent in at all. I presume these people have been putting in their time and hope perhaps to get something. But they have made no claim, or intimated in any way to the department that they intend to make a claim.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to me to indicate very peculiar ideas as to the business methods of the department.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, they have had a long number of years in which to form a judgment on the question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see that there is any particular need of a vote of parliament if they go on in this way from year to year. I do not quite understand the procedure. Is the engineer who is supposed to have been in charge of the work during the past season an officer of the government, and if so, has he been paid by the government for his work during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have an engineer—I understand his name is Ross—in charge of the canal. It may be, as the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) has said, that he was not paid at the time. I do not know about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If this engineer, who is acting for the government, has been superintending the work which these men have been doing without any appropriation apparently and apparently without any instructions, the government will be in rather an awkward position when the question of liability is raised. If the government's officer has been superintending the work which these men have been doing at the rate of $425 a day during the past season the government may have incurred liability, and it may be that an appropriation of parliament would be needed, but it is certainly a very undesirable way of doing business. No appropriation was asked by the minister last year for the reason that he had not concluded to go on with the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had concluded not to go on with the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Nevertheless, in some mysterious way, as to which we have not had any satisfactory explanation, the work has gone on and if we are to accept the statement of the hon. minister an officer of the government has been on board the dredge superintending the work which has been done without instructions from the department and with no appropriation of public money to pay for it. Now, I see an appropriation in the supplementary estimates of $50,000 out of which this work may be paid for. What is the purpose of that supplementary estimate if it is not for the purpose of paying for this work ? A part of it, I know the hon. minister says, is for some drawback, but there is a portion of it, $25,000 at least, which, I suppose, is designed to pay for this work which has been done during the past season without the authority of parliament. It certainly seems a most extraordinary way of carrying on the business of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the name of the firm that is doing the work now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Gilbert Dredging Company.

Mr. SPROULE. What are the names of the gentlemen who control the firm ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The two Gilbert Brothers. That is all the chief engineer knows and I do not know any more.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think these are the only two.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it perfectly clear that no portion of the vote which is now asked is to be applied or can be applied for the purpose of paying for this unauthorized work ? This is not enlargement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for the Galops canal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And it does not touch this subject at all ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. During the time that the work has been going on the appropriation has always been under the heading of 'Galops Rapids.' That is the way it is entered in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. It would seem that the Gilbert Brothers were working from the 1st of July, until the 1st of December, at a cost of about $12,000 a month, without any understanding with the department. As the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), has pointed out the hon. gentleman can hardly hope to escape responsibility. These people have their plant, they have been engaged by the department, under the engineer or some officer of the department. He has been on this plant or on some part of it and he remained in possession of that work for five months. They incurred a liability of $60,000, and the hon. minister comes down now and does not ask the House for anything to provide for payment. The hon. minister cannot hope that these people will consent to go without their pay. The hon. minister proposes apparently to deal with these Gilbert Brothers in the same kindly manner in which he dealt with them before. I remember last year that a claim came up for $25,000 which Gilbert Brothers had made against the department. They put in a claim for $25,000 for extras done several years before the hon. minister came into the department. That claim the then hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart)——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is very interesting of course, but we might read it all over some Sunday when we have nothing else to do. I can put my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) upon the right track if he will allow me. The Gilbert Brothers who preferred that claim which he has in contemplation are not the same Gilberts, so I am told by the engineer, and I believe that to be the case. There are five brothers and they are not by any means associated together in business.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, it only shows how very pernicious the example of the hon. minister was. Here are two men named Gilbert, who had this claim against the department when the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was at the head of the department. He offered them a fiat to go into the courts and prosecute that claim and they refused to go into the courts with it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What is the use of my hon. friend starting at one o'clock in the morning upon a controversial question which he knows is not one-sided, which he knows has another side and which he knows has been debated in parliament two or three times and which might be debated again if it were a little earlier in the session and a little earlier in the evening. I would be pleased to hear the hon. gentleman repeat the speech he made on a previous occasion, but I appeal to him whether it is not a little late to revive that subject.

Mr. BENNETT. I was starting out to say that the hon. minister by his kindness to these Gilbert Brothers, seems in that particular case to have inoculated the whole family of Gilberts with the result that we must pay this $60,000, and the hon. minister cannot shelter himself behind the statement that he has made because these men certainly went on with the work and he did not stop them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the hon. minister will look at his report for the last year he will see that Mr. Rubidge says :

> Operations on north and island shoals were resumed in May and June, 1901, will be continued until the close of the season.

And they were. The appropriation for the Galops rapids runs to June 30, 1901, at which time notice was given to the contractors. I will admit that according to his statement Mr. Rubidge gave notice to the contractors, but on the 1st of May, when Mr. Rubidge had that dredge at work on these rapids, he placed Mr. Ross and a staff of engineers in charge of the work. They were not in charge of the canal, they were in charge of the work and that staff of engineers, notwithstanding the fact that he notified them that the vote had lapsed, remained on these vessels until the snow made them stop in the fall. They were not taken off the work but the work went right along.

Mr. SPROULE. And the government engineers were right there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Ross has another position on the Grenville canal. When the hon. minister states that Mr. Ross was in charge of the canal I understand that once a month he took the pay cheques down and paid the men, but he was in charge of the work, and I know the names of other assistants that were with him. If they had stopped the work on the 1st of July then, of course, no fault would be found. I am making this appeal to try and get this straightened out so that it will not be continued.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the engineer send in no report in regard to the work that had been done during the summer ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They seem to have had a pleasant little time amongst themselves; these gentlemen with the dredge at $425 a day, and the engineer and his staff enjoying themselves without sending in any report. They apparently have expended nearly enough to enable Captain Bernier to discover the north pole, and all that has been done without the knowledge of the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I make no claim to omniscience or to omnipresence, and I certainly could not be supposed to know that the men were going on to prosecute a work that we had decided we would not continue and for which we obtained no appropriation.

Mr. BENNETT. There were no applications made by these people from the 1st of July, to the 1st of December, for remuneration ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None whatever.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the date of the first application ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not until within a month of this date. The chief engineer tells me they came up about a month ago to ask whether or not there would be any appropriation in he estimates next year for the carrying out of the work.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the amount of the claim ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no amount stated.

Mr. BENNETT. It seems incredible. These men were paid for a time up to the 1st of July, on monthly estimates I suppose, but then they continued, under the supervision of the government engineer, doing work from the 1st of July, to the close of navigation they never made a claim for it until a month ago when they came to the department and incidentally mentioned this trifling amount of $60,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am informed by the chief engineer that they stated no amount. The only amount mentioned was that one mentioned by the superintending engineer.

Mr. BENNETT. When did Mr. Rubidge make this report ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When he was asked for his report in view of the preparation of the estimates.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When Mr. Rubidge was notified by the department that the vote had lapsed was it not his duty to take his staff off ? Did he inform the department that these people were persisting in the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As far as I can see now, I would like to hear what Mr. Rubidge has to say in his own defence. It seems to me that was his duty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I should think he would be entitled to censure for not doing that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think so.

North channel—forming dam, $56,250.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is simply throwing this money away. You had better throw the money into the river than put that dam across there. This is a scheme put up by the Gilberts to get work for $56,000. There is no question about that. I would really like to know what this dam is going to be.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Gilberts have nothing to do with this. Cleveland is the contractor.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the dam put there for the purpose of improving this channel that we have been discussing ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The report is that there are cross currents.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This channel that the Gilberts have been working at for the last twenty-five years——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They commenced the channel in 1876 and they have been working continuously ever since. This water that comes between these two islands runs directly across the channel the Gilberts have been working at, and this dam is simply put there to stop that current. Really and truly if the minister looks into it, he will see that it is of no earthly use whatever. I appeal to him not to put a dam there, because it would injure the rapids, and I believe that the vesselmen will condemn it. It would be far better to give whoever the contractor is, half the amount he would make in profit and not have the dam there at all. I appeal to the minister that that dam should not be put there.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will tell the hon. gentleman what I will do. I will undertake that the money will not be expended until I have the subject thoroughly investigated, and until I have had the opinion of other engineers. Not being an engineer myself, I cannot form judgment upon a question of this kind. I can, however, probably decide not to spend, and I will not do so until I ascertain from independent engineers that it would be a proper expenditure to make. Of course, my hon. friend knows that there is always a great difference of opinion with regard to the navigation of channels.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I can quite understand that, and the answer of the hon. minister is quite fair ; but large vessels will never go through these rapids, and this is a part of that other scheme. If the hon. minister will look into the matter, I feel satisfied that he will never spend the money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already mentioned that this is a continuation of work that has already been started in the same direction.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That other work of Mr. Cleveland's is satisfactory, and he is doing his work very well. But it is not part of Mr. Cleveland's original contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The building of the dam will not absorb the whole of this money.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, it will, because it is in a bad place and is a very large dam. It is a mile and a half from Mr. Cleveland's original contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to undertake to say that no part of this money will be expended, because it may be necessary to spend a portion of it for the purpose of completing the channel which I spoke of, and which the hon. gentleman says is a very proper work to do; but I will undertake to say as to the dam, to which he takes exception, that nothing will be expended until inquiry is made.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Any money voted for Mr. Cleveland's contract is perfectly right.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand that this vote is not for any part of the Gilbert work at all?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has no connection at all with their work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. gentleman not think that we have gone far enough to-night?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentlemen opposite will consent to the rest of the items of my department going through to-night, I shall be willing to discuss any of these items on the supplementary canal votes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There are a couple of members of the House who want to speak on the Trent canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will say the same with regard to them.

To repair locks one and two Lachine canals, $100,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why spend such a large sum on the old locks?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are in a very insufficient condition and we have to repair them.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance the House adjourned at 1.30 a.m. Friday.

Hon. Mr. BLAIR.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 2, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 150) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 151) respecting the remission of penalties.—The Minister of Justice.

HALIFAX INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 152) further to amend the provisions of Chap. 183 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the Halifax Industrial School, and Saint Patrick's Home at Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of it?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is merely to extend the age at which boys shall be admitted to the reformatory. At the present time the age limit is sixteen years, but the local legislature has passed a Bill to extend the age to eighteen years. This is to make our statute conform to the statute of the local legislature.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BELL. I wish to call the attention of the First Minister to a return which I moved for on the 26th of February, which is not yet down.

The PRIME MINISTER. About dismissals?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend called my attention to this matter of dismissal some few days ago, and I sent an urgent letter to all the departments but have so far not received the information required. I shall call attention to the matter again.

POST OFFICE ACT.

Bill (No. 106) to amend the Post Office Act (the Postmaster General) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CLARKE. What is the object of removing these officers from the provisions of the Civil Service Act?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). By the Civil Service Act

they are required to undergo a preliminary examination and it is intended to discontinue this system and substitute the departmental examination. It was not considered of any practical importance that these officers should be required to have special qualifications necessary to pass the examination required by the civil service examiners. A more practical examination would probably be better.

Mr. CLARKE. What would be the nature of the examination ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That would be for the department to prescribe. It would be such an examination that would call for a knowledge of the elementary subjects, such as reading and writing and a little arithmetic, in order to see if they have the necessary education to enable them to discharge the duties of their office.

Mr. CLARKE. That is practically the examination that they are called on to pass now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the first place, they will not have to pay anything. At present a very large number of persons present themselves annually for examination who are never called to any position, but under this Bill no man will be requested to undergo an examination unless there is a position for him. It will be the same practice as is followed in the Toronto police corps, I presume. Under the present law, thousands of persons have presented themselves at the annual examinations, at considerable cost to themselves, and the great majority of them never receive an appointment.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill will afford opportunities to the department to pass those whom they wish to pass, whether eligible or not. I think that the system of submitting these young men for examination to some entirely independent board, where each applicant stands on his own merits, is much better than to leave the department to select those to whom they wish to give appointments and exclude those whom they do not want to pass.

Mr. PUTTEE. This Bill will take that branch of the service altogether out of the operation of the Civil Service Act. It will be excluded, not simply in respect of examinations, but of everything else. This brings up the question of the terms of employment. Under the Civil Service Act these men are yearly employees, getting yearly salaries, but under this Bill their salary will be so much per day, and it does not provide how many hours will constitute a day's work. If we are to change from the yearly system to the day system, we should define how many hours constitute a day's work, and will entitle a man to a day's pay. It seems to me that eight hours work in the eleven between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. should be the limit. It is an essential principle of

employment by the day, that the number of hours should be defined. A man might work a sufficient number of hours in a day to entitle him to two day's pay. That cannot be the case under the present system, under which the employees are paid by the month or the year.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is nothing in the law to-day defining what should be the length of a day's work. It seems to me it is equally necessary to pass a rule in the one case as in the other, if it be necessary at all. There is nothing to show that there has been any abuse as regards overwork in the branch I have to do with. Some people have very exaggerated ideas of the labour exacted from many of these officials. So far as the length of the day is concerned, the only class that takes exception to this measure is the letter carriers. I had an account taken of their labour, and I find that the average day of the letter carriers on duty throughout Canada is eight hours and twenty-one minutes. There will be no enlargement of that day, and there is no necessity for any statutory provision on the subject.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the hon. minister give us the particulars respecting the information he has collected as to the length of day? These men have to go to the post office in the morning to get the letters and put them in shipshape before beginning delivery. Is that time included ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I understand that the eight hours and twenty-one minutes includes all the time they are on duty.

Mr. PUTTEE. If that be the case, it ought to be easily arranged to have the number of hours specified in this Bill. At present there is no specified number of hours. The employees are under the monthly wage system, under which a man does what work there is to be done, and will sometimes have longer and sometimes shorter days. But when we change to the day system, we are paying so much money for so many hours work, and the question is how many hours work should be in the day. If a man does ten hour's work, that would amount to $2.50 at 25 cents per hour. We should either have the one system or the other. If we introduce the day labour system, we should specify the number of hours per day.

Mr. BARKER. Many letter carriers are very uneasy as to what their position will be after this Bill becomes law. This Bill puts them on day work. They regard their positions as of a permanent character, and they are very uneasy as to whether they will simply be in the position of men employed for the day, whose services may be dispensed with to-morrow.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The measure will in no way whatever weaken

their tenure of office. There is a clause in the measure saying that they shall be removable only by Order in Council. That is all the guarantee that any one in the civil service has, and there is no more possibility of their being dismissed without cause under this provision than under the existing condition of affairs. I am not aware of any parliament having fixed by law what shall be the particular hours constituting a day's work. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) may know of some case of that kind and if so, I would like to hear of it. The postal departments may, as a matter of policy, name a number of hours in their regulations, but I am not aware of any legislative body or parliament binding its hands in that way.

Mr. BELL. Will the Postmaster General allow a question ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. BELL. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that, at present, under the Civil Service Act these officials could be dismissed only by Order in Council, and that hereafter they would have the same protection. But, this Act declares that it shall supersede the Civil Service Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But in clause 12 of this Act it is provided :

> Appointments, promotions, reductions in grade and dismissals under this Act shall be made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. CLARKE. What practice obtains in the United States respecting the hours of employment of letter carriers ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not familiar with the American practice.

Mr. HEYD. The objection I see to fixing the hours of labour to a day's work is that the men have a certain beat in which to discharge their duties and an active man can probably do his work in six or seven hours, while a slower man will take eight or nine hours. To keep all employed for the same length of time, it will be necessary to make the beats for some men at least 25 per cent greater than for others. A man exercising diligence in the pursuit of his business can lessen the number of hours to a considerable extent. If the average is now, as the Postmaster General has said, eight hours and twenty-one minutes, that is not too long a day's work.

Mr. PUTTEE. That may be an argument why the staff should be left under the present Civil Service Act, which allows and provides for all that. But we are adopting a new policy, a new principle altogether, and it seems to me that it is absolutely necessary that the number of hours' work should be specified and limited. I think it should be eight hours within eleven, which would give two or three hours a day when the men are not required on the beat.

Mr. HEYD. What action would the Postmaster General be compelled to take if a man could not do an ordinary day's work in eight hours ?

Mr. PUTTEE. If an ordinary man could not do the work it would be necessary to engage more than one ordinary man for the work.

Mr. SPROULE. In what respect is the Civil Service Act so defective that the Postmaster General introduces this Bill ? This seems to be rather in the line of discrediting the Civil Service Act and taking a large number from under it that were intended originally to be under the provisions of that Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My hon. friend only sees what he thinks are the bad spots in this Bill. I hope he will be able to see something good in it.

Mr. CLARKE. We do.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will try to point out some of the good points. This is not forced upon anybody now in the service. It applies to those to be appointed hereafter, but gives those now in the service the privilege of availing themselves of it, if they think it is to their advantage; but if they do not think so, they are left in the full enjoyment of their rights. Now, I have not heard any complaints from any of the classes in question, with the exception of the letter carriers. Let me state what the position of the letter carriers is to-day. As far back as 1872, the law with regard to the appointment for letter carriers provided that their initial salary should be $300 a year, with an annual increase of $40 until a maximum of $560—or a possible maximum of $600 under certain conditions—was attained. That continued to be the rate until 1874. On the change of government in 1874, a change was made in the initial salary, the Mackenzie government fixing the amount at $400. No other changes were made at that time. That continued to be the law until the downfall of the Mackenzie government. When the new government came into office, they reduced the initial salary to from $400 to $300 a year. That reduction continued in force from 1878 until 1882, when the then government made a change reducing the annual increase from $40 to $30, and confirming the reduction of initial salary from $400 to $300. In 1885 they increased the initial salary from $300 to $360, leaving the annual increase at $30. This continued from 1885 up to the present time. In the public interest it is advisable that there should be some incentive to letter carriers to report for duty when duty calls. The public expect their mail to be delivered to them with regularity. But this cannot be accomplished if when the letter carriers should appear for duty on a given morning a considerable number of them are absent. Experience has shown that those who are

on yearly pay are absent very much more often than those who are on day's pay. It becomes necessary sometimes to engage persons to act as letter carriers, who are not eligible to be appointed under the Civil Service Act. They discharge the same duties as those appointed under the Civil Service Act and their pay is, perhaps, slightly less. Good men taken on in that position are allowed to continue and my information is that those who are on the civil service list are absent from duty three times as long per annum—over and above the statutory holidays—as those who are on by the day. The day's pay is an incentive to them to report for duty. I understand that in England the same principle obtains, and if a letter carrier does not appear for duty at the proper time he loses his day's pay or a great portion of it. There are substitutes appointed and the letter carrier suffers a pecuniary loss because of his absence. I do not know how it is in the United States, but, perhaps, my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) is informed on that point.

Mr. CLARKE. .The information I have is very limited, but I was going to say after what had been stated by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) with regard to the reduction of hours, that I understand there are two staffs delivering, beginning earlier and continuing later, and that the men work eight hours a day. I am not sure, however, that such is the case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. At all events there is a manifest advantage in having some means of exerting pressure upon this class of officers, so that they shall appear at the time of duty. It is as essential for them as for the trainmen to appear when required. They are required to perform a class of duty the regularity of which is, all important, and we are frequently embarrassed because letter carriers at the last moment fail to appear at the time appointed. It is necessary to meet that weak point in the service, and a measure of this kind is in the public interest in that respect alone. Now I have said that this measure is in other respects an advantage to the employees. For example, I have had a statement prepared by the officers to show the difference between the salaries received under the present law and those which will be received under the proposed law. Take the case of a letter carrier to-day entering the service. As the law has been for about the last twenty years, entering at $360 a year, his salary increasing at $30 a year until he attains the maximum of $600, he will enter upon his ninth year before he will attain the maximum of $600. Under the proposed measure he will enter as a probationer for a period of six months, he will be learning the route and the small matters they have to learn. At the end of six months he is supposed to be qualified to be confirmed in his position. During that probationery period he is under instructions, we have to detail a man, so to speak, to teach him, not necessarily go with him all the time ; but he is under tutelage for a time. Nevertheless during that period of tutelage he is paid $1.20 a day for six months. As soon as he is qualified to be confirmed in his appointment he then begins his salary of $1.50 a day, which amounts to $469.50 per annum. We give him two weeks leave of absence, and at the expiration of two years his pay goes up to $547.75 a year. At the end of those two years he will be entitled to promotion, assuming always that he has deserved it, to $2 a day, or $626 a year. His salary will remain at $626 unless he should be promoted or reduced in rank. Assuming he remains at $626, when he has entered upon his ninth year of service, an officer appointed under this law will have received during that period from the commencement, $713.50 more than under the present law. In addition to this there is a provision that a letter carrier may get every year a bonus of 10 days extra holidays where his conduct has been reasonably satisfactory. It does not mean that there is a prize only to the top man, but I am hoping that a number of men in the service will win this 10 days extra holidays, or he may at his option receive $2 a day, or $20, in lieu of these extra ten days.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you strike off his pay for each day's absence ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Now if he should accept $20 a year in lieu of the holidays, he would receive during that comparative period that I have referred to, $883.50 more under this proposed measure than under the existing law, or an average without the bonus of $20 a year, of $83.94, and with the bonus of $20 a year, an average of $103.94 more than under the present law.

Mr. CLARKE. What about superannuation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The Superannuation Act was repealed some years ago, and the Retirement Act has been adopted in lieu of it. They are living under the Retirement Act, and that is wholly for their benefit, not for the benefit of the country.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman was making a comparison of the condition of the letter carriers under his law, and the conditions under the old law. Will he give us an idea of how much better off these men will be in respect to superannuation?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is not necessary to discuss a repealed Act ; if the hon. gentleman will ask me to discuss the Retirement Act I will be glad to do so. The Retirement Act is now in force as to all new appointees and all appointees of recent years, so that the Superannuation Act each year is having less and less application, and

if this Act was to drop it would not affect anybody, either under the Superannuation or the Retirement Acts.

Mr. SPROULE. When the hon. gentleman was speaking of the salary, I asked if he made any provision for striking off from their salary for days they were absent, and he did not deign to answer.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Because the question was not applicable to my observations, and would have been more fittingly asked at a latter period. At the same time I would say to the hon. gentleman that the Bill provides for payment of a day's work, it also gives the men two weeks leave of absence. I believe the hon. gentleman is an employer of labour himself, as I am sure many of us in this House are, and he knows something about fines, rates of pay, and so forth. Perhaps the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) will tell us whether he considers these rates will be regarded in his part of the world as reasonable to be paid by the taxpayers of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that is merely evading the question. I asked what I regarded as a proper and a courteous question.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have answered the question.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister does not choose to reply he need not do so. The answer he has given is no answer at all.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman asked me if there is a provision made for leave of absence.

Mr. SPROULE. I asked whether there was a provision made for a reduction of their wages when they were absent.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As I explained, they are paid for the time they work. That is a system perfectly easy to understand. A man is paid so much per day for the time he works, he is also paid for two weeks that he does not work, and may be paid for ten days further that he does not work. If he is absent more days than that, his pay is stopped during the additional period of absence.

Mr. COCHRANE. I want to remind the minister, when he wants members on this side to be courteous to him, that when he was on this side of the House himself he did not draw the line so closely, and he was not very courteous.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I hope I have improved my methods.

Mr. COCHRANE. Not much.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What about cases of sickness ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I was about to say when I began my observations, that no class of officials except letter carriers take exception to this measure, and inasmuch as those who object to it are not bound by it, I hardly see that they have much standing. I happen to have received yesterday the following communication which shows another side to this question :

Toronto, April 26, 1902.

Hon. Wm. Mulock, P.M.G.

Dear Sir,—At a meeting of the employees of the Toronto post office including porters, messengers, box collectors and mail transfer agents, it was unanimously agreed that your amendment to the Post Office Act is a move in the right direction and we would be glad to see it pass and will be pleased to come under the provisions contained therein.

Respectfully submitted.

Your obedient servants,

F. S. RUTTAN, Secretary (pro tem),

W. J. RAY, Chairman.

Mr. CLARKE. You do not know where the meeting was held in Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I know nothing except what the communication says.

Mr. CLARKE. Does it refer to the letter carriers being pleased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have read every word of it. Shall I read it again?

Mr. CLARKE. If you please.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL : (reading)

Toronto, April 26, 1902.

Hon. Wm. Mulock, P.M.G.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—At a meeting of the employees of the Toronto Post Office Department including porters, messengers, box collectors and mail transfer agents, it was unanimously agreed that your amendment to the Post Office Act is a move in the right direction and we would be glad to see it pass and will be pleased to come under the provisions contained therein.

They have the option of coming in or not coming in.

Mr. SPROULE. That does not include the letter carriers because it says nothing about them.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not speaking for the letter carriers. I am explaining that I have heard from all these employees except the letter carriers. As to the others they have sent me this communication.

Mr. CLARKE. You do not know how many were present at the meeting ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have told the hon. gentleman that the document contains all the information I possess on the subject.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. My hon. friend has not answered my question in regard to cases of sickness. Employees should lose their pay, of course, if they are absent from work, but in cases of sickness will they be deprived of their pay ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The law makes no provision for their being paid when they are not at work, except for two weeks annual leave and for ten days additional pay as bonus.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Does not my hon. friend think it would be unfair to make them lose their pay if they are sick ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, the ten days bonus will more than pay them for that. During the year gone by statistics have been collected and they show that the ten days bonus that we give them will quite pay for absences from other causes than holidays.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. So that they will have to get sick during these ten days, or otherwise they will lose their pay ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That will be for their election. This will cure a great many of sickness.

Mr. CLARKE. If they get pay now during sickness and they are to be deprived of that pay under the provisions of this Bill they will not be in as good a position. They get pay now if they can get a medical certificate, but under the provisions of this Bill, they will be deprived of pay during the time they are sick. Am I right in saying that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have explained that they are paid for the days they work, and they are paid for fourteen days holidays when they do not work. They are also paid a ten days bonus, and as to the rest if they do not work other days, they are not paid for other days, whatever be the cause of absence. The civil service is very bad for the health at times. We find a great many absent when pay goes on who might perhaps be able to do their work if pay did not go on. We have had numerous cases of rapid recovery when it was made clear that longer absence would be accompanied by loss of pay. I was about to give the committee some information as to the rates of pay in other walks of life for people who are more or less in the public service. Take the case of policemen. I have a schedule showing the rates of pay of that class of people. In the city of Brantford the rate of pay is $1.30 per day for the first year, increasing to $1.40 the next year, and then, in the fourth year, to $1.50, after ten years $1.60 and after sixteen years $1.70 per day. They receive no pension, they work nine hours a day and receive uniforms.

Mr. TAYLOR. They have lots of pickings.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I should be sorry to think that of them. I think they are a highly respectable body of men. In Hamilton the policemen receive $1.40 a day at appointment, after one year $1.80, and after six years $1.90 per day. They have the benefit of the police benefit fund, their hours of work are eight hours a day and they receive uniforms, except shoes and underclothing. In Kingston policemen receive $35 a month upon entrance, and $40 a month after. They receive no pensions but they are granted $45 per annum as a clothing allowance. They work twelve hours a day. In London they receive $1.40 a day on entrance, $1.55 after a year, and $1.90, usually, after three or four years. They are entitled to the police benefit fund, they receive uniforms, but no boots or underclothing, and they work eight hours during day duty, and nine hours during night duty. In Montreal they receive $9.20 per week on entrance, $10.20 after one year, $11.20 after three years and $12.20 a week for specially good men. They are entitled to share in the Police Benefit Society fund and they receive uniforms. They work twelve hours a day, six hours of inside and six hours of outside duty.

Mr. CLARKE. What about sick pay at these different places ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no information here as to that.

Mr. CLARKE. You did not get the information on that ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is nothing in regard to that.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that a return from the Labour Department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No. In Ottawa policemen receive $35 per month for three months and after three months $40, after one year $45 and after that $50, $55, or $60 on recommendation. They receive uniforms, no pension, work ten and a quarter hours day duty, and eight and three-quarters hours night duty. In Toronto they receive $1.30 a day on appointment, $1.50 after one year, with good conduct ; $1.75, after three years. That $1.75 continues until the end of seven years after which the pay is $2 per day. They receive half pay after 25 years service. They work eight hours a day which can be extended when necessary. In St. John they get $1.40 a day upon entrance.

Mr. CLARKE. Will the hon. Postmaster General allow me to interrupt him ? What did he say in regard to the pay in Toronto ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They get $2 a day after seven years service.

Mr. CLARKE. Well, there is a further provision for increase of pay after a given number of years.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have not that. What is it ?

Mr. CLARKE. They get ten cents a day additional for each good conduct mark.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. How long do they serve before receiving good conduct pay ?

Mr. CLARKE. I cannot remember that. Besides, this pay of $2 is for seven days in the week.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Well, the good conduct stripe may be a good feature.

Mr. COCHRANE. What has all this information to do with the Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is to show the committee what is paid in other walks of life. In St. John they get $1.40 on entrance, $1.50 after three years, and $1.60 after six years. They are on duty twelve hours in day time and ten hours at night. In Winnipeg the pay is $50 per month on entrance, $60 after one year, $65 after two years, $70 after three years; no pension; they get two full uniforms; work nine hours a day. In Vancouver the pay is $60 a month, increased to $70 after the first year. They receive two uniforms a year and equipment, work nine hours, including one hour for luncheon. It says a pension fund will be shortly established. In Halifax the pay is $400 a year, increased to $450 after one year's service, and they receive full uniforms and work ten hours a day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where did the Postmaster General get these statistics ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My department wrote to the different cities for them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the Postmaster General gathered all the facts? Can he tell us whether when a constable is off duty on account of sick leave, his pay is docked, as in the case of the post office service?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no information on that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. When you get the statistics you should get all the facts, so as to make a fair comparison.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What comparison is there between policemen and letter carriers; irrespective of salaries, of course?

Mr. CLARKE. They both have to walk.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some people might think that a policeman's duties were altogether more onerous and hazardous.

Mr. CLARKE. They have different beats from the letter carriers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The letter carriers work, as a rule, during the day time, and policemen are on duty at night often. I should think that if a man had a choice of serving as a letter carrier or as a policeman, the pay being equal, no doubt he would be a letter carrier. I think this because we are deluged with applications for the position of letter carrier, and they are often from men who have good callings; not unskilled men, but men who have trades. Why do they come to the government service when they have a trade of their own ? They evidently admire some features of it. There is constant employment, regularity of occupation, and their employer is sure to be able to pay them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. That is the reason why I tell my hon. friend that he makes a grave mistake in comparing letter carriers to policemen.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In what way ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Because it shows that in most cases the policemen are better off than the letter carriers.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It shows altogether the other way.

Mr. TAYLOR. Might I ask the hon. gentleman why he makes the law in reference to letter carriers and mail clerks different from that of government employees in other departments. As I understand it, in the inside service, where persons are working by the day they are paid for seven days. The Minister of Agriculture told us the other night that in the census department the officials are being paid for seven days, and I think that is the rule in all the other departments. Why make a different rule for these hard-worked letter carriers, who have to be out rain or shine, perhaps ten or twelve hours a day, and who if they are sick, lose their day's pay.

Mr. PUTTEE. I hope the Postmaster General does not think that we are only picking out the bad spots in this Bill. I have been carefully through the Bill and have compared it with the present system, and I am prepared to say that there are some good features to it, but at the same time it is our duty when in committee to pick out the bad spots. There is no doubt that the limitation of the time for reaching the maximum salary is a good feature in this Bill. The old system of $30 a year increase for nine years before a man reached the very low maximum was altogether absurd. If we can get some necessary amendments as regards the hours, and one or two other things in this Bill it will accomplish a great deal of good. One good feature is that it does away with Sunday work. As a matter of fact, at the present time in some cities, if not all, the letter carriers are brought to the office to do some kind of work on Sunday, but under this Bill the local officers will have to report if there is necessity for that, and they will be paid for Sunday. But better still, it will have the effect of doing away with Sunday work altogether, and that is a good feature. My own opinion, however, is that this Bill does not touch the right spot. The Postmaster General wishes to make his letter carrier staff more effective, and there is no doubt that an effective staff of letter carriers is

an absolute necessity. The reason the staff is weak to-day is because of the system that has been followed.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the matter with the system ?

Mr. PUTTEE. The patronage system ; that is the matter with the system.

Mr. CLARKE. Does this Bill do away with that?

Mr. PUTTEE. Not at all. A bad system does not produce good results, and I am not surprised to hear the Postmaster General say that there are weak spots in his staff. The very fact that a Bill of this kind is thought to be necesasry to cure some of the diseases is evidence that there is a bad system, and that it is producing bad results. I had hoped that the Postmaster General would have been able to take the bull by the horns in this case. An effective staff is necessary, and I thought that the hon. gentleman might be able to take the matter of appointing and governing the staff altogether out of the field of politics; and partisan politics at that. That is what makes the staff non-effective and inefficient. It is that that some men know they can be sick and they can play with the officials because they will be sustained by the influence they can bring to bear.

Mr. HEYD. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Puttee) to give us the information on which he bases his statement that this staff is inefficient.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am only drawing what I think to be the proper inference from what the Postmaster General told us himself. He said that men paid by the day are only sick one-third as much as men working under the Civil Serive Act.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you state that is a fact yourself?

Mr. PUTTEE. I heard the Postmaster General state it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I stated it. I have information in my department to that effect.

Mr. CLARKE. Have you information to the effect that when men are employed by the month or year there is three times more sick leave than when they are employed by the day?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These are statistics I have from the Toronto office.

Mr. TAYLOR. We should get the ministers working by the day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. And the members of parliament.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it not a fact that when a man is off sick he has to send a medical certificate to the department?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certificates should be produced, but we very often find that these certificates are not wholly what they appear to be. Men may be sick in reality, and yet they may have occasioned their own sickness. We have many instances, if your want details.

Mr. CLARKE. That often happens.

Mr. PUTTEE. I am inclined to think, at all events, that there is some foundation for this opinion. I am not stating that the letter carrier staff is inefficient all through ; but, as a necessary result of the system, there are very weak spots in the operation of the service. The very fact that it is thought necessary to introduce a Bill of this kind, in order to get the men there every morning and not to have any misses, means that there have been misses in the past, and that as a matter of fact the staff is not as efficient as it would be under a better system. I thought we might possibly have a proposition to take this service away from the influence of politics altogether, and put it on a basis where merit and proper attention to work would be recognized and well paid. Now, there are some weak spots in this Bill, and if there are not some radical amendments made in it, I question very much whether it would not be better to keep to the Civil Service Act. For one thing, it does not state the hours which shall constitute a day's work. Then, it should include labourers, sorters and stampers. Then, subsection 2 of section 4 recognizes a new and bad principle, which I hope will be struck out of the Bill ; that is, it provides that in the case of inefficiency, reductions in grade may be made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not a change in the law.

Mr. PUTTEE. It is a bad principle. This service consists wholly of manual labour, and we start on the very proper system of having men enter at the lowest grade and go up to the maximum. In labour of this kind, when a man is young, he is at his highest efficiency, and as he grows old he necessarily becomes less efficient, and this provision means that he is going down the ladder. It is a bad principle to recognize in an Act of parliament. If the man has performed his duties faithfully in the best years of his life, he should not be reduced in grade ; but he should be kept so long as he is able to do the work, and should then be superannuated. This provision should be made to read that in case of inefficient or unsatisfactory service or the committal of any offence against the rules, a man should be suspended as a penalty. That, it seems to me, would accomplish any object the Postmaster General has in view. But if we are going to leave the service under political influence, it is a bad principle to place in the hands of a minister the power to put a man down instead

of up. It is a principle to which I cannot agree.

Mr. HEYD. I have taken considerable interest in this Bill and have given it careful study. One reason for that is that since I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this House, we have established in the city of Brantford a free letter delivery, and I naturally made myself conversant with that system, in order to see that the men employed were not overworked and were not underpaid; and a great many of the letter carriers throughout the country have written to me asking me to look after their interests in this matter. Now, I can say, after a careful study of this Bill, that it establishes a system most favourable to the working classes, and the most liberal in its pay, of any that exists anywhere in the Dominion of Canada. There is no agricultural or machine or carpenter shop anywhere in this country where men are getting as good pay as these men will receive under this Bill, or where they work shorter hours.

The Bill applies to two classes of people—those who are trying to get into the government employ, and those now in it. Those that are in do not need to take the benefit of these provisions unless they like. Those that are without do not need to come under its provisions unless they want a government job. The first question is, how will the Bill affect those who are trying to get into the service? At present a man is appointed at $1.15 a day, whereas under the Bill he will be appointed at $1.25, and he will be expected to act as probationer for a period of six months, during which time his pay will be $15 greater than it was under the old system. Under the old system a man was appointed at $360 per annum. Under the new system, after six months probation, he gets $469.50 per annum, or $109.50 more than under the old system. After the first year, under the present system, he gets $390. Under the new system he will get $469.50, or an increase of $79.50. At the end of the second year he can be put into grade 'C,' then his pay becomes $1.75 per day, or $547.75 per annum, which is $127.75 per annum more than he gets under the old system. In the fourth year, under the old system, he gets $450, while under the new system he gets $547.75, or an increase of $97.75. So that the man coming into the service will improve his position in four years by $414.50, and from that time he will be in receipt of $626 per annum.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member in his calculation provide that the employee shall work every day except Sunday?

Mr. HEYD. I am assuming that. As the Bill applies to those of the present staff who choose to come under these provisions, it has this effect upon all men who have been one, two, three, or four years in the service. If a man has been four years in the service he passes at once into class 'D,' which gives him $600 a year. If he has been five years in the service, and is drawing $480 a year at present, he will draw $626, or an increase of $146 a year. If he has been six years in the service, his wages will increase by $116; if he has been seven years in the service, they will increase by $86; if eight years, by $56; and if he is becoming a $600 man, the highest point to which he can reach under the present system, his wages will be $26 more. No injustice is done to anybody in that class, and the only man who has any cause of complaint at all is the man who is now getting $600 a year. This whole thing originated because a petition was sent in by the letter carriers for an increase of pay; and the desire of the great majority of the employees of the Post Office Department has been gratified by this very radical increase. But it applies with less force to the class now getting $600 a year, and we have the right to ask whether $600 a year is not fair pay. We must not forget that there is another class into which a man may enter at the end of four years. By diligent service or by the discharge of especially arduous labour, he can be advanced to class 'E,' in which his wage is increased to $704.25 per annum.

I regard that as a very high rate of wages, higher than is paid in any manufacturing establishment in Canada to any class of employees no matter what years of apprenticeship they have to serve. In addition these post office employees get two weeks leave of absence, and under special circumstances that leave is extended ten days longer, equal to twenty dollars in money, besides getting clothing for the ordinary discharge of their duties, and also shoe leather. All classes under this Bill will be better off than they are now. The only class that has any occasion to complain is that which is now getting $600 and desires more pay, and which may not be satisfied with an increase of $26. We have a right to compare the salaries paid these men with those paid in other walks of life, to see whether these men are really underpaid at $600 a year. I suppose we would regard a street car conductor as a man sufficiently intelligent and qualified, physically, morally and mentally, to be a letter carrier. Well, the salary of an Ottawa street car conductor is $9 a week for ten hours work per day, whereas the pay of a letter carrier is $12 a week for an average day's labour of eight hours twenty-one minutes, or say nine hours. Or in a year the letter carrier gets $150 more than the man who is employed on an Ottawa street car. We do not need to take policemen or firemen or men of that class, but you can go into the big factories and look at the wages paid there. Take the tool makers in the machine shops, the lathers, the planers, the vice hands and fitters and others, and you will find that they are not paid the wages paid in the Post Office Department. Is there any reason why a man who is a messenger

in the post office should have more wages than a man who has served an apprenticeship five, six or seven years in a manufacturing establishment? What are the necessary qualifications for a letter carrier? He requires sufficient intelligence and education to read the addresses on the letters and sufficient honesty to deliver them. He does not require any special training. When I had the honour of appointing six letter carriers in Brantford, the system was arranged, the letters were delivered, and the whole thing worked like clock work from its very inception. There was not even a slip from the very start. That shows that it does not require special intelligence to do the work. We have got along so far without trouble or friction in Brantford. It may be said the letter carriers there do not do as much work as in Toronto and in Ottawa. But judging by the receipts in the Brantford post office, the Brantford postmen do more work than those of any other city in Canada, because the receipts are greater in proportion to the number of letter carriers than they are anywhere else in the Dominion. The work does not demand special intelligence. It does not require an apprenticeship of five or six years, and the wages of $600 per year are abnormally high as compared with those paid in other walks of life where years of apprenticeship are required and a considerable amount of technical skill. My sympathies are always with the men who work for a daily wage, but at the same time we must not make the position of a letter carrier so exceedingly desirable that men in other avocations will begin to grumble. Why should a tool maker, a trade which requires superior expertness and years of experience, be paid less wages than a letter carrier? A tool maker works in Toronto fifty-five hours for $14.70, and in Brantford fifty hours per week for $12. The lathe hand, who has to serve an apprenticeship of six years, gets in Brantford an average weekly wage of $9.25 for a day of twelve hours, and in Toronto $12 a week, which is a small wage compared with what is paid a post office messenger. And when these men only show up at 9 a.m., do they get paid a full day? Not at all. And when they are absent one or two days on account of sickness, do they get paid in full? No, they only get paid for the hours they work. In all these avocations a man is paid only the hours he labours, and I do not see why a letter carrier should be in a different position.

Take the planers and shapers in an engine shop, also high class work, they get from $10.30 to $11 per week in Brantford and $13 in Toronto. Take the vice hands and fitters, they get in Brantford from $10 to $11.80 per week and in Toronto $12.75. Then there are the drill hands, who do an inferior class of work, they only get $9 per week in Toronto. You can go through all the agricultural implement establishments in this country, take any branch of their business requiring the greatest amount of training and years of apprenticeship, and no where are they paying the wages received by the letter carriers of Canada to-day. Go to St. Thomas, where recently the government built a drill shed under the schedule of fair wages, which is always regarded as pretty high, and what do we find. We find that the contractor's foreman carpenter gets $2.25 per day; the excavators, $1.50 per day; builders' labourers $1.50 per day; joiners, $2 per day; stair builders, $2 per day; plumbers, $2 per day; metal roofers, $1.25 per day. I do not need to go on through the whole list, but when we find the highest class men in these factories are not paid as high a wage as $626 a year, we are justified in asking that their case be considered fairly on its merits and not solely from the point of view of its disadvantages. I am glad that in Brantford our letter carriers are pretty well satisfied with the arrangement now proposed. They drafted a resolution and sent it on to me as follows:

> Dear Sir,—I am instructed by the letter carriers of Brantford to inform you that they have had a copy of the new Post Office Act, that is now before the House, and after giving it the consideration that is necessary to come to any conclusion as to its merits, and how it will affect us under present conditions, after all due consideration having been given to all the changes it contains, as far as it affects Brantford, we are satisfied with the Bill as it stands, and would ask you to support it in the House, as we are confident you will. We learn that Toronto is against it and may ask for its withdrawal, but we do not want to see any such thing happen, as we are of the opinion that on the whole it is as good as the most of us could expect and better for us in Brantford than we expected, and we hope that it will become law without any opposition from the carriers.
>
> On behalf of Brantford carriers, I have the honour to be,
>
> Yours respectfully,
> GEORGE BROATCH,
> Letter Carrier.

That is the opinion of the men in Brantford, whose wages will be advanced immediately to the extent almost of $146 per annum. Why should they not approve of this? There is not a man in the whole employ of the Post Office Department, there is not a letter carrier who has any right to complain except the man who is now getting $600 a year, and will only get $26 more. I have stated that a wage of $2 a day for a man who gets his appointment, say at the age of 25 and holds it as long as he can do the work has a pretty good thing. Take the agricultural implement shops, the Massey-Harris Company. They will pay their hands a less wage than these letter carriers get, and for ten weeks in the year they are shut down.

There is hardly an agricultural implement shop in this country in which they do not lay off their men from six to ten weeks in the year, and they do not then pay as high

a rate of wages as is paid to these men. Take bricklayers, earning $3 a day; they apparently get big wages, but they only work for eight months in the year. Plasterers earn $3 a day, but work nine months in the year. Stonemasons are paid $3 a day and work for only nine months in the year. And all these trades require skill, they require training, they require an apprenticeship. These employees of the country get more money than those engaged in other avocations, and besides they have steady employment, no dockages as long as they discharge their duties, and they have the possibility before them of getting into a class in which they will draw $700 a year. They have no right to complain. The Postmaster General in this Bill, is treating the employees of the country with almost prodigal liberality, such as I am fully persuaded, will satisfy the great mass of the letter carriers.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Heyd's) defence of the Bill is commendable from his point of view, and admirably gotten up. But it is not quite so strong as it might appear to be. The hon. gentleman evidently starts with the assumption that any one who rises to ask a question is thereby condemning the Bill.

Mr. HEYD. I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the only inference to be drawn from the tenor of the hon. gentleman's argument. And the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) when invited to give legitimate information which might enable us to judge the merits of the Bill seems to jump at the same conclusion. My first observation with regard to the Bill was designed to elicit on this point—it seemed that the effect of the Bill would be to remove a large class of civil servants from under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and I wished to know in what respect that law was defective. It seemed to me that, if the Civil Service Act were not what it should be, it would be better to prepare one that was more suitable and so improve the whole service, rather than make a special law for one class. I regret that the asking of questions with a view to gaining reasonable information disturbs the Postmaster General and ruffles his temper. When members put courteous questions, I think they are entitled to respectful answers, without the minister immediately concerned jumping to the conclusion that the request for information indicates opposition to his proposals. I had neither intention nor desire to oppose the Bill, but merely sought to elicit such information as would enable me to judge whether this Bill would improve the public service and do greater justice to public officers than the Civil Service Act or not. I do not think that any member of parliament is stepping aside from his duty in asking for such questions, and I think that a Minister of the Crown is doing less than his duty who is not prepared to answer those questions courteously. The time when the Bill is brought up is the time for us to get information that we may intelligently judge of the merits of the Bill. The hon. Postmaster General, no doubt, gave us a great deal of information in connection with the measure. But there was information he did not give, whether it was because he misunderstood the question or because his mind was running in another channel and he wished to engage in a general defence of the Bill, I do not know. At any rate, he seemed to be more anxious to prove that the Bill would have good results and that it would do justice to the letter carriers than to compare the Bill with the Civil Service Act and prove that this Bill is better. I listened with a good deal of attention to the speech in support of the Bill delivered by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman prepared his brief very carefully. When he read his certificate of character to the Bill which he had received from the letter carriers, it sounded to me as if it were something prepared by the hon. gentleman himself to give to the House as a clincher of his argument.

Mr. HEYD. If I may be permitted. I would like to say that I did not know the letter carriers had had a meeting and passed resolutions or that they were going to write to me.

Mr. SPROULE. I am glad to know that, because it relieves my mind of the impression that the whole thing had been got up by the hon. gentleman himself and that he had done it out of kindness to the Postmaster General and to help him over a difficult place. It seems necessary that I should assure the Postmaster General that I am not opposing the Bill, nor do I regard the Bill as altogether a bad one. I think it has some features that might be improved, but that in some respects it is ahead of the Civil Service Act. But there is one thing about it that struck me from the first as being somewhat inappropriate. If the Civil Service Act is not a suitable one, it seems to me we ought to amend it and have all branches of the service under the one Act.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There are many others besides the letter carriers who are outside the Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I know there are. And for that reason I have always regarded the Civil Service Act as requiring amendment. If the Civil Service Act is entirely unsuitable, we ought to do away with it and have another in its place. I would not complain of this Bill if it results in giving us more efficient employees and in doing justice to those who engaged in the service of the country. But I wish the Postmaster General to understand that when I put a question I do not put it with a desire of in-

terfering with him in the discharge of his duties, or of ruffling his usually good temper in conducting matters on the floor of the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if he does not think that this would be a good time to provide for a free delivery system in all the cities of the Dominion? I notice that some cities have that system, while others of equal importance are without it. That strikes one as not being in accord with the principle of one law for all. My hon. friend from Brantford was able to tell us how well things were working in Brantford and how the Bill would apply there. I can hardly know anything about the matter because we have no letter carriers. Yet I represent as important a city as does the hon. gentleman, the city of St. Catharines. As we have no free delivery system there I can hardly know what these hon. gentlemen are talking about. Would not this be a good time for the Postmaster General to propose an enactment, if an enactment is necessary, that all cities of the Dominion shall have the same system of free delivery? Of course I can understand that in large cities there must be more frequent delivery than in small cities. In a city like Toronto they may well require five or six deliveries a day. But why should not a city like St. Catharines have at least two deliveries, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. What fairness is there to that part of the country in the present state of affairs? I would like to ask the Postmaster General to give me some words of encouragement as to what we may look for in that respect.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When I took charge of the department I found that St. Catharines was not enjoying free delivery. The hon. gentleman's friends had had an opportunity during many years of giving that city a free delivery system.

Mr. LANCASTER. The city has grown since then.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad to hear it has made such progress, and I hope the government have contributed toward it. I have made some progress in the way of extending the free delivery system by giving it to the city of Brantford. Therefore, my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) will see that there is movement in the direction he suggests. I am not able to tell him, however, on what day the system will take effect in St. Catharines. Such a provision will not find an appropriate place in a Bill of this kind, an item in the estimates would be necessary for that purpose. Whenever Council can be induced to provide the ways and means, then the Post Office Department will put the system into force.

Mr. MAXWELL. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Grey declare that he was heartily in sympathy with this Bill. I may say that I also rejoice that this Bill has been introduced, because I do not think there is the slightest doubt but that it is a great improvement on anything that we have had, so far as letter carriers are concerned. We have quite a staff in the city of Vancouver, somewhere over thirty now, which this Bill more or less affects, and I think I voice their sentiment in saying that they will be very glad of the changes proposed in this Bill. So far as I have information by letter, they are very anxious, in common with other letter carriers of the Dominion, that some change should be made for their benefit. While they have naturally been looking for more, perhaps, than they are going to get, I think every fair-minded man will come to the conclusion that they are on the whole fairly treated in the present Bill. The hon. member for Brantford might have gone a good deal further in his remarks, so far as the pay of the men is concerned in his province. I have in mind a class of men who have to spend three or four years at a university in the Dominion of Canada, and then have to take a theological training as well, and the salary of the great bulk of that profession in Canada to-day is from $600 to $700 a year. So that when we compare their salary with that of the letter carriers, I think the latter receive very fair treatment, not only from the government, but from the people of Canada. But my main object in rising was to say a word in favour of the stampers and sorters of the post office.

Mr. HEYD. They are affected in the same way.

Mr. MAXWELL. No, they are not included in the Bill, and I would like to have them included. So far as Vancouver is concerned, we have some very intelligent and industrious young men who have been appointed as stampers and sorters, and who show considerable intelligence by the fact that they have passed the qualifying examination. Their pay is particularly small I think for men of that calibre.

Mr. CLARKE. What do they receive?

Mr. MAXWELL. $40 a month, the same as the letter carriers. I think the benefits are so important in this Bill that they ought to be extended to the stampers and sorters.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). I would suggest to the minister that he add a clause to his Bill giving all cities of 10,000 inhabitants the benefit of free mail delivery. I think that would meet the approbation of nearly all cities of that size in Canada.

Mr. CLARKE. There are some good features in this Bill, and I cheerfully recognize that fact. I refer to the shortening of the time, after a man enters the service as a letter carrier, when he may receive the maximum salary of the position. I think in view of the fact that the Post-

master General has abolished the Superannuation Act he was in duty bound to shorten the time, and I congratulate him upon having done so. A young man who is qualified to act as letter carrier does not require to train for six, eight or nine years before he receives the maximum salary. If he is not fit to discharge the duties of letter carrier at the end of two or three years, he ought not to be permitted to remain in the service. I think it is only reasonable and just that the amendment which the Postmaster General has made should receive the approval of the House. I cordially support it, and have great pleasure in doing so. But when the hon. gentleman and his friends opposite attempt to argue that this Bill improves the position of the letter carriers of this country beyond what it was before he came into office, he has a very difficult proposition to prove. He and his friends seem to forget that before the Superannuation Act was abolished the letter carriers contributed 2 per cent of their salary towards a superannuation fund, and after they had served from 20 to 35 years they got a pension of 20-50ths or 35-50ths as the case might be, of their salary for the remainder of their lives. The abolition of that Act put this class of men who have been appointed since that time, upon a very different footing from that occupied by the carriers before. The position of a carrier under the Superannuation Act was far better than it is under the proposed amendment to the law. I need not take up the time elaborating that fact, it must be patent to every one who will give it consideration. But I refer particularly to the case of men who entered the service prior to 1896, the men who have served the public as letter carriers for a great many years, and it must not be forgotten that these men served the country on a very small salary for a number of years, commencing at $300 and increasing by $30 a year; but, as the hon. gentleman says, it took eight or nine years to attain the maximum of their class. These men are not benefited by this Act; and these men constitute the vast majority of the letter carriers of this Dominion. Their position is not improved in any way by the Act which has been introduced, notwithstanding the fact that they have been very largely supported by public sentiment in the demands which they have made for several years past upon the Post Office Department for an increase. Now, it seems to me they have not been treated as frankly as they had a right to expect, in view of the statements that were made to them when a deputation waited upon the Postmaster General to represent and to advocate their case. During his absence last year the question of remuneration to be paid to letter carriers was brought before the House by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Birkett). I find in the 'Hansard' of May 21, last year, at page 5792, the following remarks by the hon. member for Ottawa:

Mr CLARKE.

Yesterday I placed a resolution on the Order paper, asking the attention of the acting Postmaster General, to the increase of salaries which he admitted he intended giving the letter carriers. I was one of the deputation that waited on the hon. the Postmaster General a day or two before he left, and he assured the deputation that the gentleman he was leaving in charge of his department would see that the matter was carried through. Several deputations have since waited on the acting minister, and I think it would be a gracious act on his part to carry out the promise made by the Postmaster General. The letter carriers are a very deserving class of men and certainly have presented a case that is well worthy of consideration.

The present hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was acting Postmaster General during the absence of that hon. gentleman, and he made the following remarks:

My hon. colleague, the Postmaster General, had taken the matter into consideration before he left, and had practically devised a scheme by which these men would be given an increase. I had two or three deputations of the letter carriers wait on me. There was some difference of opinion as to the best plan to be adopted, and after full consideration I concluded it was best to allow it to stand over until next session. I think that the letter carriers themselves were pretty well satisfied also to have the question remain over. While I am not in a position to say what will be done, I can assure my hon. friend that the Postmaster General and the government are favourable to an increase, and that a plan will be adopted which will, I trust, meet the views of the letter carriers and the House generally.

If that statement means anything at all it means that the increase will apply to the great body of letter carriers and not to a small percentage of them. Yet, in the Bill which the hon. gentleman has brought down, we find that the great percentage of letter carriers are not affected beneficially by its provisions. The hon. Postmaster General quoted from a communication which he received the other day that at a meeting of the employees of the Toronto post office department, including porters, messengers, box collectors and mail transfer agents, this Bill was unanimously endorsed. The hon. gentleman does not state when the meeting was held, where it was held, or how many were present at it. I have been advised that there were not more than half a dozen people present at the meeting at which this resolution was passed, and of course, the men who adopted this resolution were not letter carriers at all. They were not the men who have been memorializing the hon. Postmaster General for an increase. They are men who have only been in the service of the Post Office Department for a year or two. But, I did not notice that the hon. Postmaster General referred to a resolution passed at a meeting of the letter carriers held a week or two ago in the city of Toronto at which a very large number were present. The resolution, which was passed

unanimously, according to the report of the Toronto 'World,' reads as follows :—

That, whereas this assembly petitioned the Postmaster General praying that the letter carriers be granted an increase of 20 per cent in salary, owing to the increased cost of living ; and whereas the assembly has received from the Postmaster General an acknowledgment of said petition promising that said increase of salary would be considered, thereby leading us to believe that our prayer would be granted; be it resolved that we again reiterate our former prayer that the letter carriers be granted an increase of 20 per cent in their salary. Feeling assured as we do that the present prosperous condition of the country warrants it, we are not asking more than a fair day's pay for a long day's labour ; and be it further resolved that, as the Bill No. 106, entitled an Act to amend the Post Office Act, in no way answers organized labour's prayers for an increase of salary for the letter carriers, we do hereby express our strongest disapproval of said Bill and trust that it will be altered or amended to conform with this and our former prayer. Copies of the resolution will be forwarded the Postmaster General, Ralph Smith, M.P., A. W. Puttee, M.P., and the press.

That does not seem, Mr. Chairman, to look as if the letter carriers, whose petitions have been presented again and again asking for an increase in their pay, were satisfied with the provisions of the Bill now under consideration.

An hon. MEMBER. Where is the member for Nanaimo ?

Mr. CLARKE. I do not know where the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Smith) is. He is not in his seat. I have no doubt he is otherwise engaged. During the early part of the year the 'Globe' newspaper took up the cudgels on behalf of the letter carriers and strongly supported their contention for an increase of pay. I find, on January 6th, the following article :—

The Letter Carriers' Pay.

The Post Office Department ought to begin the new year by raising the salaries of the letter carriers. Rent, food and expenses of all kinds are higher to-day than some years ago, and the carriers' wages are now altogether too low. Economy is a good thing, no doubt, but what can be done by keeping down the wages of these men will make hardly an appreciable difference in the annual expenditure of the Dominion, while it makes a big difference to the postmen. Parliament ought to sympathize with these men. The indemnity of members of parliament, including the senators, has been raised from $1,000 to $1,500. If it costs a member $1,500 to live for four months, how does he expect a postman to live for a year on a fifth or fourth of that amount ? This matter has now been delayed long enough, and we hope that the very reasonable request of these faithful servants of the public will be complied with at an early day.

The hon. Postmaster General, in the statement which he presented to the House, gave statistics as to the pay which was given to the letter carriers as far back as 25 or 30 years ago, but it is an acknowledged fact, and the hon. gentleman will not deny it, that the cost of living has substantially increased since that time. The letter carriers, living in cities, have to pay more rent, they have to pay more for their food than they did then, and in view of the increased expenditures which they are called upon to make in order to live it is not unreasonable or unfair that the demand which they have made should receive the favourable consideration of the government. The hon. Postmaster General has the advantage of having at his elbow all the time the Minister of Labour to aid in preparing measures affecting the working classes, and I am sure that hon. gentleman must have drawn his attention to the resolutions which have been passed by representative labour organizations as to the compensation which the letter carriers are receiving to-day. On page 33 of the report of the Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Session of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, held at Toronto, September 8th-14th, 1892, the following resolution was adopted. This resolution was moved by the gentleman who now occupies the position of fair-wage officer in the Department of Labour, and it was seconded by the gentleman who now occupies the position of secretary of the Labour Bureau of the province of Ontario. These gentlemen were well qualified apparently to speak in the interests of those on whose behalf the resolution was moved. The congress which they addressed was so impressed with the reasonableness of the resolution that it was passed unanimously. I will read it for the information of the committee :

Moved by Mr. D. J. O'Donohue, seconded by Mr. R. Glockling and resolved,

That in the opinion of this congress the minimum salary of letter carriers in the public service should be not less than $600 per annum, and that it be an instruction to the executive committee of this congress to use its best efforts in pressing this view of the case upon the government.

In 1898 the Trades and Labour Congress wrestled with the subject again and passed the following resolution :—

Moved by Mr. Mortimer, seconded by Mr. Watson and resolved,

Whereas, the letter carriers and other postal assistants of Canada have frequently appeared before different trades councils of the Dominion and complained that the conditions under which they worked were not such as should exist among government employees ; and whereas, these trade councils have investigated and found that these men had a just grievance, in that they received insufficient wages, had no set hours of labour and had no definite system of promotion ; therefore be it resolved, that we urge upon the Dominion government the necessity of establishing a minimum wage of $2 a day for eight hours work, and so regulating the department that letter carriers may depend upon promotion for faithful services.

Last year, at Brantford, the Trades and Labour Congress again dealt with this matter, so that the attention of the hon. Postmaster General and his colleagues must

have been drawn to the attitude which organized labour has taken in respect to the pay of the letter carriers. In 1901 this resolution was adopted :

That the letter carriers of the Dominion having, by petition, requested the hon. Postmaster General to consider the advisability and justice of granting an increase of 20 per cent in the present scale of wages, and as the letter carriers have not as yet received the consideration which their petition merited, be it

Resolved, that it be an instruction to the incoming executive committee of this congress to immediately, by petition or otherwise, draw the serious attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that the increased prices of the various necessaries of life, such as food, rent and fuel, render it necessary that this urgent and important question should receive immediate and favourable consideration and settlement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what consideration has been given in this Bill to the large body of the letter carriers of the Dominion ? Has their position been improved ? Not in the slightest degree. Those who have been in the service for eight years and have obtained the maximum are getting $49 per month, while in the scale provided for by the Postmaster General those in class D will receive $49.40. That is the only difference I can see, except that in the case of men appointed since 1896, they may reach the maximum in 4½ years, but, as I have said, those who have already obtained the maximum pay will not have their position improved in the slightest degree. They have asked for bread and it looks to me as if they had received from the Postmaster General a stone. Their position remains exactly as it was before. There is not the slightest difference made in their position, notwithstanding the petitions which they have presented from time to time ; notwithstanding the assurances which they have received from the Postmaster General and his colleagues; notwithstanding that they have established that the cost of living has substantially increased during the past five years. The position of these letter carriers, proven to have been unsatisfactory, has not been bettered in the slightest by the Bill introduced by the minister (Hon. Mr. Mulock). It does not affect the men who are receiving the maximum. The hon. gentleman from Brantford (Mr. Heyd) read a resolution that was passed by the letter carriers of his city. Their position undoubtedly will be improved under the operation of the Bill, and they ought to give credit to the Postmaster General. But the reason why their position will be improved is because they have only been appointed during the last two or three years, and they will reach the maximum in a shorter time than if the provisions of the old Act were in force. They are in duty bound to give credit to the Postmaster General, because the Bill beneficially affects them to that extent. I do not desire to speak at greater length, because I know that the time of the minister is very short here this afternoon, and I would not like to interfere in any way with his arrangements. I repeat that the Postmaster General has not done what the letter carriers expected he would do, or what they were given to understand he would do. No amount of specious argument can establish that the position of these industrious, hard working, faithful men has been improved in any way by this measure. In August last there was a flourish of trumpets in the 'Evening Star,' a very excellent paper printed in Toronto, which supports the Postmaster General, and it was owing to the fact that some order had been issued by the Post Office Department respecting the purchase of supplies for use in that department. It is worth reading. It says:

Current Wages and Union Hours—The stipulations for all who furnish Post Office supplies.

Ottawa, Aug. 28.—Hon. William Mulock has decided that all men or firms furnishing supplies of all kinds to the Post Office Department must pay the current rate of wages to their employees and adopt the union hours of labour. This applies to goods whether sold under contract or not. At present the regulations apply only to contracts, but the principle has now been extended so as to become operative in the case of all who are on the patronage list of the department. Hereafter all persons who sell goods to the Post Office Department will have to make a sworn declaration that they have complied with the new regulation before they will receive payment.

If that statement is correct, the Postmaster General deserves credit for having issued the regulation, but I think the rule should apply to the employees in his own department as well as to those from whom supplies are purchased. It is a notorious fact that those who have been employed in his department in collecting letters from the street letter boxes have had to work seven nights in the week. Their hours of labour are more than nine or ten hours. They were on duty from eight o'clock in the morning until sometimes ten o'clock or eleven o'clock at night. I think, therefore, that it is a good rule to have a regulation of this kind apply first of all to the employees of the hon. gentleman's own department. I think charity, justice, and fair play should commence at home, and I believe with my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Puttee) that an amendment should be made in this Bill, fixing the hours which the letter carriers have to work, if their wages are not to be increased. The hon. gentleman said that one man could distribute a greater number of letters in a given time than another. That is quite true, but I wish to say that so far as the city of Toronto is concerned, in many cases the letter carriers are overburdened with work. They are not able to carry out all the letters and mail matter, and so not only automobiles but

wagons are used to bring an additional load to meet them on their beats, when they have their work partially done. This is a condition that should be remedied. These men are employed, some of them, from six o'clock and half past six in the morning until five and half past five at night, and they are out in the most severe weather. As the hon. gentleman knows, they are employed on holidays, when there is at least one delivery. They have to discharge arduous duties; they are a faithful body of men, and they deserve better consideration from the Postmaster General. I hope that before this Bill goes through, the Postmaster General will concede that the grades shall be rearranged, and that men, after having served a reasonable time in class D, will be put into class E. There is no provision made for them going into class E, except on the recommendation of the officer who has supervision. The whole trend of this Act places these employees practically in the hands of the administration of the day. They need not be raised from class A to class B, or from class B to class C, or from class C to class D, or raised to class E unless the officer says so. The letter carriers who are affected by this Bill are entirely in the hands of the government of the day; they will owe their promotion to superior officers in every case, and in that way the Bill will have an injurious effect, and ought to be amended before it is passed. I would suggest that it should be amended in this way: That unless these men are reported against as being inefficient, they should in the natural order of things and at the end of a given time be promoted from class to class. Is that an unreasonable proposition? I submit that promotion should not be on account of some extraordinarily arduous service, but that if they have faithfully served for a given number of years they should be promoted from class D to class E. Why is grade E put in? Why is the hope held out that they may some day succeed in getting $2.25 a day? Who is to determine when that promotion is to be accorded to them? It is most unfair to them that the provision should be worded in that way. The highest class ought to be attainable by them after a reasonable length of service with good conduct, or else it ought to be struck out of the Bill altogether. I hope the minister will amend clause 3 by providing that at the end of a certain number of years men shall be promoted from grade D to grade E, thus making the maximum $2.25 per day, instead of $2 as at present. The men who are now in the service get holidays and they are paid if they are absent on sick leave. Under the provisions of this Bill they get 14 days holidays, but they have now 21 days, and under the Bill they will receive no pay whatever if they are sick. Is their position improved under the new order of things? Not at all. The Postmaster General says that if men are not paid for the time they are absent on account of sickness there will be less sickness. That is hardly a warranted reflection to make on these men. If men are found shirking their work; if men are found shamming sickness they should be dismissed from the service. I repeat that the position accorded to the letter carriers under this Bill is a much less favourable one than the letter carriers of the Dominion had a right to expect. I hope that the Postmaster General will so amend the Bill, that after a certain number of years' service men can reach class E and receive $2.25 a day, and that some definite time should be fixed as to the number of hours in a day's work. The hon. member for Winnipeg says the day should be eight hours. That is a reasonable proposition, and I hope it will be embodied in the Bill before it is eventually passed.

I notice that in the United States Congress an effort is being made to substantially increase the pay of the letter carriers on the other side, and the same arguments are there used on behalf of the men as may fairly be used here. For instance, the increased cost of living and the increased amount of work done. Under these circumstances and in view of the efficient manner in which our carriers do their work, I think the Postmaster General ought to make the maximum pay at least $2.25 per day, and fix the hours of labour at not more than eight in the eleven. If the Bill were amended in these respects, I am sure it would be generally acceptable to all the men in the service and be highly appreciated.

I notice that there is a clause providing for the appointment of a superintendent of the city post offices. Who is superintending the city post offices now? Is the work not being done efficiently now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is no regular provision for the superintending of city post offices in the full sense of the word. These offices are supposed to be more or less under the supervision of the inspector, but the post office inspectors have not got that intimate acquaintance with the technical post office work which makes them competent to discharge the duties that would be required of a chief city superintendent. I mentioned on a former occasion the gentleman I had in my mind for the office, and I think my hon. friend will agree that a better appointment could not be made.

Mr. HEYD. I find that one of the objections in the minds of the letter carriers is this. Under the present Civil Service Act, the wages of the letter carriers, sorters, and others increase from $360 to $600 per year by annual increases of $30. The letter carriers are under the impression that this works automatically, and that the increase takes place without the intervention of anybody, but under the new Bill, a recommen-

dation is required and thus the increase may be refused.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may say that parliament was informed some time ago that the late Minister of Justice, Sir Oliver Mowat, gave it as his legal opinion that no civil servant was entitled to the annual increase provided in the Civil Service Act, except on the recommendation of the Governor General in Council, and on the money being voted by parliament. He gave it as his opinion that no civil servant has any legal right to the increase, but that the increase is a matter wholly within the discretion of parliament and the government. Recommendations for the increases are therefore necessary to-day, and these words do not in the slightest degree vary the law, but give expression to what is the law, so that the letter carriers and others will know quite well that they have to depend for their increase upon the recommendation for the promotion. There is every disposition to be lenient with all public officers. In my own department my instructions are that every civil servant, who has a salary of $800 or less, should be given the annual increment unless there is good ground for disqualifying him. Every one is given the increase unless his superior officer reports against him. That is the rule adopted, and it is no unkindness to the staff to let them understand that even if the hand is not very often used, there is a master hand which may be used. They are treated with the utmost consideration, and this Bill is in no sense a measure to give arbitrary power, which might or might not be abused, and I am satisfied that these observations which I am making will be of benefit to the staff themselves. They are meant in kindness, whether accepted in that light or not. As to the provisions whereby some of the letter carriers might be promoted to class E at $2.25 per day, there will be some appointments of that kind, especially in the leading cities, where there are greater responsibilities devolving upon some of the letter carriers and where their duties are perhaps more onerous. Those who are getting the maximum to-day will get $26 more to begin with, and if they work the 313 days they will get a $20 bonus besides, if their services were satisfactory. It is not meant that the work must be specially satisfactory, but what would be considered a reasonably fair and satisfactory service, such as would commend itself to any respectable man. Public officers cannot withhold or give certificates arbitrarily. They are amenable to public opinion even if they are not actuated by conscientious motives, and the general disposition is to be very friendly to those beneath them. You can rely on it that every superior officer will, wherever possible, recommend the letter carriers and these other various officials for the increase, and unless these officials have disqualified themselves by bad conduct, they will get the extra $20 as well as the $26. Those in receipt of $600 a year will get $46 extra, and will have the chance of getting a further increase in grade E of $78 a year. The increase of $46 on the salary of $600 is an increase of between 7 per cent and 8 per cent, which is not an insignificant increase.

As regards the hon. gentleman's statement that I had made some promise, I must disclaim anything of the kind. I am aware that some organizations have passed resolutions in which I am reported as having promised to a delegation which waited on me in March, 1901, that there would be an increase. But I was extremely careful, as I am on all occasions, not to make any promise. You have yet to find an occasion when I have made a promise to any individual or deputation as to what the government or council would do. What I stated was that the matter would receive my best consideration, and that I hoped to mature a plan which I would leave with my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance to present to parliament. The Minister of Finance was present. I had a scheme in my mind at the time, which is somewhat the same as that presented to-day, and which does provide a measure of increase to those who chose to avail themselves of it. I wrote a confidential report to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, setting forth my views and requesting him to take up the measure and bring it before my colleagues. But during my voyage I came to the conclusion that the views that I had left behind were not sufficiently definite and that it would be better to defer the matter until the present session, and I cabled to my colleague, the Minister of Finance, to that effect. But I want to make it quite clear that I never made a promise beyond what I have stated on the floor of the House to-day.

Mr. HEYD. I understand that there is a rule in force that no man can be appointed as a letter carrier who is over 25 years of age. Will that be rescinded by the adoption of this Bill ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. There are many persons over 25 years of age who would be able to perform the duties of these various positions, such as packers, messengers, and so on ; and if they are paid by the day, there is not the same objection to men advanced in years being appointed that there would be if they were paid by the year.

Mr. CLARKE. The Postmaster General said, if I understood him correctly, that all the persons affected by this Bill would receive at least $46 a year increase.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. If I read section 7 correctly, I do not so interpret it. Probably the Postmaster General can set me right.

The men now receiving the maximum will not come under section 7, will they ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. If they wish.

Mr. CLARKE. But they will have to abandon their superannuation ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, there is a saving clause in section 6, which provides that they shall not.

Mr. BARKER. I hope the Postmaster General will extend the privileges of class 'E' to the present employees, whether they accept the provisions of this Bill or not. There is a strong feeling among the old employees of the department that this Bill does not do them justice. The hon. minister has told us, as the fact is, that the present employees to attain the maximum salary have to serve nine or ten years. There are many who have served these nine or ten years, and there are a good many perhaps who have served six or seven years. By this Bill these men will have placed side by side with them other men who will attain the maximum salary in four and a half years. That will, I think, breed discontent and a state of things not to the advantage of the service. If the men now in the service were allowed to have the advantages of class 'E' in common with those who come under the Bill, I think it would do much to remove any cause of dissatisfaction in that respect. I think it is not a gracious thing for the government to treat an old and faithful civil servant in such a way that he has to be coerced to accept this Bill in order to get the advantage of it. It does seem reasonable that the special class 'E' should not be confined to men who are appointed after this date, but should also be open to old servants who have served the public well in the past.

Mr. PUTTEE. Has the hon. Postmaster General considered the suggestion made by the hon. member for Burrard (Mr. Maxwell), to include sorters and stampers in clause 1 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When we get through the Bill, I propose to offer an amendment in the form of an independent substantive clause dealing with stampers and sorters.

Mr. MAXWELL. Will you allow me to make another appeal ? According to the ruling of the Postmaster General a short time ago, the age limit at which a man could enter the service was changed. He must now be between 18 and 25, and I am in hearty sympathy with that rule. I think the younger you can get a man into the service the better, both for the service and for himself. But unfortunately there were a number of men in the service before that rule came into force, and these men, after having passed—some the preliminary and others the qualifying examination—were refused to be put on the permanent list because of the age limit. When this Bill is coming into force, I think it would be a gracious act to allow all those men who have been in the post office service to receive the benefit of the Act as well as the permanent staff.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think my hon. friend's request is perfectly reasonable, and I will say that it is intended, as soon as this measure becomes law, to go through the list of all those now performing temporary work, and all who are suitable to be brought under the provisions of this Bill will be brought under its provisions.

On section 3,

Mr. PUTTEE. This provides that those in grade 'A' shall receive only $1.25 per day. Even the trackmen on the Intercolonial Railway are going to be paid above that rate very soon, and it seems to me that this is too low a sum to recognize here as a minimum at all. Seeing that the grade only lasts six months, I think it would be a great deal bettter to make this read that the salaries of those in grades 'A' and 'B' shall be at the rate of $1.50 per day. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Heyd) says that in this class of work a man is efficient as soon as he enters the service. There is nothing to learn; there is no apprenticeship; it is work that needs a man and not a boy; and therefore there is no reason why he should be paid at that low rate. It seems to me that it should be fixed at $1.50. Then a man would be in grade 'A' while on probation, and when it was decided to appoint him permanently, he would be moved into grade 'B.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am willing to meet my hon. friend's objection in a certain way. The six months is about as short a probationary period as you could reasonably fix; but if a man deserves the appointment sooner, then the $1.50 will begin. I am willing to put in words to provide that he shall be subject to a probationary period of not less than six months, or until he shall on the recommendation of the proper officer, be sooner confirmed in his appointment.

Mr. PUTTEE. That goes a long way towards meeting the point. But if I were the Postmaster General and were willing to go that far, I would do away with this eyesore of $1.25 a day.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, I want efficiency.

On section 4, subsection 1,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved that the clause be amended by striking out the words 'not less than' in the 20th line, and, after the words 'months' in the 20th line adding the following: Or until such earlier

period as he shall, on recommendation to the proper officer, be confirmed in his appointment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to know if there is any possibility of this grade 'E' being made more open. I suppose that the idea at present is that very few will enter it. But it seems to me that any man who has not been especially reported against ought, after twelve years service, to enter grade 'E' as a matter of right.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think it better to let the Bill go into force as it is in that respect. We will see how it works for a while. I could not agree to-day to any amendment.

Subsection, as amended, agreed to.

On section 4, subsection 2,

Mr. PUTTEE. I think the Postmaster General will see the reasonableness of asking that that subsection be altered in some way. It seems to me that the principle of reduction in grade as a man grows older should not be recognized.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is the law to-day.

Mr. PUTTEE. It should be worded in some way so that, in the interest of discipline a man may be subject to suspension from time to time. But, for myself, I totally object to the subsection in its present form, because it involves what seems to me an altogether harmful principle. This power to reduce the officers in grade may not be used except in case of change of government, or something like that, but the subsection does give the department power as a man grows older to reduce him in grade.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But it does not change the law. Civil servants are liable to be reduced in grade at any time. That is very rarely done, but it is quite right that they should understand that it is possible. Civil servants are sometimes reduced in rank.

Mr. BARKER. Is it to be done by Order in Council ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Of course.

Mr. BARKER. Would it not be better to say so here ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is covered by section 12, which provides that appointments, promotions, reductions in grade and dismissals under this Act shall be made by the Governor in Council.

Mr. PUTTEE. Then, why put in this subsection at all ? If it is put in it must be because it is expected that it will be made use of. The idea is to reduce men as they grow inefficient. And, of course, when it is a matter of carrying weight and walking miles a man must grow less efficient after a certain age.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a clause that is in the interest of the employees, for it makes it possible to continue old men in the service. According to my hon. friend's (Mr. Puttee's) view the employees should be kept so long as they can work under the full head of steam, and then dismiss them. But, under this subsection that will not be necessary, but a man can be given suitable work as his efficiency grows less. Whether it works well or otherwise depends upon the man in whose hands it is. An arbitrary use can be made of any power, or a fair use can be made of it. Governments are amenable to public opinion, and I do not think it would be fair to assume that this power will be cruelly or unfairly used. The same power exists with regard to the whole civil service to-day, and it is as well for those in the whole service to be aware of the existence of this power.

On section 10,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why say 'chief superintendent' ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have a number of superintendents, and it is to prevent any confusion. We have post office inspectors who have certain duties of superintendence, and in some post offices there are persons called superintendents. He will be called the chief superintendent in order to avoid any confusion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This would not interfere with the appointment of inspectors?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

11. No person over thirty years of age should be eligible for appointment as railway mail clerk or as stamper and sorter.

Mr. PUTTEE. Would it not be necessary here to make some such provision as this :

Other than those serving as temporary employees at the time of the passing of this Act.

I believe there are some who have been in the service for years and are called temporary employees, who would be debarred for appointment under this section. There are some over thirty years of age, I believe.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I have no objection to those words. I move that these words be added after the word 'age,' 'other than those at present temporarily in the post office service.'

Amendment agreed to.

On section 13,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are these sections that are repealed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Those are sections dealing with the rates of postage upon parcels. I mentioned in course of the debate the other evening that the

rates for parcel post are in great confusion. Some rates are fixed by Act of parliament and some are left to the Postmaster General to be fixed, and it is impossible for postmasters to determine the legal rate upon many parcels passing through the post office. We cannot stop and overhaul them, and it is proposed to repeal all these statutory provisions, and leave them as under the general Act. When this clause is repealed, then the Postmaster General will deal with all the rates.

On section 14,

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The only change in this section is this: There is at present a fund derived from assessments to make good losses that arise through the default or wrong-doing of any of our officers, and it has been held that we cannot use that fund for payment to any one except to the Crown. For example, a person has deposited money in our savings bank, and suppose a postmaster has embezzled that money, we could draw upon the assessment in respect to that loss. But if an individual transmitted a letter containing money through the post office and one of our officers misappropriated it, although it was quite clear who had done it, we could not pay out of the assessment to the individual who had lost the money. The amendment is to make that fund liable to the individual citizen in case of a loss sustained by him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there regulations in force now?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There were, and there will be more. There is no power to make the assessment fund available for a private citizen.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL moved:

That the word 'or' be inserted after the word 'derived' in the 14th line.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How do these regulations come before parliament, or do they come before parliament in any way? How does parliament know what they are?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They have to be gazetted, and they are published in the Post Office Guide, and they get to the public in that way. I do not know that there is any other way of their receiving publicity. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr Borden, Halifax) suggest something?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest that these regulations might perhaps be laid on the Table of parliament within a certain number of days after the opening of the session next after they have been enacted.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They might be incorporated in the report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, unless there is some provision in the statute.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We generally incorporate them wherever we can. We want to give them the widest publicity. Still, I will endeavour to meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion as far as I can.

On section 15,

Mr. PUTTEE. I would like to ascertain whether the hon. Postmaster General can give any assurance as to meeting the important question of providing for the length of the day's work. I believe that it would make for the smooth operating of every city post office if the suggestion which I make were adopted. It would tend to a greater degree of equality in dividing up the beats and therefore save a great deal of trouble. In the United States eight hours is a day's work, and the salaries which they pay are 50 per cent higher than what those which our letter carriers receive. I would suggest that a clause something like this be added to section 3:

A days work shall consist of eight hours and the eight hours shall not, intermissions included, extend over eleven hours.

That would not interfere with the service, but, on the contrary, would improve it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is really an amendment which is not necessary. It is quite impossible to fix the exact length of time that a letter carrier will be on his beat. He must remain on his beat until his work is completed. If the hon. gentleman would peruse the time tables in Canada I am sure he would not make that suggestion, because he will find that in many instances the length of service is under eight hours. We cannot measure off the beats so as to fix the exact time during which a man will be out. When he goes out upon his beat he must stay there until the work is completed. The average number of hours during which letter carriers work throughout the whole of Canada is eight hours and twenty-one minutes.

Mr. CLARKE. The work is being steadily increased, and of course it takes longer to do it. The number of letters to be delivered on each man's beat is steadily increasing. He has to go up and down stairs and up and down in elevators, and all that kind of thing, and it might not be unreasonable to expect that you should fix some hour for commencing and finishing work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The debate is sufficient to indicate the view of the committee, and we will endeavour to live up to the spirit of the discussion this afternoon. The practice in the past has not inflicted any serious injustice on these men, and you can depend upon it that we will not retrograde at least. I propose to move an amendment to the Bill. There is at present a third class in the post office outside service entering at $400 and going

up to $800. I propose to divide that third class into two classes, one to be called the fourth class, which will come in at $400 and go up to $600, and the other to begin at $600 and go up to $800, to take power to transfer to that third class stampers and sorters, and to make the annual increment in the case of the fourth class $50 a year. I beg to move :

That portion of schedule 'B' of the Civil Service Act entitled 'Clerks in the City Post Offices' is amended by adding after the words 'post offices' the following :

Fourth-class on appointment $400, by annual increase of $50 up to $600.

And by striking out '400' after the words 'third class' and insert in lieu thereof '600.'

Any stamper and sorter may be promoted to the fourth-class and on such promotion his initial salary as such forth-class clerk shall be equal to the amount of his salary as such stamper and sorter at the time of such promotion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not relevant to this Bill, but I would like to mention a subject as a mere matter of notice. I would like to have the hon. Postmaster General bring down the three affidavits mentioned in the memorandum of the deputy minister, dated May 1st, respecting the dismissal of Mr. Robert Kaulbach. This memorandum refers to the affidavit of Mr. John A. Shaw, Mr. George B. Phalen and Mr. Ainslie B. Shaw.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will do it.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 109) respecting the Molsons Bank Pension Fund.—Mr. Osler.

Bill (No. 123) to incorporate the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Fraser.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 127) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George Depew.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 145) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Copp.

THE ORTHODOX RUSSO-GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Mr. OLIVER moved second reading of Bill (No. 140) to incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and Aleutian Islands, and each of the parishes and missions of the said church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, I am not going to offer any factious opposition to this Bill ; but there seems to be a fatality attached to it. I see that the French translation of the Bill provides for the incorporation of the church, not the bishop, while in the English version it is the bishop of the Orthodox Greek Church. I must also call the attention of the House to the fact that in the body of the Bill there is no responsible name at all. We are asked to incorporate the bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church of North America and the Aleutian Islands and his successors in office. A bishop has no successor in office as bishop, because the word bishop itself does not imply that there is a succession.

The PRIME MINISTER. How do you know ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How do I know that a king never dies ? We had a Bill before a committee this morning, containing the name of a bishop, and we incorporated that bishop and his successors in office. Surely we ought to have a responsible name, because a bishop in that sense is not an individual. There are many other irregularities in connection with this Bill. The party who is seeking incorporation under this title has never proved his identity. We have no petition besides his own, and, as I said on another occasion, he is a foreigner living in a foreign country. He claims to be Bishop of North America and the Aleutian Islands, which is a very vast diocese. Before recognizing the authority of that high clerical official, I think the House should give this matter a second thought. I will allow my hon. friend to have the second reading carried on a division, because I do not want to be committed to the principle of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, on division, and Bill read the second time.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Census, $120,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. minister laid on the Table the papers he promised at the last meeting ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I think so, with the exception of the accounts which the hon.

member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) asked for in connection with the investigation in the province of Quebec, which I now lay on the Table. The other papers asked for were laid on the Table the day after the discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman promised to bring down the stub check-book showing the checks that were paid during January and February to the friends up in Lisgar.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Here is a statement of the payments to the enumerators.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman laid any information on the Table with regard to a matter which I brought to his attention? I asked him to give me the names of the enumerators who had their attention directed to the charges of fraud in connection with the taking of the census, before these charges were made public.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I was misinformed when I said I believed that the enumerators had been notified of the charges made against them. I believe there was only one enumerator really who was spoken to about this investigation, and he was spoken to informally by the hon. member for Bagot, who was looking into the matter in the county of Bagot. I had a conversation with Mr. O'Connor, of Montreal, who made the investigation there. He told me that one of the enumerators, who had been working in 1891, was enumerator also in his division in 1901. I asked him if he had spoken to this enumerator, and he said that he had not spoken to him definitely, although he had asked him about it, but intended doing so. I thought he had done so, but I found afterwards that he had not. I thought that several other gentlemen were spoken to, but I find that they were not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman was very positive the other day that a number of the enumerators had these charges of fraud brought to their attention, and had been requested to send in their replies before those charges were made public. The hon. gentleman ought to know positively before making any statement of the kind. I think it is one of the most humiliating admissions ever made by any man in this House, which the Minister of Agriculture has just made. He admits that he has brought charges broadcast against these men, and that in not one instance were these charges brought to their attention before they were made. What justification has the hon. gentleman for slandering these men behind their backs and scattering those charges throughout the length and breadth of the country, without giving them the opportunity of saying a word in their defence? It is only due to the hon. gentleman himself and the government and this House that some justification of that extraordinary mode of procedure should be given. We have these charges made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and then repeated over and over again by the hon. gentleman. I did not think it possible that such a course could have been adopted without some notice having been given these men. The charges against them were not made under oath. These enumerators were not given the opportunity of examining witnesses, but they were denounced as guilty of fraud on these ex parte statements, not made under oath, and made against men who were under oath in the discharge of their duties. Surely there must be some explanation of this extraordinary mode of procedure. Surely it has not been resorted to merely to make political capital.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What we wanted was to get at the proof and find out what explanation there was of the extraordinary condition of affairs, shown by comparisons of the figures of the census of 1891 with those of 1901. The figures of 1901 showed in many cases great decreases in population, in places where the people, who were familiar with the neighbourhood, could not believe such decreases could have taken place. The first mode of procedure was to try and check over the results of the census of 1901, and in the province of Quebec we had a ready means in the parochial returns of making this check. Our check shows that the census of 1901 was fairly accurate. The difference between the parochial, and the census returns of 1901, in twenty-one constituencies, was only 8,000, and that was as close as could be expected, considering the three months difference in time between the two. The question then was whether there had been any mistake in the census returns of 1891. Going back we found a difference of 44,000 between the census of 1891 and the parochial returns of that year, which was a most extraordinary discrepancy. The question then was: Where did this discrepancy take place? We found that a number of people had been enumerated in the Dominion census, who were not present when that census was taken, and we established this by incontrovertible evidence. I must confess that while I expected that some of the enumerators implicated had been notified, I did not give any definite instructions to that effect, and did not take any particular means for the purpose of consulting them. The evidence we had was such that it was impossible not to believe that the enumerators had unduly swelled the returns of 1891, and that being the case, I could not see any necessity for consulting the enumerators. No doubt if I had, they would have tried to shuffle out of the responsibility.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is certainly a remarkable reason. The hon. gentleman listens to ex parte statements, not made

under oath, made behind the backs of these men, and assumes them to be true. He says that these men are such scoundrels that there is no use at all appealing to them. Just as if some one should accuse the hon. gentleman of burglarly, and a third person should be appealed to who would say that the hon. gentleman was guilty. It would be suggested that the hon. gentleman should be heard in his own defence, but the answer would be: No, if the Hon. Sydney Fisher is guilty of burglarly there is no use in asking him, because he would deny it. That is a specimen of the hon. gentleman's logic with regard to these men. And he considers that he is doing justice to himself, I suppose, when he makes that explanation. He accused these men over and over again, in his speech, of fraud, and this is the only answer that he has to give to this House and to the country when he is expostulated with for making these charges without giving these men an opportunity to answer. And he has a number of gentlemen around him who were shocked because the other day the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was not disposed to give the name of a gentleman who had informed him that Mr. Wm. Pugsley had gone to New York. These gentlemen almost wept with sorrow and grief over that refusal. Yet the hon. gentleman and his colleagues and his friends have nothing to say when an explanation is asked with regard to this extraordinary occurrence. Fifty or sixty or perhaps a hundred enumerators—I do not know the number—are charged deliberately in this House with fraud of a most serious character, with perjury, with violating their oaths of office, and yet the Minister of Agriculture says that the only excuse he has for making these charges against these men behind their backs and without giving them the slightest opportunity to answer, is that the charges are true and the men must be such scoundrels that there is no use in asking them about the facts. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman should venture to rise in this House when he has no better explanation than that. I venture to think that it would have been far better for him to have retained his seat, to have said nothing at all, than to give so useless an explanation of his conduct as he has given. I deeply regret, for the sake of this country, that these gentlemen, members of this government, should have so little regard for the decency of civilized life as to make these charges against the public officers without giving them the slightest opportunity to be heard in their own behalf, without even speaking to these men before the charges were made thus publicly in this House. Why, the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture is a monstrous one. The charges that he made were not supported by any evidence under oath, they were supported by hearsay evidence, statements made, in many cases, by persons who did not pretend to speak from their own personal knowledge of the facts. The statements were not made under oath, but the returns made by these officers which are called in question, were made under oath. The work of these men was in discharge of their duty as public officers, and surely any man who undertakes to perform service for the country is at least entitled to expect that members of the government under whom he serves, or of any future government, will not attack him behind his back as has been done in this case, will not accuse him of fraud without at least giving him an opportunity of being heard in his own defence.

Mr. CLARKE. Who was the chief census officer in 1891?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Mr. George Johnson.

Mr. CLARKE. Is he still in the employ of the government?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Was he asked for any explanation of these alleged discrepancies, or called upon to make any report as to how they arose?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He has not been called upon for such a report yet.

Mr. CLARKE. And he is still in the employ of the country, and occupying a responsible position. He was responsible to the government of that day and to the people of the country for the accuracy of the statements that were made as to the results of the census of 1891. As the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has pointed out, most serious charges have been made by the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) and one of his colleagues impugning the integrity of the enumerators in many places. Yet the gentleman who was responsible for the census and who is still a government officer has never been asked to give his views or to offer any explanation of what would appear to be very grave discrepancies in the census. Hon. gentlemen opposite have made so many statements within the last three or four years as to the progress Canada was making, as to the exodus being stopped, and as to the population of Canada increasing by leaps and bounds, that when the result of the census of 1901 was made known they had to find some pretext to justify their statements. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1898 estimated the population of Canada at five and three quarter millions, and expressed the hope that it would soon be six millions. But when the census figures were made known and the hon. gentleman found that he was wide of the mark, he devoted all the energy and ability he pos-

sesses to pouring vituperation upon those who had taken the census of 1891.

Mr. COWAN. Did he not give pretty good evidence for what he said ?

Mr. CLARKE. Not a particle of evidence that would be accepted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) himself as a professional man. Not one single allegation was buttressed with statements under oath from those who knew the facts. It was ungenerous and unjust for a minister of the Crown to charge these officers with fraud and perjury and with giving false returns of the census of ten years ago. But the extraordinary spectacle is presented to us to-night of the Minister of Agriculture having still in the employment of the Crown in his department the man who must have been responsible for this loose condition of things, if it existed. Surely he should have been treated as an honourable man, and if these inaccuracies had been discovered, as alleged, he should have been asked for an explanation of them ? He surely might have been invited to consider whether the statements as to frauds were correct or not and to say whether the figures presented in 1891 in connection with the census were worthy of credence or not ?

Mr. COWAN. He might have been asked to explain the knitting factories and the carpet factories shown in the census of 1891.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) will say something germane to the subject before you, Mr. Chairman, I shall be happy to discuss it. I can only hear something about 'knitting factories,' and I do not see what that has to do with the question. We have here a most humiliating state of affairs. Hon. members of this House occupying the most responsible positions in Canada, ministers of the Crown, have not hesitated to make statements in this House which their friends in the country will be expected to believe, but which statements have not, so far, been justified by such evidence as to make them appear statements which can be relied upon as well founded. Is it the intention of the Minister of Agriculture to give Mr. Johnson an opportunity to explain, to call Mr. Johnson to his aid in making an explanation of the discrepancies which are said to have been found in these various towns and parishes ? Would it not be reasonable to ask Mr. Johnson for an explanation ? If that gentleman is still worthy of being retained in the public service, surely he is the man who should be asked to account, if he can, for these alleged discrepancies ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not come to any conclusion as to what steps I shall take in the further investigation of the census of 1891. As I said on a former occasion when this question was discussed, this whole investigation arose out of a desire to check the census of 1901, and was carried on for that purpose, and with that object in view. The developments are shown by the papers laid on the Table of the House. As head of the bureau of statistics in 1891, no doubt Mr. Johnson is responsible for the census. But I have not suggested in any way that Mr. Johnson was responsible for these inaccuracies. All the evidence points to the fact that the enumerators in the different localities put on names for the purpose of swelling the returns. It has been suggested, though that may not be the proper explanation, that, as they were paid according to the names they put on, they sought to get more pay than they otherwise would. I have not gone into that question, and have no results except those that I have laid on the Table. But I think these documents fully justify me and my colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the conclusions we drew that the census of 1891 was materially and very largely stuffed in those counties in which we have had an investigation.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Agriculture came before this House last session and the session before and asked us for an appropriation for the census of 1901. That money was granted. Now the minister comes and informs this House that he has misappropriated some thirteen or fourteen thousand dollars of that money to employ commissioners to ascertain whether the census of 1891 was correct or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On what does the hon. gentleman base that statement ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister himself stated he had paid out of the census fund $13,000 or $14,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When did I say that ?

Mr. TAYLOR. At the last meeting when we discussed the question.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Did I mention any sum ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, you did not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman's statement of the sum is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will get at it. The minister did make the statement that he had paid these commissioners out of the census vote, $13,000. I am credibly informed the sum was about $13,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have laid the statment on the Table, and if the hon. gentleman will look at it he will find it was 200 odd dollars.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, if it is only 200 cents the minister had no right to misappropriate

funds. He never asked this House for a vote for that purpose, yet he has the audacity to come forward and say he took a sum out of the money voted for taking the census for 1901, to make an investigation of his own, and I will read the result of one of these investigations. I have here a letter from an honest man whose signature is as good as his oath. None of the other statements are made under oath, neither is this one. This gentleman is of high standing, and a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Belleville, January 22, 1901.

Archibald Blue, Esq.,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir,—I have completed the work in connection with the examination of the census of 1891 for the Townhip of Thurlow and the city of Belleville, as requested by you.

I could have done the work much more quickly and easily had the numbers of the lots and concessions, as well as the names of the streets been given. This difficulty, and another, which applies particularly to the city of Belleville—I refer to the numerous and flagrant mistakes in spelling—greatly increased my work. In many cases I at first supposed whole families had been added, but in every case I afterwards ascertained that the names had been incorrectly spelled either by the census taker or by the copyist.

The decrease of population in the township of Thurlow is attributable to two chief causes, first, the general movement to the unsettled parts of the Dominion and secondly to the fact that no work is being done at either of the large limestone quarries at Foxboro and Point Ann, where, ten years ago, fully six hundred inhabitants were directly dependent upon this industry. It the city of Belleville there were ten years ago, twenty or perhaps twenty-five small industries, conducted by men of moderate means, that gave employment to a considerable number of men and boys. These have been almost entirely wiped out by the large concerns of other places. This fact coupled with the general movement west, to which I have adverted, are the causes of the decline of the population of Belleville. I am glad to be able to report after a very careful examination, that I find the census of 1891 for the township of Thurlow and the city of Belleville to have been correctly taken.

I am, dear sir,
Faithfully yours,
(Sgd.) N. VERMILYEA.

Now, Mr. Vermilyea reports the census in that district, which is one of the suspected ones, was correctly taken; yet the minister, with that statement in his hands, comes forward and charges the enumerators for the whole Dominion with having perpetrated frauds and stuffed the lists; and he misappropriates funds, not voted for the purpose, to pay Mr. Vermilyea and these other commissioners who went round to investigate what was done ten years ago. If a crime has been committed the minister has committed it, for he has done what no other minister ever did in this country before—take money voted for one purpose and use it for another purpose entirely different. In the whole record of the late government he cannot find anything of that kind. Yet this minister comes forward and asks for an appropriation, and steals part of that money to pay some of his political friends.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, 'take it,' if that is a better word—take money out of one appropriation and use it for a purpose altogether different, without informing parliament. Now, the minister may as well understand it as not. He promised us last night that he would bring down the cheque book for the payments, made in January and February, to the parties in Lisgar. He brings down a little statement here to-night, but no payment for January or February, nothing since September, October and December. I am informed that a large number of cheques were issued out of the census fund, and that there was a number of cheque books. I fancy the commissioner of census is the party who issues the cheques for paying the census claims, and he has the stubs for January and February, and I want to see them. The minister has not brought down a statement for January. I am credibly informed that a large number of cheques went out there in the Lisgar election early in February when the campaign was on. The minister promised to bring down the cheque books so that we may see what cheques were issued. We want those papers before this item goes through.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman is evidently so excited that he does not measure his language very closely. He said a few minutes ago that he was credibly informed that this investigation about which he was talking cost $13,000 or $14,000. I have laid on the Table all the payments that have been made in regard to that investigation, and they amount up to the present time to $254, speaking from memory.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps they are not all paid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All in the province of Quebec are. The hon. gentleman goes on and says he is credibly informed—on the same ground I suppose—that many cheques were issued for payment of the Lisgar census accounts in the months of January and February. Well, the hon. gentleman has in his hand a list of the payments, all that were made in the Lisgar census work. There has not been a single payment made except those in the list the hon. gentleman has in his hand. I have not got the cheque books here, because the stubs of the cheque books out of which the Lisgar payments are made are all regular cheque books that come in their

order. There are no other payments made than are found in those cheque books. I thought if I gave the hon. gentleman a list and told him on my responsibility as a minister that that list contained all the payments made for the Lisgar census, he would accept my statement. If he does not choose to, I can bring down the actual cheque books and place them on the Table ; and the hon. gentleman will find, on the statement of the accountant and the register of the bank, the date when the letters were sent out containing those cheques. These can be brought down if the hon. gentleman has any doubts.

Mr. TAYLOR. Were there cheques issued just previous to the Lisgar election by the census department and sent out there ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has them all in that list under his hand.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister answer my question ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will answer it as I proceed. I do not know the date of the Lisgar election.

Mr. TAYLOR. The 17th or 18th of February.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If that is the case, I will look at those dates and see my accountant, and find if any were sent out at that time. The hon. gentleman has under his hand a list of every cheque that was sent to Lisgar to pay the accounts in that district. If he examines that list he will find out the date of every cheque sent, and he will find that there was not one cent in the month of February, nor in January either. Now, the hon. gentleman went on to talk about money being misappropriated, and he used very strong language. The hon. gentleman cannot substantiate that statement in any shape or form. There was no money misappropriated. The money which was spent in that investigation was spent properly and rightly in dealing with the census of 1901 ; it was spent for the purpose of finding out whether the census of 1901, as it was taken by our enumerators, was correct. The first thing that struck us in the census of 1901 was that, in certain parts of Canada, there was a decrease of population as compared with the census of 1891. That seemed an extraordinary condition of affairs. Possibly there might have been some mistake in the census taking of 1901. We therefore took means to check over the census taken in 1901 and in that process of checking over the census we took the parochial returns in those constituencies where the population is practically altogether Catholic and consequently where the parochial returns would include practically the whole population. We found that in 21 of these counties there was a difference of 8,000 between the parochial returns and the Dominion census returns of 1891. I may say that at the same time that was done the parochial returns of 1891 were consulted to see what the comparison was between them and the census returns of that year. The result was that we found in the parochial returns that there were a lot of names, but not by any means all of the names that were in the census and we found that the census contained numerically names that were not in the parochial returns. The question was to find out whether these census returns were correct, to find out whether the people enumerated in the census returns were there or not, and whether a mistake had occurred in the parochial returns or the census returns, and we found, on the evidence of men who knew these parishes through and through and year after year, many years before 1891, that there were people who were enumerated in the census but not in the parochial returns who were not present in these parishes and were not present when the census was taken. That was the object of the investigation. It was not an investigation to prove that the census of 1891 was incorrect but it was for the purpose of proving that the census of 1901 was and is correct, and I think it is proved beyond peradventure, and if as a result of this investigation it has been found that the census taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1891 was false and was stuffed, so much the worse for them and so much the worse for the way in which their census was taken. It was also proved that the Dominion of Canada has not been standing still, as it was thought to have been when the census returns first came out, but that, as a matter of fact, probably has increased in population at as fair a rate as could be fairly expected. The hon. gentleman speaks of this being a misappropriation of funds. As a matter of fact it was a perfectly proper expenditure for the purpose of proving that the census of 1901 was correct and was properly taken.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did the hon. gentleman, in the statement which he gave to the House when he asked for money for taking the census, say that he wanted to use a portion of that money to inquire into the census of 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I had no intention of doing it at that time.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman asked for money to take the census of 1901 and not to inquire into the census of 1891. Whether this amount of money which has been expended in this way is small or large it does not affect the question. The hon. gentleman hands in a typewritten paper containing a few names but I do not see the name of the reverend gentleman that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) has referred to for having done a large amount of work. I do not see any account of money having been paid to him. The statement

contains the names of the following gentlemen and the amounts they received :—

Rev. E. Roy, Montreal..	$ 5 00
Rev. J. R. Leonard, Rimouski.. ..	10 00
Rev. N. Marchand, Three Rivers..	40 00
Rev. F. A. St. Germain, Nicolet ..	10 00
Rev. T. B. Morin, St. Jean de Matha..	15 00
Archbishop Begin, Quebec..	25 00
E. G. O'Connor, Montreal..	90 35
Dr. C. S. Gauthier, St. Ephrem d'Upton....	50 00

making a total of $245.35. I do not see any reference to any money being paid to the reverend gentleman referred to by the hon. member for Bothwell.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know that that gentleman has received any. That is all that has been paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, there must be a lot unpaid. I do not see any account of a payment to Mr. Vermilyea, nor do I see any record of a payment to Mr. Petrie who looked after the town of Simcoe and the village of Port Dover. Nor, do I see anything paid to——

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. These are the payments in Quebec. I told the hon. gentleman that the statement did not contain the list for Ontario. The other bills have not been paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much of the vote is the hon. gentleman going to misappropriate ? I do not see the account of a payment to E. O'Callighan, of the town of Cornwall, who was a candidate in the last election. He has to have his election expenses paid and the hon. minister asks him to find out the frauds perpetrated in Cornwall in 1891 so that he may pay him a little bill. As to the statement which the hon. minister brings down I did not ask him for a statement of how much had been expended in Lisgar. I asked him for the cheque book for January and February. He puts in a statement of the expense of taking the census in Lisgar during the year, giving the names of the enumerators, when paid, the amount paid, the total paid, and the balance claimed. In this statement he shows the balances claimed but the last payment which he shows to have been made in this statement was in the month of December. There has nothing been paid according to this statement since the month of December. Are these balances that we find to have been claimed unpaid still ? Will the hon. minister say that these balances which he shows in his statement are still unpaid or were the enumerators in Lisgar paid just previous to the election ? That is the information which I have received.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, the hon. gentleman's information is entirely wrong. The statement shows what has been paid. Nothing else has been paid in Lisgar. There was no cheque sent out in January or February to Lisgar at all. I have sent my accountant for the cheque book and the hon. gentleman will have it in a few minutes, and he will be able to see for himself.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman refer these accounts to the Public Accounts Committee and allow us to have an inquiry into them ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will move that they be referred to the Public Accounts Committee next session he will have an inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR. This session.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, the Public Accounts Committee does not deal with the accounts of this year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. gentleman say that these accounts are unpaid ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman will see the total amount paid and that is all that has been paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. I ask the hon. minister if these balances which are claimed are still unpaid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly, if they are not included in the total amount paid they are not paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister only shows what has been paid up to December.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Nothing has been paid in Lisgar since the last date contained in that list. I do not know that I can make it more clear.

Mr. McCREARY. I do not much wonder that the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is a little anxious about Lisgar. Lisgar may be rather an important matter to him. Sitting beside him are the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) and the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), both of whom took an active part in the recent election in Lisgar.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. McCREARY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Roche) may not have been there. I will retract the statement as far as that hon. gentleman is concerned. But the hon. member for Macdonald took an active part in that election. He exercised all the eloquence of which he is possessed and put forth every effort to secure the support of the people for the Conservative candidate. He also had the premier of the province of Manitoba, the Minister of Public Works, the Attorney General and other members of the local government with him, and yet, Sir, all the Conservative electors they could find in Lisgar were 1,300, just sufficient to lose the Conservative candidate his deposit. It is no wonder that some hon. gentlemen think

the population of that county is not as large as it should be. In regard to the census taken in 1901 and the census taken in 1891 I would say that anybody who has known Winnipeg during the last few years must know that a large increase in population has taken place.

I well recollect that in 1891 when the ex-mayor of Winnipeg, Mr. McMicken was enumerator, he went so far that he was kicked out of some of the houses in Winnipeg because of some impertinent questions which he asked of certain people. Every one in Winnipeg who is acquainted with the facts, knows that as a matter of fact, large numbers of people left the province of Manitoba in 1894, 1895 and 1896. I remember travelling one evening from Winnipeg to Deer Lodge, a distance of five miles, as a representative of the Board of Trade, and I met on that trip 26 covered wagons with people coming from Alberta and going across the line south. But what is the condition of affairs to-day ? I have here some immigration returns published in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' of Wednesday, April 30th, and they are well worth reading, so that hon. gentlemen can compare the condition of affairs at the present day as regards immigration with the condition formerly :

The number of immigrants arriving from the United States, for the month of March, was 3,243. The States from which they came and the numbers from each, are :—

Iowa	573
Minnesota	499
Nebraska	410
S. Dakota	291
Kansas	249
Utah	201
Michigan	111
Wisconsin	95
Missouri	86
New York	68
Massachusetts	70
Montana	59
Illinois	54
Oklahoma	49
Indian Ter	38
Pennsylvania	40
Texas	22
Idaho	22
Rhode Island	14
New Hampshire	16
Indiana	8
Ohio	9
New Jersey	6
Maine	5
Wyoming	3
Virginia	2
Vermont	2
N. Carolina	1
Washington	1
Florida	1
California	1
	3,243

The British immigration during the same period was as follows :

English	647
Welsh	24
Scotch	275
Irish	203
	1,149

The British and American immigration into Canada for the month of April last was 4,355. This year it was 7,243, an increase of nearly 60 per cent. The total number of British and American immigrants who have come to Canada this year is 10,069, as against 5,821 for the first three months of 1901.

I trust that every member of this House will weigh these figures carefully. These men who are coming to settle in Canada are our brothers ; they are coming to help us to build up our country, and there is no use of our quarrelling with the census of 1891 or or 1901. I believe there were mistakes made in both census. I know that there were mistakes made in the census of 1891 and there were mistakes made in 1901. But so long as the people are happy and are coming into our country in such large numbers, just as large as our railways can handle, surely we should be content and need not quarrel about the census of 1891 or of 1901. I notice that reference is made quite frequently in this House to the population of the city of Belleville. That is no doubt a remarkable city, but I am not much surprised that it is somewhat depopulated. As far as I know the city of Belleville is the home of some gentlemen who were known as the nest of traitors a few years ago, and I am not surprised that some of the best young men of that city took the idea into their head to go west. I think they are all the better for having done so. I believe that men living in a city with politicians of that sort are far better to go west than to remain there. I do not think that the members of the west should decry the census of 1901. I believe that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government remain in power for another ten years, as I believe they will, any one who decries our population now will be ashamed of his language when the census of 1911 is taken. I believe we are going to have in the west at the end of the next ten years a population, not of 400,000 but a population of 2,000,000 between Lake Superior and the Rocky Mountains. If that happy result flows from the acts of this present administration it will be something that not only the western members but the eastern members should be proud of.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have no doubt that the member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) has enlightened the minister by the eloquence he has just displayed. Perhaps the hon. gentleman can give me a little information which I would like to know. There is a person in his constituency by the name of John Menery who put in an account for $280.60 and was paid $250.10, leaving a balance of $30.50 due him. Perhaps the

hon. member for Selkirk can tell me whether that balance is still due to Mr. John Menery.

Mr. McCREARY. And suppose it is.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. George E. Laidlaw claimed $211.73 and he was paid $162 on account, a balance being due him of $49.73. Can the minister tell us if these accounts are still due or are claimed by these gentlemen ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman does not seem to understand this statement. There is first of all the name of the enumerator, then the date the cheques went out, then the amount paid. Mr. John Menery sent in a bill for his total claim of $280.60, but the accountant cut down a portion of that as not being properly charged and a cheque for $250.10 was sent to Mr. Menery in settlement. The amount of $30.50 is what was not allowed of his account.

Mr. TAYLOR. And he claims the balance yet.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know whether he does or not. We have had no communication from him saying whether he is content with what he got. Unless he can show some good reason that his account was unjustly and improperly cut down, he will not get more than the $250.10 that was paid him under the rules and regulations issued for the payment of the enumerators.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps I had better read his entire statement, so that some of these gentlemen who are claiming balances in Lisgar may know whether they have been paid or not since December. The minister says that there was not a dollar paid in Lisgar in January or February.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said that and I maintain it, nor up to the present date.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the minister will hear later on something different. There are numerous claims by enumerators here averaging from $1 up to $56. My information is that all these gentlemen were settled with previous to the Lisgar election, and that the cheques were sent to them for these balances either in the month of January or February.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That information is entirely incorrect.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, perhaps we will have a way of reaching it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will give the hon. gentleman the stub cheque books, and if he can find there that payment was made to any one in Lisgar in January or February, I will take back everything I have said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one statement in the list of documents laid on the Table of the House which I would like to inquire about. One of the officers of the department says :

> The object of procuring the parochial statistics was, first, to ascertain the correctness and accuracy of our own census ; and incidentally we discovered that the census of 1891 had been unduly stuffed, and made a thorough investigation in a few counties here and there throughout Canada.

I would like to inquire what meaning the hon. gentleman attaches to the expression 'unduly stuffed.' To what extent would the census have to be stuffed before it was unduly stuffed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I should say myself that if it were stuffed at all it would be unduly stuffed. What was meant was that there were names improperly entered in the census of 1891, because the people were not in the country when the census was taken.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What were the counties in which a thorough investigation was made ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The list was placed on the Table. There were twenty-one counties in the province of Quebec in which the parochial returns were examined.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I inquire whether the hon. gentleman acquiesces in the view of his officer that that constitutes a thorough investigation ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, I think it is a thorough investigation to take the counties eminently entirely Catholic, and to check the census returns with the parochial returns in those counties. We took practically all the counties in the province of Quebec where that was the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this is a general statement, that the census of 1891, not in those particular counties, but in all the counties of Quebec at least, was unduly stuffed.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think what we found in those counties would justify the statement that very generally the census of 1891 was unduly swelled by the insertion of the names of people who were not there. I referred on another occasion to a statement made on the floor of this House in 1894 by hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Hon. Mr. Borden) as to what occurred in the province of Nova Scotia in his county on that occasion, and I think the accumulation of evidence is such as to justify the statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In other words the hon. gentleman thinks he is justified in accusing the enumerators in every county in Canada in 1891—

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not in every county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what counties, then, was the census of 1891 not unduly stuffed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot tell in what counties the census was honestly taken and in what counties it was not, but we have evidence to show that in a large number of counties there was clear dishonesty in entering the names of people who were not in the country, and that being the case, I made the general statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says he has sufficient evidence on which to make a general statement that the census of 1891 was unduly stuffed, whatever that means. What I want to know is whether his information is sufficiently definite to enable him to state whether there is any county to be excepted from that statement. If there is, I would like him to name that county.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has just heard the statement read by the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), a statement to which I referred the other evening that the investigation in the town of Belleville and the township of Thurlow showed that the census there was accurately and properly taken. That is the only statement I have received to show that in any particular place the census was accurately taken. I must correct myself in saying that. I am informed that there were reports laid on the Table from some counties which showed that the census was accurately taken in those counties. I cannot give the names of the counties at this moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are not the hon. gentleman's officers prepared to give us the names of those counties ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not got those names in my mind at the moment. The list was laid on the Table with the full statement in regard to them.

Mr. HACKETT. With regard to these parochial returns were they asked from the Roman Catholic clergymen of Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, we made no investigation in the province of Prince Edward Island at all.

Mr. SPROULE. In listening to the statements in this House regarding the conduct of the census enumerators in 1891, what they had done and what they had not done, one would readily come to the conclusion that human character was either of very little value in Canada, or that the moral code of some gentlemen in the country was at a very low ebb, because the freedom with which sweeping statements have been made regarding a large number of enumerators, extending to some thousands, that they were practically perjurers, and had done what, if established in court, would land any one of them behind the bars of the penitentiary, is something astounding ; and when one comes to analyse the evidence on which these statements are made, one is forced to the conclusion that the parties who made them either had very little regard for men's characters or very little idea of what they were saying. I have in my hands one of these returns. It is from the town of Simcoe, and I give it as a fair sample of the others, though I have not gone over many of them. It is in just such returns that the statement was made in this House that these men had deliberately perjured and forsworn themselves. Mr. H. G. Petrie, of Simcoe, says :

> The lapse of time and the consequent lapse of memory of persons having knowledge of the facts has rendered it very difficult to get information ; but notwithstanding this the list contains 120 names of persons improperly enumerated—77 in Simcoe and 43 in Port Dover—which alone instead of a decrease would have shown an increase compared with the returns of 1901.

He goes on and gives a number of these names, but the significance of the matter is that he nearly always speaks of them as being out of the place two years previous to the time the census was taken. He can manage to establish that data from the memory of people living in the locality, no matter how imperfect it is, with sufficient care to say that they were absent two years from the place or never lived in it. Then he goes on to say where he has given many of these names, that they were names of parties living in some other locality, but he is innocent enough to give himself away by saying that the names entered in the various schedules have not corresponded with many of the names. When he is giving duplicate names to show that the parties were taken in two places, he says the names do not correspond. That is sufficient to satisfy any person that the chances are that they were not the same parties at all. Although the names are the same, they were names of different individuals living in different localities.

He was depending on what was told him by people who were trying to charge their memory back with conditions that existed ten years before. What hon. member can say who resided ten years ago in the particular village or town in which that hon. member happens to be living ? How many of us could say on oath whether such an individual lived ten years ago in our own town or not, or how long such an individual had been out of the place previous to 1891 ? In my opinion, had these people been put upon oath and questioned carefully and reminded that the information they were giving was information which was going to damn some people's character, they would have been much more careful. They were probably not aware of what use would be

made of the information they were giving, or they would have been much more careful. If we consider the lapse of time, ten years, we must conclude that it would be very difficult for any one to say who were living in a certain place ten years ago. He might remember some of the prominent families or his associates in business and social relations, but a great many other people he would utterly fail to recollect. And supposing he could remember that some were out of the place ten years ago, how could he tell how long they had been out of it, and whether they intended to come back or remain permanently away. We must not forget that in the instructions given, the enumerators were ordered to enumerate any people who had left the place temporarily and were expected back. My attention was drawn to this in 1891 by a gentleman from the province of Quebec, who told me that this regulation would lead to an incorrect taking of the census. The enumerator puts the question to the head of a family: How many children have you? The head of the family replies, so many, and gives the names. Then the enumerator asks of each: Is he at home? The head of the family replies: No. Then he puts the question: Do you expect him back? And in forty-nine cases out of fifty, especially in the province of Quebec, the parent will reply in the affirmative, even though the child had been away for years, and had married or settled down elsewhere. It is a fact that the heads of French Canadian families, in nearly every instance, expect their children back. So that many names would go down in the census of people who were not in the locality at the time the census was taken and who did not come back as was expected. Then the instructions go on to say that if the party is absent for a long time and the answer is not given that he is expected back, the enumerator must put this other question: Has the party been away over two years? If an answer be given in the affirmative, his name is not taken down. But you can see how easy it would be for parties to be taken down, when the first question was answered in the affirmative, and how easy it would be to have many members of the family enumerated although they were out of the country at the time. I only mention this as an illustration to show how easy it was to make an incorrect census, and to do so innocently and in the faithful discharge of duty, according to instructions given. Then an analysis is made and the census is found not absolutely correct, according to the memory of men living in the locality ten years later, and on such statements these enumerators are declared to be perjurers who ought really to be in the penitentiary. The parties who make these allegations must have very little respect for their fellow men, when they make these charges in the wholesale way they do. Take some of these as an illustration. I find the following statement: 'McBride left Simcoe permanently in 1891, and has not lived here since.' How could the man who made that statement know that McBride had left prior to 1891 and had left permanently? And is it not possible that McBride's name was taken down, on the statement of his parent that he was coming back; and because he has not come back since, we are to assume, on the statement of a party who is looking back ten years, that the enumerator is a liar and a perjurer? Is that evidence on which we should rely in order to damn any one's character? The Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Trade and Commerce ought to be ashamed of themselves when they make use of such statements to bolster up these flimsy charges. Here is another statement: 'James Bray, married, and not resident in Simcoe.' There is not a word said about the time. Yet this is taken as evidence that the enumerator did not do his duty. Here is another: 'George Bray, married, and gone permanently, not resident in Simcoe.' There is nothing said as to when he left Simcoe or how long he had been out of the place or whether he was there in 1891 or not, but this is considered as evidence that the enumerator is a liar. Here is another statement: 'James Weston, permanently engaged out of town, and not resident in 1891 or several years prior.' I took a number of other cases, and in every instance the party was declared not to have been a resident for two years before 1891. The statement is very specific with regard to the exact time, notwithstanding the fact that the memory of the parties who gave the information may have been defective, and there is a strange coincidence in the fact that in nearly every instance two years is given as the length of time when the parties mentioned were absent prior to 1891. Here is another statement: 'George Kelly, employed permanently on the railway, with headquarters elsewhere than Simcoe, was away a year previous to 1891.' There is nothing to verify the statement, but the statement is made simply on recollection going back ten years. How does the party know that this man had been away a year before 1891? Is his memory infallible? Is it not possible that he may be all wrong? Yet such statements as these are taken to prove that the enumerator was a liar and perjurer. What can the Minister of Agriculture think of himself when he takes such flimsy evidence for the purpose of damning human character? I never heard of anything so disgraceful, and find it difficult to believe that any one who considers himself an honourable man should lend himself to such unworthy proceedings.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A few moments ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture if these parochial returns had been asked for from Prince Edward Island?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand the clergy in the province of Prince Edward Island were asked for these returns but only one was sent in.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A moment ago the hon. minister said there were none sent in.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were asked for, but only one was sent in, and that was from the Rev. Mr. Gallon.

Mr. HACKETT. That would be Bloomfield ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not say what parish.

Mr. HACKETT. What township ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot give that information just now.

Mr. HACKETT. It appears that out of a large number, seventy-nine, he was the only one that made any reply. I would like to know what part of the island he resides in ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My officer informs me he cannot remember the parish, but the name of the only one who made a return from Prince Edward Island was the Rev. Mr. Gallon.

Mr. HACKETT. Were the enumerators in Prince Edward Island appointed by townships or by polling divisions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The enumerators everywhere were appointed by polling divisions.

Mr. HACKETT. Who was the enumerator in the first polling division in West Prince ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The memorandum does not show for which polling divisions the several enumerators were appointed. But if the hon. gentleman will give me any name he wishes to check--

Mr. HACKETT. A man called Doyle.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman spoke of him the last time this item was under discussion, and I have obtained the information he desired. Doyle was appointed one of the enumerators, but when he was asked to take the oath, he declined to do so. The commissioner recommended Anthony Broderick as enumerator, and, on reference here, Broderick was appointed. He did the work and received the money.

Mr. HACKETT. Is the hon. minister aware that Doyle went around two days taking the census ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. On the contrary, my information is that Broderick did the whole of the work. The books show that all the returns were made by Broderick and that the money was paid to him.

Mr. HACKETT. I happen to come from that county and I know all the facts. Doyle went about for a day or two taking the census, but found that he was incompetent and looked around for another man to take his place. Peter Broderick was anxious to get the job for his son, and Doyle offered for $20 to get him appointed. Broderick gave him $20 and got his son Anthony appointed, and he went around and took the census. It is difficult to say whether Broderick began where Doyle stopped or where he stopped himself.

Mr. COCHRANE. But Doyle got the $20 ?

Mr. HACKETT. Yes, he did.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So far as the records of the department show, the commissioner there reported that Doyle, the man first appointed, refused to take the oath and the commissioner, Mr. Tweedy, recommended the appointment of Broderick. That was discussed here and the commissioner was authorized to appoint Broderick. The returns from the polling division are signed by Broderick and countersigned by the commissioner. Broderick received the money from the department as having done the whole of the work. The cheque was made out in favour of Broderick. We have no knowledge whatever of Doyle having done any work in connection with the census. If the statement which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) makes is correct—and I have no doubt that he is convinced it is—it has never come to our attention at all. If any farming out of the work has been done, it has been done in direct contravention of the instructions given to the commissioners and the enumerators, and we would not have recognized it. If, as the hon. gentleman says, Doyle did some of the work and Broderick got paid for it, we know nothing of that here.

Mr. HACKETT. I am not finding fault with the minister in this connection, but I want to get at the facts. Will he please tell me who recommended Doyle and who recommended Broderick ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that the recommendation of Doyle came from Mr. McLellan and Senator Yeo. When Doyle refused to take the oath Mr. Tweedy recommended Broderick. That was submitted to Sir Louis Davies, who was then a minister of the Crown, he endorsed it and Broderick was appointed.

Mr. HACKETT. I am pleased to get the information, and, as I say, I attribute nothing to the hon. minister in this connection. I know the parties very well. I was speaking with Doyle on my return from Ottawa last year. I had learned here that he was to be the enumerator. When I met him, I said : 'Well, Martin, how are you getting along about the census.' He said :

'I am getting along fine; I have got $20 in my pocket that I got out of it, though I have only done one or two day's work. I found it was a difficult undertaking, and I could not go ahead and take it, so, after working for a day or two I saw Peter Broderick and asked him if he would allow his son to do the work. And, I said: If you will give me $20, I will have your son appointed to take the census for the balance of the polling division.' So, it was accomplished in that way. If this kind of thing has been going on all over the Dominion, the hon. minister will see what an inefficient enumeration we have had. He will see that there must have been great looseness in the taking of the census. I am not finding fault with the minister, but simply pointing out the need for careful inspection in this work.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If anything of the kind the hon. gentleman speaks of has occurred elsewhere, of course it is something we know nothing about, and is directly contrary to the instructions given to all parties concerned. Of course, it could not have occurred had Broderick not been appointed. He was appointed from here and it was supposed that he did the whole of the work. Broderick stands on our books as the enumerator for that polling subdivision, Doyle having disappeared in consequence of refusing to take the oath. That is the whole record in the department; therefore, there is no question so far as the department is concerned of any farming out of the work. If there was a bargain between Doyle and Broderick that Doyle should give up his work, or refused to take the work for a consideration from Broderick, that is a matter entirely outside the knowledge or business of the department. I confess it is an improper thing, and should these gentlemen be referred to me again for employment, I would not employ them. I consider that farming out government work and traffic in offices is a most improper thing, and I should never allow it to be done by any of my officers, to my knowledge.

Mr. HACKETT. Anthony Broderick, then, was appointed solely on the responsibility of Mr. Tweedie, the commissioner, and not recommended by anybody else. Was he recommended by Mr. McLellan?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, he was recommended by Commissioner Tweedie, and that recommendation was endorsed by Sir Louis Davies. The appointment was made on that recommendation. I have just been informed that the parish of the reverend gentleman whose name I gave a few moments ago is Palmer Road.

Mr. HACKETT. That would be the Rev. Dr. Chaisson.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have in my hand a cheque book for December, January and February. It commences December 21st, 1901. That is the only date I discover in the book; it runs on after that date until the end of the stubs. But I find some accounts on this page that I fancy belong to some part of February, because the cheques show a balance of account up to the 31st of January. I find some payments to enumerators concerning which I would like some information. What is the average pay for an enumerator?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is difficult to give the average pay, because they are paid according to a schedule of rates, according to the number of names, the number of farms, and so on. The only way I could find the average would be to take the whole number of enumerators and find out how much they had been paid in the aggregate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the minister can tell me who Geo. Coutts is, because the stubs of the cheque do not give any information at all except the name and the service.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I could not tell off-hand who Geo. Coutts is.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are here three suspicious looking cheques. Geo. Coutts received for his services as enumerator $1,198.10.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed this man was in the Atlin district, in the north of British Columbia, on the road to the Yukon.

Mr. TAYLOR. And Robert Patrick, services as enumerator, where is he?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot find that out at the moment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps these are the gentlemen who visited Lisgar.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I don't think they went from Atlin to Lisgar. I find in looking up the list of enumerators for the electoral district of Burrard in British Columbia, that Geo. Coutts and Robert Patrick were two of the enumerators for that district, which includes the whole coast line from Vancouver to the Yukon territory.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many names would an enumerator have to take to earn $1,198?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Those men were paid by the day. Men in the outlying districts, where they would have to cover a large extent of territory, were not paid by schedule rates.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find there are three gentlemen; one received $1,198, Mr. Patrick received $758, and Harry E. Brown $643.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That, no doubt, is quite correct. The figures here are a little more. I suppose these cheques have been supplemented by others. Brown received $768, Geo. Coutts $1,216, and Robt. Patrick $800.

Mr. TAYLOR. The cheque book gives practically no information. The hon. gentleman knew that, I fancy.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave the hon. gentleman the information on the statement which was made out by the accountant.

Mr. TAYLOR. The statement shows there were balances.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is the difference between the amount claimed by these enumerators when they sent their accounts in, and the amount allowed them under the schedule rates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do they still claim a balance ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot say whether it is still claimed or not. It was the difference between the original amount as sent in by the enumerators and the account as it was allowed in the department by the auditor.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is there a further balance ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not unless there was some extraordinary reason, because the amount paid was fixed by schedule rates. There are a few instances where the difference may be legitimately paid if proof is supplied. For instance, the voucher may not be supplied with the account at first, and if it is properly supplied afterwards the account would be paid. I cannot tell whether these balances are due to that or due to improper charges, for too many names, for instance, or too many farms, or something of that kind. The accounts of the enumerators in every case have been carefully checked over. I regret to say that a large proportion of them, I daresay more than half of all the accounts sent in by all the enumerators have had to be cut down materially, and have been so settled. In some cases the settlement thus awarded is accepted, in other cases the enumerators send in statements afterwards which show that in some cases the reduction had been improper, that is to say, they had a proper account if they had supplied it in proper form, and with the proper vouchers and explanations. In those cases, where that is clearly shown, the difference would be paid, but not unless the account was shown to be in strict consonance with the regulations and schedule rates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. gentleman what is known as supplementary cheque books ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are none except those the hon. gentleman has.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to ask about Mr. J. P. R. Drouin. Who is he, and where is he working ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is working in the census bureau at the present time. He is a gentleman from Montreal, appointed on the census staff, and is receiving $2 a day. The pay list is on the Table.

Mr. TAYLOR. He is being paid $2.25. Has he special qualifications which entitle him to be paid that salary, while many other men are paid $1.50, $1.60 and $1.75, only occasionally $2 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is in charge of a certain number of other men in the office there, looks after their work, and is therefore given extra pay.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is he a brother of the candidate who retired from St. James division, Montreal, Mr. Drouin, and who, at one time, threatened to run against the present hon. member (Mr. Brunet), but who was withdrawn ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He is a brother of Mr. J. A. Drouin.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it on account of being a brother that this gentleman was given this appointment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was appointed about a year before this occurrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was he down doing electioneering work for his brother during the campaign in Montreal for a couple of weeks or more ?

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

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the hon. gentleman's commissioner will know ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not that the commissioner is aware of.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the hon. minister be surprised to know that he was there for a couple of weeks and drawing his pay at the same time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I would be.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that information can be supplied to the hon. gentleman. That gentleman was provided with free transportation besides drawing his pay. He went down to help run the election for his brother and drew pay at the rate of $2.25 a day for the two weeks he was down there.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not provide him with free transportation. I should be very much surprised to

find that he was taking part in the campaign in Montreal and drawing pay here.

Mr. SPROULE. It will be in order for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) to get up.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that Mr. Drouin was one day in Montreal some time ago to see his sick father, and that he was not there for a fortnight at all.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere) and the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) are not in the House to-night? They would have had something to say on this question had they been present.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Perhaps their statements would be about as accurate as those of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the hon. minister had better hold over the item until the information is furnished. I may say that I have been informed by gentlemen who know this to be the fact that he drew his pay for the full two weeks while he was in Montreal during the election campaign.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this item be adopted?

Mr. BELL. Is it understood the item should be held over?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is not understood.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word in reference to the matter that was mentioned in respect to which the hon. minister undertook to make the statement that the census of 1891 was dishonestly taken and stuffed with names of numerous persons who were not in the country. I think that the hon. minister has not at his command at present sufficient evidence to warrant him in making such a statement. Apart from the fact that it would seem very improper to make a statement of that kind which involves the accuracy and honesty of most of the enumerators employed in 1891, I would be inclined to think that the hon. minister did not have at his command such evidence as would justify him in making that statement. He must rely upon evidence to make it and upon what evidence? He simply says that certain statements are made to him by some individuals whom he has employed to revise the facts connected with the census of 1891. What reason has the hon. gentleman to attach more value or more importance to the statements given to him by the persons whom he has employed to revise the census of 1891 than he had to attach value to the figures given by the enumerators at that time? Is it a certainty that all the enumerators employed by the commissioner, or the chief census officer who took the census in 1891, would be dishonest and that all the persons from whom the hon. minister obtained that information in the course of this present year would be absolutely honest? It seems to me that there is no good ground advanced here to warrant the statement that has been made. Now, if it were true that sufficient evidence had been advanced to prove that the census of 1891, was a dishonest census, I think, unquestionably, the hon. minister would have proved the fact that a great wrong had been done to the country which had been deceived by a census which was dishonestly taken, and I would suppose in that case that the hon. minister would consider his duty not done until he had proceeded to punish, by reason of the power which the law gives him to punish the dishonesty in men who are employed by the country to do this work, any persons guilty of wrongdoing. If it be the truth that in the province of Quebec, in 21 counties, the enumerators, who must have been nearly all of the Roman Catholic faith, because we are told that the population was nearly all Roman Catholic—if it be the truth that in 21 counties of that province in 1891 the enumerators with one accord violated their oath and made false returns, I do not think the hon. minister will do himself justice until he proceeds to establish that fact by prosecuting these individuals in the courts. I do not see how he can stop short of that. I think he should have had that end in view before he made the statement in public which he has made. I am sure that so far as a large part of the population of Canada is concerned, they will never accept the statement made by the minister, or by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) for that matter, that they will not regard it as being of much weight, or as having been fully considered if the hon. minister do not proceed to vindicate the rights of the country and to punish these men who have done wrong, if they have done wrong. I would call attention to the fact that there cannot be much confidence attached to the investigation said to have been made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It is entirely ex parte and there is the further fact that what has always been looked upon as a binding rule in connection with the census has been clearly violated. The schedules of the census communicated to the enumerators and the officials of the country by the people under the seal of confidence, which is absolutely necessary in order to secure correct returns from the people who will not reveal their private affairs to any officials of the country unless they are satisfied that it is done in confidence, have been handed over to persons who apparently were not sworn to do exactly what was right and to act justly, or to maintain that secrecy which is necessary in order to secure the confidence of the people in that investigation. Why should the hon. minister assume, as he does assume, that all the officers whom he has employed to make this in-

vestigation are absolutly correct, are absolutely honest, and that all the persons who were employed in 1891, under the chief census officer of that day, were absolutely dishonest? Why should he ask this country and ask this committee to accept a statement prepared ten years after the facts, an ex parte statement, prepared by men not under oath and to believe that it should be more correct than a statement prepared in the regular official manner by the sworn enumerators and which was checked over by the chief census officers? Why should the hon. minister, himself, believe such an absurd thing, and if he does believe it, why should he ask the committee and the country to believe such an obviously absurd story? I think there could not be a more gross wrong done to these enumerators than to make this charge against them and then to leave it hanging in the position in which it now is. I believe it is due to these gentlemen that they should have this investigation now carried out to completion, that they should have it carried on carefully before a judge, or before an independent man, one who can command the confidence of both parties in the country, that all questions asked and all answers given should be under oath and that such evidence should be adduced for the use of the country as would command the confidence of every man in it.

It is well known to the Minister of Agriculture that the census of 1881 was supposed to be in excess of the actual facts, not on account of any intentional wrong doing, but because under the system which had been adopted, a great number of names of persons had been taken who were out of the country for more than one year, and in some cases for more than twenty years. It must be in the knowledge of the minister, that when the census of 1891 was taken, a new regulation was introduced in order to guard against that, and so far as the government of the day was concerned and so far as the officer who had charge of that census was concerned, they laid down a new proposition by which it was intended to avoid that error and to reduce the figures so that they would be more nearly accurate than the census of 1881. The result was what might have been expected; that instead of the figures of 1891 showing such an increase over those of 1881 as might have been expected, the figures of 1891 were disappointing. Of course under the new rule a great many more names were excluded from the census of 1891 than in 1881, and the census of 1891 was more nearly correct. In the case of the census of 1901, simply because the growth of the country is less than these hon. gentlemen opposite expected, they proceeded without the authority of parliament, and in order as they alleged to vindicate the correctness of the census which they are now in process of making; they proceeded not to inquire into the correctness of the figures taken by their own officers—which they could have verified to a large extent because the circumstances are all fresh and the officers are living—but they proceeded to investigate the correctness of the census of 1891, relying upon the memory of persons as to facts eleven years old in order to test the correctness of the census made now. That is a most extraordinary course to pursue. The natural course would have been to have checked over the present census, or if they desired it to have checked both census. I am satisfied that no body of people in this country will accept the figures that have been given under such circumstances, as having the slightest value. I believe that the investigation should be continued, and that not only the census of 1891 but the census of 1901 should be investigated with all the solemnity of a court in a trial before a judge, and that we should in that way arrive at a nearly correct knowledge of the exact population of our country. That is a basic fact, and it is of the utmost importance that succeeding governments should know precisely the number of the people in Canada so as to mark the progress of the country. There are one of two circumstances by which we can measure to some extent the character of the census of 1901. About the month of August, 1891, the chief census officer issued a statement of the population of Canada which agreed with the finally corrected statement as closely as one-quarter of one per cent; an error only of some 2,000 persons. In the case of the census of 1901, in the month of January a statement was issued that the final determination of the figures was 5,369,666, but since that there has been another change made. It will be noticed that the census of 1891 was practically accurately and finally determined in four months after the census was taken, but in the census of 1901, ten months after it was taken and when we get the final result, we see that the first estimate shows an error about ten times as great as that which was made by the gentlemen who took the census of 1891, and the result of which was announced four months afterwards. This is a fact which is clear to us all, and it goes to show that there was more ability, and more care, and more thoroughness, and much more expedition shown in taking the census of 1891 than in taking the census of 1901. For that reason a great many persons in this country will continue to prefer to believe that the census of 1891 was a better census, cost less money, and was more quickly completed than the census of 1901. I do not suggest criminal wrong doing in connection with the census of 1901, but there are some circumstances in connection with that census which inspire a want of confidence in the people, and which were absent from the census of 1891. In the province of Nova Scotia there is, according to the census of 1901, but a very slight increase in the population. We find that increase entirely among the people of the

French race in that province. If you take out of the census returns the increase shown in the few limited localities where people of the French race are to be found in Nova Scotia, you actually show a decrease in all the rest of the province. Now, to say the least, that is a highly improbable circumstance. It seems to me that in order to give the people of Canada confidence in the result of our census, it is not sufficient for the minister to make this partial, incomplete, and unsatisfactory investigation into the figures of 1891, but he should go on to make an absolutely thorough and exhaustive examination—not an expensive one—into the returns from some parts of the Dominion which will enable us to satisfactorily determine the result of the census of 1901, and which of course can be done much more thoroughly and much more satisfactorily than any inquiry into the census of 1891, which is now eleven years old. It has been suggested by the minister that there was a motive in 1891. I will not refer to the absurd suggestion made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) as to the reasons why all these enumerators in 1891 proceeded to make themselves criminals. But I shall refer to one reason given to-night by the Minister of Agriculture. He suggested that the enumerators in 1891 swelled the figures because they were paid for each name. But the minister must know that if that had any effect in 1891 it would have a hundred fold more effect in 1901, because he raised the price paid per name. Instead of paying 3 cents per name, as was done in 1891, the minister paid 5 cents per name in 1901. The minister must see that if 3 cents per name would increase the number unduly in 1891, the payment of 5 cents per name in 1901 would necessarily aggravate the error, if the error arose from that circumstance. I do not believe we have any reason whatever to conclude that men who are taken at random, selected by the different members of parliament to act as enumerators, could be found by a government that is bad enough to look for such characters, in such numbers as would be required to make all the enumerators of the Dominion of Canada absolute criminals and willing to obey the hint or nod of any government that is bad enough to require them to falsify the figures that they put down on their schedules. I would be sorry to think that it were possible that any one could believe that it is within the bounds of possibility that any government could, through the chief census commissioner, summon to its aid and service, thousands of formerly reputable men ; men for the most part respected by their neighbours, who were willing to deliberately break an oath solemnly taken, and to repeat an act of perjury or falsification 500 times over; and to do that for what reason ? Simply because a political enemy suggests that the government of that day had a motive in securing a dishonest and improper return from these enumerators. I think it is a terrible charge made against the people of Canada to insinuate that there is such a class of people among us, and that they are deliberately suggested by the representatives of the people of Canada who sit in parliament, when those representatives are asked by the government to supply them with trusty men to take an honest census of the people. It is a most improper suggestion, and if it has been sincerely made by the minister, I think he owes it to himself, to his character and reputation in the country, to every enumerator, and to the chief census officials—because they are all involved—to give them an opportunity to disprove the charge, and to show that they have acted as honest men and worthy citizens. And I would suggest—and I hope the government will accept the suggestion—that having gone as far as they have gone to raise this question and to make this charge, through the mouths of two ministers, and I dare say a third—because the Minister of Finance seems to concur in the idea that the census of 1891 was exaggerated—having made this charge against an important section of the people of Canada, they owe it to their own reputations and to the men assailed to carry that investigation to the point of enabling any fair-minded man to determine whether there is anything beneath the charge or not.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am glad in one way to have the endorsement of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, of my course. He says I ought to have begun by investigating the accuracy of the census of 1901. That is exactly what I did, and what has led to all this discovery in regard to the census of 1891. The apparent anomaly which we discovered, that a large number of the rural districts of Canada had decreased in population between 1891 and 1901 according to the census returns of those years, led us to check our own returns of 1901 with the different parochial returns of the province of Quebec for 1901, and we found that they corresponded in a marked degree. We therefore believed that our census returns were correct. We then made a comparison of the parochial returns of 1891 with the census returns of 1891, and found such discrepancies that we had to believe that either the parochial returns of 1891 or the census of 1891 were inaccurate.

Mr. BELL. But the hon. minister did not proceed to do that in such a way as to divest the investigation entirely of partisan or government manipulation. It was done secretly. Would it not have been better to have put this investigation into the hands of a commission or a judge, so that the result would compel the acceptance of every one ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The returns were taken as a purely departmental work. It was not done, as hon. gentlemen opposite seem to think it should have been done, by a special vote of parliament, outside of the census of 1901. It was done with the money voted for the work of the census, for the purpose of checking our returns and ascertaining whether they were correct or not. But we had to go the length we did go before we could prove it to a demonstration, and we believe that in the results which were found, which we were asked to lay on the Table, and which we have laid on the Table, it has been proved to a demonstration. Unfortunately this was not the first exposé of the census of 1891. The hon. gentleman will remember that the hon. Minister of Militia of to-day, in 1894, brought up in this House the results of the census of 1891 in his county, the county of King's, N.S., and he proved conclusively at that time, by the list of names he was able to give, that the census of 1891 had been unduly swelled in that county.

Mr. BELL. In the case of one enumerator.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And he offered to go on and show that the same was the case generally in the county; but the hon. gentleman's own friends, sitting at that time on this side of the House, shut off the inquiry, and refused to give the information by which he could have shown it, because they knew perfectly well that if my hon. friend had been allowed to go on, he would have been able to show that it was general in his county.

Mr. BELL. I do not agree with that.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman may not agree with the motive, but if he goes back to 'Hansard' and other records of that day, he will find that the facts were as I have stated; and the Minister of Militia, who is here, can corroborate me in that regard.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman says I ought to prosecute the men who did that work. I would ask him what his own friends did in the county of King's?

Mr. BELL. They proceeded to prosecute the enumerator, and he left the country.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am credibly informed that he did not leave the country, but that two weeks later he was in an adjoining county.

Mr. BELL. That may be, but he left his own home.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He left his own home and went into an adjoining county, where my hon. friend's friends did not make any effort to find him or prosecute him.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. If I may be allowed to interrupt for a moment, I may say that the enumerator in question had moved from my county to Amherst before the matter was brought up here at all, and he has never left Amherst from that day to this.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is even worse than I thought it was. The hon. gentleman's friends did not take much trouble to find him. They did not take the advice the hon. gentleman is now giving me, and prosecute this man, when they had the proof of what he had done.

Mr. BELL. He can be got at yet.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is possible he can be, and I am not prepared to say that no step shall be taken against the gentleman who did this work. That is a question that has not been reached yet. I may say frankly that I do not think the end of this investigation is by any means reached yet. I am not prepared to make a statement to-night, but it is quite possible that this matter is of such importance that further steps may be taken, either in the courts or otherwise. But I want to point out the injustice of the hon. gentleman in taking me so severely to task for not prosecuting these men when his own friends did not attempt to prosecute this one enumerator who was within their reach, and has been for eleven years, and could have been prosecuted during all that time. I think the hon. gentleman is a little unjust in allowing his bias to give one law for me and another for his own political friends and leader at that time. I do not wish to blame the hon. gentleman; but I think that under the circumstances he is taking a position which is hardly justified and which does not become him. As far as the investigation is concerned. I have pointed out that I did undertake to investigate the census of 1901, for which I was responsible, and in the province of Quebec, where the parochial returns were obtainable, the comparison showed, as far as it went, that the census of 1901 was accurate; and in going further with that same investigation, I found that a comparison of the parochial returns with the census of 1891 showed that the census of 1891 was inaccurate.

I went further to find out the details and got those details—name after name, family after family, given in full and laid upon the Table of the House weeks ago. It is not a matter of making general statements, but a statement based on particular facts, which leaves no room for doubt. It may be necessary to have an investigation under oath, but that would be long, elaborate and expensive. Personally I would be glad to have such an investigation because I am

satisfied it would show clearly and distinctly that the census of 1901 was well taken and that the census of 1891 was unduly swelled in the way I have pointed out. That would be an endorsation of the work done by my department, but whether it would be worth while incurring the expenditure and taking the time, I am not prepared to say just now.

Mr. GANONG. How is the census of the manufacturing establishments taken ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The larger manufacturing centres were taken by special enumerators and the other places were taken by the ordinary enumerators.

Mr. GANONG. Were the enumerators who took the manufactures appointed on the same principle as the general enumerators—on the recommendation of the defeated candidate or local member.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were recommended in the same way as the others.

Mr. GANONG. No special qualification required ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It was understood what they were needed for.

Mr. GANONG. What about the question of the fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The fisheries were taken, as a general rule, by officers of the department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. GANONG. Who took the census of the fisheries in the county of Charlotte ?

Mr. PRINGLE. What amount was paid Mr. E. O. Callaghan, who makes a report with reference to the town and township of Cornwall ? I find here a report from him dated January 24th, which does not seem to convey much information to the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Callaghan finds that a number of McPhails and McDonalds have been duplicated. I would call the ministers attention to the fact that in the township of Cornwall, which is settled largely by Scotchmen, there is a number of McPhails and McDonalds who have the same names, and it is quite possible that the enumerators in 1891 have got them quite correct. There is quite a reflection cast in this report on the enumerators of 1891. I may say that I am familiar with the names of these enumerators. They are all men of good standing in the electoral district of Cornwall and Stormont, who, I am quite satisfied, would not duplicate names. This report, to my mind, is very indefinite. Mr. Callaghan winds up by saying that the list which is appended to his report shows that there were at least 150 persons whose names were duplicated by the enumerators of the district. It seems to me that these names have not been duplicated. There are many McDonalds of the same name and many McPhails and many Lapointes of the same name. I would like to know what has been paid Mr. Callaghan for this very indefinite report. I am quite satisfied that the enumerators in 1891 did their duty correctly and that there have been no errors in the census taken by them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will read the report carefully he will find that Mr. Callaghan refers to that very fact. He says that there were a great many people of the same name, but he took particular pains to put in that list of 150 names those he knew perfectly well were duplicated.

Mr. PRINGLE. I think the hon. gentleman is wrong in his construction of that report. That is not what Mr. Callaghan says, what he says is this : 'I do not therefore pretend that my inquiry has been full or exhaustive.' Then he goes on to point out the great difficulties in coming to any conclusion as regards the town and township of Cornwall, owing to the fact that there are many McDonalds and McPhails and many of the other names mentioned in the list. I wish to ascertain the remuneration paid Mr. Callaghan as commissioner for this report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His account has not been sent in yet and nothing has been paid him. I may inform the hon. member for Charlotte that Mr. Patrick McLaughlin of St. John took the fishery enumeration in Charlotte county.

Mr. GANONG. On whose recommendation was Mr. McLaughlin appointed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the gentleman who opposed the hon. member in the last election.

Mr. GANONG. What pay did he receive ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. $157.70.

Mr. GANONG. That account just covers one fishery district I believe ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. GANONG. Have the returns been published ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, they are in but have not yet been tabulated.

Mr. GANONG. This is just an illustration of what I said the other night. We could have furnished the minister down there with all the Reformers he needed to take the census in New Brunswick, and in the selection of this gentleman I must say that, of all the Reformers in the county, he was the least fitted for the work. We have in that county one of the most important

fish industries in the maritime provinces, and why the minister did not send a man qualified for that position to take the fishery census is what I cannot understand. This man at one time drove a mail and I know not what else he has done. There is not a man less qualified than he to take the fishery census in that county. The minister had good officers there, men who had been fishery overseers, who could tell pretty well whether the fishermen were giving correct statements or not. Why were none of these appointed. But instead we had a man appointed who formerly drove a mail to take the census of the most important industry in Charlotte. I certainly think that if you get the report from the gentleman and compare it with this blue book you issue here, you will find that you have made a mistake in his appointment. I have consulted several gentlemen in the fishery business and it has been a perfect marvel to them that any such appointment should have been allowed to have been made by the department. In fact, I think that the information he would get from some of those engaged in the business would be very meagre. One gentleman said he did not propose to tell his business to an old woman who would report it all over the county. That is the opinion that the fishermen generally have of the census commissioner in that county. If the census of the fisheries business for the Dominion generally is taken like that in this county I think it will show very poor results for the business.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Of course I do not know the gentleman personally, nor what his qualifications are. He was recommended as qualified for the position, and I am informed by my officer that the returns he sent in are in good order, and look as if the work had been carefully and accurately done. Until the results can be tabulated and checked over, we cannot tell much more about the matter. I did not know whether he was a farmer or a mail driver. But I can understand that a man who carries the mail through the county would be pretty well acquainted with the people and with the business that is being carried on——

Mr. GANONG. He does not drive the mail over the fishing waters.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but he drives along the highway where the people live who carry on the fisheries. As I say, I do not know the gentleman or his qualifications.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the minister if it is his intention to stop when this item is passed ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. But there is an item for the census in the supplementary estimates, and on the discussion of that item any of these questions can be taken up and any information that is desired given. But, as this item is the last one that I have in the main estimates, I think it should be passed to-night.

Mr. BOYD. I have taken very little part in the debate, but I have listened attentively to what has been said by others. I must say that, regarding it with as little bias as possible, it looks as if this census business was to a great extent being made the ground of party conflict in this country. I heard the discussion in this House about the census of 1891. The debate was carried on at great length. And, as I say, the same accusations that are heard upon this side of the House were made by hon. gentlemen opposite who were then in opposition. But the importance of the question involved in this census can hardly be exaggerated. It has been shown that the present census will cost more than twice as much as did the census of 1891, and counties have been named in which, although there are fewer people than there were ten years ago, the cost of taking the census is double what it was then. Observing the minister as he made his explanations, I feel sure that he was not able to explain to his own satisfaction. For, whatever opinion I may have of the hon. gentleman politically, I believe he does like to be able to explain things to his own satisfaction. In fact, I never knew a man to take greater delight in explanation than the hon. minister does. But he has not been able to please himself, I am sure, with his explanation of the enormous expense that has been incurred in the present census. As regards the county of Lisgar, which has been a good deal discussed, the information I gave was from men who saw the cheques in that county, cheques which were issued to straighten up the accounts of men who had not, up to that time, been able to get their accounts settled, but who had no difficulty in doing so in the warfare that went on there in the by-election. I did not see these cheques myself, I would be very much surprised to find that the hon. minister would lend himself to such dealings as was indicated by my informants. But at the same time, I do not know how to disbelieve or disregard the facts that were given to me. This item has been a good deal discussed, and, if hon. gentlemen on this side are satisfied to let it go, provided that there is another item on which we can get any further explanation that may be desired, I, for my part, would be willing to have it pass. The right hon. premier, who was peacefully slumbering a short time ago, has wakened up. And, as he is to represent us soon upon a very important occasion, and as we desire that he should leave here in perfect health, I should be glad not to have him detained here very much longer. If the right hon. gentleman promises to adjourn the House after the passing of this item, I, for my part—though of course, I do not speak with any authority —would be disposed to consent to its passing.

Mr. PRINGLE. This report has only been placed in my hands this moment. But, having glanced at it, I must say I find it somewhat surprising and would like to ask one or two questions in connection with it. I do not wish to cast any reflection on the commissioner, Mr. O'Callaghan. That gentleman, I believe, attended the convention at which I was nominated, and he was then seeking the Conservative nomination, but is now, I believe, a very active Liberal in the local contest. I do not know exactly why he should have been converted so suddenly. But he has a perfect right to change his politics, if he so desires. But he says in this report :

> There were hundreds of persons employed at the time on the canal work who lived in temporary boarding houses along the canal, of whom there is no record except the pay sheets of the contractor and the schedules of the census.

Then he winds up his report by saying he thinks there have been some 150 duplicated. He casts reflections upon men who stand very high in the electoral districts of Cornwall and Stormont, and I cannot allow this report to pass without saying a word. The men who were enumerators in the township of Cornwall stand very high in that township. I do not know what their politics are. But when he mentions men in the township of Cornwall like Mr. T. J. McDonald and Mr. McLaughlin, and men in the town of Cornwall like Mr. Broderick, Mr. Shaver and Mr. Buteau ; and men in the township of Finch like Mr. McNaughton and Mr. Wood, I would be recreant in my duty if I allowed to pass without protest a report casting reflections upon gentlemen who stand so high in that community. Mr. Callaghan, I must say, is very indefinite in this report. He says he thinks there are about 150 persons whose names were duplicated by the enumerators ; but he admits in another clause of the report that it was utterly impossible for him to say whether these enumerators were right or wrong, as a large number of these people have left the locality since 1891 who had been employed in connection with public works, or on the Cornwall canal. I would like to ask the minister upon whose recommendation Mr. Callaghan was employed. Was it upon the recommendation of Mr. Mulhern, the Liberal candidate at the last election ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think Mr. Callaghan was recommended by Mr. J. F. Mulhern. I would like to say in regard to that report—which I would like the hon. gentleman to send over to me if he would—that the two parts of the report which he says are conflicting, to my mind do not conflict at all. Mr. Callaghan says distinctly there was a large number of people on the lists who were probably canal employees and who passed away ; but there is nothing in his report to indicate that any of the 150 names which he mentions as being duplicated were of that class. Mr. Callaghan declares distinctly that these 150 were people about whom he knows, and were not of the class which he refers to in the other part of the report as people about whom he could not say anything. So I think that what the hon. gentleman calls an inconsistency in his report is on the contrary a confirmation of the report, and shows that what Mr. Callaghan does state he states it with positive knowledge. In the other part of the report he acknowledges there were many people there besides these 150 about whom he could not give information. He says the list which is appended shows there were at least 150 persons whose names were duplicated by the enumerators of the district, and at least ten others were recorded who were domiciled elsewhere, who were not in the place when the census was taken.

Mr. PRINGLE. If the hon. gentleman will look through the list of names there he will find McPhails and McDonalds. We have any number of McPhails and McDonalds, not only in the town of Cornwall, but in the township of Cornwall.

Mr. HACKETT. I fully endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) that the minister is endeavouring in every possible way to satisfy the committee with regard to his estimates. I believe he is perfectly conscientious in what he is saying to us. I would like to ask the minister who was appointed for taking the fishery census for Prince county, Prince Edward Island ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. John Davidson, of Bedeque.

Mr. HACKETT. What was his salary and travelling expenses ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He was paid on the whole $184.25. I have not a statement of how much his travelling expenses were. He was paid at the rate of $3 a day for the time he worked.

Mr. TAYLOR. And $1.50 for horse hire ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. For all expenses, provided they showed vouchers for the accounts.

Mr. HACKETT. Mr. Davidson is a very competent man, I think he is all right, but he is a fishery officer.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think all the men who took the census in Prince Edward Island were fishery officers except one.

Geological Survey, $64,430.

Mr. BELL. Might I ask who is the head of this department now ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). There has been no

permanent director appointed yet. Dr. Bell, as senior officer of the survey, is the acting director.

Mr. BELL. Is there any prospect of an appointment at an early date ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the appointment will be made in a few months.

Dominion lands—chargeable to income, $157,532.

Mr. BOYD. Will there be some supplementary estimates in regard to Dominion lands ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will have a vote on which my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) may speak if he wishes.

Superintendence of insurance—to meet expenses in connection with this service, $11,500.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an item which properly speaking is not a charge against the Dominion treasury as it is recouped to us by the insurance companies. There is a readjustment of salaries and statutory increases in two or three cases so that there is nothing special about it.

Maintenance of assay office at Vancouver, $16,000.

Mr. EARLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) if it is his intention to establish an assay office at Dawson ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have no positive intention in regard to that, but I may say to my hon. friend that the question of establishing an assay office at Dawson would depend largely on the time that the mint gets into operation so that we could buy the gold ourselves. I am under the impression that as soon as the mint is in working order we will probably require an assay office at Dawson, although I cannot speak positively about it as yet.

Mr. EARLE. It has been the opinions of the trade, and of merchants generally, both on the coast and in Dawson, that the establishment of an assay office there would be more beneficial to them than an assay office at Vancouver. It appears that they are obliged in trade to take gold at a valuation something in excess of what it is really worth, and there is great difficulty in establishing the value of it, because it cannot be ascertained in Dawson. It has been and is the occasion of a very considerable loss to the traders there. They are at present taking gold dust at the value of $16 per ounce, and they find that when sent to the coast it does not realize more than $15 an ounce, and they have been memorializing the department to the effect that the establishment of an assay office at Dawson would enable them to handle the gold at its actual value. The banks could purchase it, or traders might remit the gold bars instead of remitting the dust, and they would be able to ascertain the actual value on the spot. I noticed in the press only a short time ago that the traders of Dawson have recommended very strongly that an assay office should be established there, and established at as early a date as possible ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) that my information is much to the same effect as his own. The probability is that the miners are not receiving altogether full value for the gold. They propose, and I think in many ways it would be desirable, to establish an assay office there. I have discussed the matter very fully with Mr. Ross, the commissioner of the Yukon, who has been here for some time, and all I can say to my hon. friend is that the whole subject will receive very full and careful consideration.

Maintenance, construction of roads, bridges and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Spring Reservation near Banff station, N.W.T., $19,420.

Mr. HACKETT. What is the meaning of that item ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a general vote for the maintenance of the national park at Banff. It provides for taking care of the buildings, the museum, and the construction of roads which goes on to some extent all the time under the supervision of the superintendent. There is an increase of $5,000 this year which is to provide for the erection of a new building for the museum. The museum at present is very small and it is absolutely necessary to have a little more accommodation. The museum is one of the things that attracts the attention of visitors.

Mr. HACKETT. Has the park been increased in size ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, the Bill for the increase of the size of the park received its third reading a couple of days ago. The park will now be about 5,000 square miles in extent.

Mr. HACKETT. Are there many visitors in the summer season ?

Mr. EARLE. The number of visitors is so great that the Canadian Pacific Railway are enlarging their hotel by the addition of several hundred rooms in order to be able to accommodate them.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The number has very largely increased; in fact, the number was so great that during the last couple of months of the season the Canadian Pacific Railway had to send word ahead that visitors could not stop there because they had not any accommodation. As my hon. friend says, they intend to very largely increase the accommodation. It will be a matter of gratification to the House to know that the expenditure upon

this work has not been without effect in attracting visitors and has caused it to become very much more popular as a resort.

Mr. HACKETT. That is very satisfactory, and I am glad to hear it, because in the east a great many people say that this park is simply a pleasure ground for some of the government members. I am very pleased to hear that it is visited by a large number of people and that it is going to be a great success.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The park is becoming a place of very general resort for visitors who take the transcontinental trip. My recollection is that when I was there in December I was told that the visitors for the year numbered something over 13,000. That is a very large number, and they generally remain a considerable length of time.

Department of the Interior—Cost of litigation, $1,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the Liberals were in opposition they charged the Conservatives with wasting this money and not employing the Solicitor General to do the work. Now we have a Solicitor General and a Minister of Justice, and the Liberals are not doing what they promised.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is not much.

Department of Labour, $34,900.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will there be an item for this in the supplementaries, or the further supplementaries, or the further further supplementaries, because if not I will ask it to stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there will. At all events, I will give my hon. friend a guarantee that he will have an opportunity of raising the question.

Printing Bureau—Plant, 5 Linotype machines, $15,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. With this new machinery will the Printing Bureau be able to do all our printing. Large sums have been paid to outside newspapers and others to do the printing, and even some of the departmental reports have been printed in that way. Surely the Printing Bureau ought to be able to do all the printing of the government without employing the Montreal 'Herald' and other newspapers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know that I can guarantee what my hon. friend desires, but with this additional equipment we certainly can do more and there will be less occasion to go outside.

Cost of arbitration respecting the accounts between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec (payments on account of services rendered may be made to members of the Civil Service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $3,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this arbitration going to sit for ever ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not wonder that my hon. friend asks that because it has sat for several years longer than I imagined. We are doing everything possible to have it closed up, and I think it possible that at no distant date we will succeed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has any return been made of their work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A statement is made every year as to how the matter stands.

Mr. BELL. How often do the arbitrators meet ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are judges in the different provinces and they cannot meet always at our convenience. We have to consult their convenience and also the convenience of the provinces, all of which means slow progress. We have so little now to take up in the main estimates that we might finish them to-night. The Minister of Trade and Commerce is not present, but these estimates are not in any case increased, and that being the case, we might pass them, and there will be in the supplementaries some items relating to that department, so that if there is anything that requires notice hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity of bringing it up.

Mr. TAYLOR. The leader of the opposition may have something to say on some of these mail subsidy items, and we will call them carried if a promise is made that they can be discussed later on.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We will afford every opportunity for discussion at another stage.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is there anything in these estimates for the fast line ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not at present. That will come in the further further supplementary estimates that my hon. friend has spoken of.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

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

Mr. TAYLOR. The leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), who has been called away, requested me to ask when the return respecting passes on the Intercolonial Railway, the motion for which was passed in this House on the 6th March last, will be brought down.

The PRIME MINISTER. I will inquire about it.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 5, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 154) to amend the Naturalization Act, Chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Bill (No. 153) respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—Mr. Pringle.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That the Select Standing Committee of this House have leave to sit during the time the House is in session.

Motion agreed to.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright). With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. LaRivière, that the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to revise the official reports of debates of this House be adopted.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). If my hon. friend (Mr. Champagne) will permit me, I would suggest as the House is very thin this morning, that this matter should be deferred until to-morrow.

RELIEF OF JAMES BROWN.

Bill (No. 118) for the relief of James Brown considered in committee and reported.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto) moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Before this Bill is read the third time, Mr. Speaker, I desire, for more than the third time, to renew my protest against the method pursued by this parliament with regard to the granting of divorces. The system is one which, I believe, cannot be justified upon any principle of law or good sense. If a divorce is to be granted at all, it is, of course, to be granted for reasons—for reasons which the law will define. I do not believe that the parliament of Canana is the body that can properly deal with these reasons and render a decision upon them. The case before this House is one that I know nothing about; it is one that, I venture to say, not one member of this House in ten has taken the trouble to examine. We are called upon to pass judgment in a case of the very greatest importance to the parties interested, and we do this, Sir, in a way that is nothing less than a travesty upon justice. If divorces are to be granted in this country, they should be granted by a properly constituted court, a court which shall take evidence and examine into the facts bearing upon the case, a court that shall render its judgment in accordance with the evidence. I repeat that, however it may be in the other branch of the Dominion legislature—where these cases may receive the consideration which they should receive—this case and cases of this character have not received and do not receive that degree of consideration here. The evidence is not published, The investigation is a sort of Star Chamber investigation; and I protest again, as I have often protested, that, if we are to grant divorces in Canada at all, if we are to recognize any cause as sufficient for granting a divorce, it is time that these matters should be placed in the hands of a proper legal tribunal.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) When the representatives from Nova Scotia first came to Ottawa after confederation, among the things that they found in existence were dual representation and the holding of elections in different parts of the country at times selected by the government. We had that changed. By the influence and example, I think, of the representatives from Nova Scotia, we had dual representation abolished and simultaneous polling adopted. But we found also a system of granting divorces which has continued to this day, a system which, in my opinion is a perfect disgrace to our legislation and practice. In Nova Scotia, divorce cases are referred to a judge of the Supreme Court. Each case is decided in a day, and not an item of the evidence in either side is published in the newspapers. But here a lot of low, nasty literature finds its way to the public. I remember one case which arose in a former parliament of which I was a member. A man from Hamilton sought a divorce and his Bill was passed in the Senate. The Bill came before this House in due course. But the wife was a relative of a member of this House, and this member commanded such influence with the vote of the people who are opposed to divorce altogether and others that the Bill was defeated in this House. The petitioner had to come back to parliament a second year, and this he did. I remember his name perfectly, but I do not care about mentioning it. Before the Bill was presented a second time the man whose influence had secured its defeat died. On the second application, the Bill was passed. This is all very well where a man has enough money to bear the heavy expense of securing such legislation. But a poor man or a poor woman, as the case may be, must

be subject to all the trouble attending an application, and yet never be able to get a divorce. People have often referred to the small number of divorces granted in Canada, but that is owing to the fact that a poor man or a poor woman cannot obtain one under the present system. I think there is perhaps nothing in the annals of our legislation in the Senate or the House of Commons that requires amending as much as the present system of granting divorce.

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

Mr. CLARKE moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate to return to that House the evidence, &c., taken before the Standing Committee of the Senate, to whom was referred the Bill (D) No. 118, intitled : 'An Act for the relief of James Brown.'

Motion agreed to.

THE DYMENT BANKING COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 151) to incorporate the Dyment Banking, Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

On the preamble.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this word 'banking.' Is it usual to allow a private company other than a bank to use the words 'bank' or 'banking'?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). My hon. friend's remark is quite pertinent. I drew attention to that in the committee and objected to it, and it was agreed that the date should be changed. But, the Committee on Banking and Commerce has no power to make the change, we can only do it here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This Bill, when before the committee on Banking and Commerce, was the subject of considerable discussion which touched not merely the Bill itself but the whole question of the restrictions and limitations which should be placed upon the operations of loan companies. There was some difference of opinion in the committee and it was thought that it might be necessary on another occasion to make some amendments to the general Act, and it was deemed wise that we should say that by consenting to the passage of this Bill through the House we would not in any way prejudice our right to deal with this question under the general Act, if it shall be deemed necessary to do so a year hence, or at any future time. There are one or two questions relating to the power of investment of loan companies about which there seemed to be a difference of opinion in the committee. It was thought well to place some moderate limitations upon the proposals of this company and then leave the matter to be dealt with further under the general Act. Then, the point was taken that if we gave this company special powers under the Bill they might come back in the course of a year and say we have no right to interfere with them. It was agreed that I should state to the House that if we should desire to make a change in the general Act a year from now, or at any future time, we would not in any way be prejudiced by the passing of this Bill, but that this company would come under the operation of the general Act as it might be amended. That was agreed to by the promoters of the Bill and it was also agreed that I should make this statement to the House on behalf of the whole committee so that it might go on 'Hansard.'

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Would it not be better to have a clause to that effect put into the Bill ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it is necessary. We have the power to make the change and we will not save our power by putting a clause in the Bill. If you were to put this in the Bill in a special way we might thereby imply that we were limiting our right as respects other companies.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is right, but the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Blair) takes an entirely different view. He thinks that notice should be given to investors that their interests may be effected from time to time by the Railway Act as it is amended.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The conditions may differ.

Hon. Mr. TISDALE. The committee thought that a statement placed on 'Hansard' would be sufficient.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 126) to incorporate the Bishop of Moosonee.—Mr. Clarke.

QUESTIONS.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS AT BATHURST.

Mr. WILMOT, by Mr. Ingram, asked :

1. Is the government aware that P. J. Venoit, the collector of customs at Bathurst, took an active part in the elections of 1900, leaving his office for days at a time, and going out into

the country canvassing for the Liberal candidate ?

2. Did the government grant him leave of absence during the months of October and November, 1900 ?

3. Did the government grant him leave of absence for any time between April 1st and April 10th of this year ; and if not, is the government aware that he was absent from his office several days between the 1st and 10th of April, 1902 ?

4. If formulated charges are laid against Mr. P. J. Venoit for political partisanship, will the government grant an investigation ; and if the charges are proved, will the government dismiss him ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. W. Paterson.)

1. The answer to the first question is no.

2. P. J. Venoit, Collector of Customs at Bathurst, N.B., obtained the usual leave of absence for about one week in October, 1900, on application to give evidence as a witness in a suit against the municipality of Gloucester. He did not obtain leave of absence in November, 1900.

3. He did not obtain leave of absence in April, 1902, and the government is not aware that he was absent from his office several days between the 1st and 10th of April, 1902.

4. If formulated charges are laid against this officer the government will see what action should be taken.

YARN ADMITTED DUTY FREE.

Mr ROSAMOND asked :

1. How much yarn has been admitted duty free under Order in Council, No. 1149 B., file No. 52658 ?

2. What regulations has the Minister of Customs issued to the end that yarn so admitted duty free is exclusively used for the purpose for which it is permitted free entry ?

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. W. Paterson.)

The quantity of yarn admitted free of duty under Order in Council as per memo. No. 1,149 B., file 52,658, since the 1st July last to 1st of April, 1902, amounted to 114,945 pounds, valued at $39,108.

The regulations issued by the Department of Customs respecting the free entry of Botany yarn are as follows :—

Department of Customs,
Ottawa, July 2, 1901.

Botany Yarn. (Classification and Samples.)
File 52658.

Referring to memo. 1149b., for the free entry of Botany Yarn, it is to be noted that such free entry is to be allowed only for the said yarn under the following circumstances, viz.:—

'Botany Yarn, single, in numbers 30 and finer, on mule cops, dry spun on what is known as the French or Belgian system, not doubled or twisted, in white only, when imported by manufacturers of cashmere socks and stockings, to be used exclusively for the manufacture of such articles in their own factories.'

Collectors will observe that 'mule cops' are closed at one end and that yarn under the Bradford system is spun with oil, while under the French or Belgian system it is spun dry, without oil.

Representative samples of each importation of Botany Yarn admitted free are to be selected personally by the custom officers, from the body of the package, and are to be forwarded to the Department of Customs for decision as to their tariff status.

A certificate is required on the face of each entry, from the Collector of Customs, that to his own knowledge the importer is a manufacturer of cashmere socks and stockings.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 155) to amend the Railway Act. He said : Notice of this Bill appears on the order paper, but at the moment when the orders were called, I did not have the draft of the Bill in my hand. This Bill is introduced for the purpose of making a small amendment to the general Railway Act to relieve certain sections or clauses of some ambiguity that seems to have arisen in respect to them. Under the law, as it stands at present, it has been recently interpreted by the courts that the powers of expropriation for the purpose of running a spur line from an existing railway to a gravel pit cannot be exercised, if, perchance, there should be a river or lake, or anything of that kind, intervening between the point at which they can carry the railway nearest to the gravel pit and to the gravel pit itself. It has been differently understood and it was not until recent questions had arisen that the point was brought to the attention of the department.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COASTING TRADE LAWS.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick) moved :

That the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

'That it is expedient to amend the law respecting the coasting trade of Canada, and to exclude a foreign-built British ship from that trade unless it has obtained a license, which the Minister of Customs may grant, upon the payment of a duty of twenty-five (25) per cent ad valorem on the fair market value of the ship.'

Motion agreed to.

TAXATION OF CHINESE IMMIGRANTS.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved :

Resolution respecting the taxation of Chinese immigrants. (The Minister of Trade and Commerce) read the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE introduced Bill (No. 156) concerning the taxation of Chinese immigrants.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LOAN FOR $15,000,000.

House went into committee on the following proposed resolution :

That it is expedient to provide that in addition to the sums now remaining unborrowed and negotiable of the loans authorized by parliament by any Act heretofore passed, the Governor in Council be authorized to raise by way of loan :—

(a.) Such sum or sums of money, not to exceed in the whole, the sum of fifteen million dollars, as may be required for the purpose of paying the floating indebtedness of Canada, and of meeting any expenditure authorized by the parliament of Canada ;—and

(b.) Such sum or sums of money as may be required from time to time, over and above any available sinking funds, to pay and discharge the Funded Debt of Canada, or any portion thereof, as the same matures and becomes payable either in England or in Canada ;

Such sums to be raised in accordance with and under the provisions of that portion of chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada relating to the public debt and the raising of loans authorized by parliament, and the sums so raised to form part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada ; the rate of interest to be paid on any such loans not to exceed three and one-half per cent per annum.—The Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). This is the resolution respecting the raising of money by way of loan, which the House will remember I announced in the budget speech. Our last loan Bill was passed in the year 1897, and was for $15,000,000, which is the smallest amount that has been taken for many years in a loan Bill. The outstanding borrowing powers at that date, including the $15,000,000, amounted to about $23,500,000. Out of that, we raised a loan of something less than $10,000,000 (two million pounds sterling) in 1897. We have a current floating indebtedness, as stated to the House, of about $6,000,000, and our savings bank borrowings, which are regarded in the light of a loan, have increased to the extent of about nine and a half million dollars. The net result of these and some other operations is, that our borrowing powers unused are now reduced to a very small figure, being on the 30th day of April, about $2,329,000. It is of course necessary that there should be a borrowing power available to the government from time to time. We have had no loan Bill since 1897, and we have been engaged in very large operations. I do not anticipate that it will be necessary to go into the market for a loan during the current calendar year. The conditions of the money market are not too favourable, and they are likely to be better after the close of the war. However, that is a question which would be determined entirely by the state of the money market; as to whether or not we shall continue to float temporary loans, or whether we shall place a public loan on the market. There is another clause in the Bill which gives us power to renew loans falling due. In that case there is no new obligation, but merely the power to renew such portions of these loans as may be necessary, after taking account of the available sinking funds.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount of loans are falling due, and at what interest ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They are all set forth year by year in the public accounts, and a statement of those falling due within the next few years was made in the budget speech.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Very well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not gather in what way the borrowing power under the Act of 1897 has been nearly all exhausted.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The amount available in 1897, prior to the passing of the Act of that year was $8,611,752. The Act of 1897 added $15,000,000 to it, making the total available borrowing powers, $23,611,752. Since that we have borrowed the 2½ per cent loan of 1897, two million pounds, amounting to something less than $10,000,000. We have temporary loans, as stated in the budget speech, amounting to $6,083,333, and we have increased our savings banks deposits—which is another form of public loan—$9,648,080. There are several specially authorized loans—for example, the Montreal Harbour Board loan and things like that—I have not referred to these as I am dealing with general loans. We have practically used up all our authorized borrowing powers, or nearly so, and in order that we may meet the necessities as they arise this Bill would be necessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When you borrow money from the savings banks, have you to get authority under a loan Act ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think probably without a special Loan Act we could do it; but in stating to the House from time to time, the amount of our borrowings we have always included the savings bank deposits. We look upon the amount so taken as a public loan, and it is referred to in the Audit Act as one of the methods by which we may raise money.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where was the temporary loan of $6,000,000 raised ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Bank of Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At what rate ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. 3¼ per cent, and I think there was a small portion of it which bore a shade above that.

Mr. CLARKE. At what rate of interest was the last loan ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The stock bore 2½ per cent; authorized minimum 91, and yielding £91 10s. 5d., if I remember aright, or equivilent to about $2.83 per cent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When you effect a temporary loan of that character for what period does it usually run ? In the present case is it for a definite period, or is it on demand, or is it renewable ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is sometimes for a fixed period of a year, but in the recent case it was only for six months. Owing to the state of the money market the banks preferred a short period of six months, and they gave a better rate than for a year. That, of course, was advantageous to us, because it is renewable and the conditions may be better later.

Mr. CLARKE. How is the interest payable on these temporary loans ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have an annual appropriation which covers general interest as well as the specified bonds.

Mr. CLARKE. How frequently is interest paid ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is practically a discount; you discount Treasury Bills.

Mr. CLARKE. It is practically paid in advance.

Resolution reported ; read the second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) authorizing the raising by way of loan of certain sums of money for the public service.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FRUIT MARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 136) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901 (the Minister of Agriculture) read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the minister would be good enough to explain what change in the law is effected, and for what reason this amendment is introduced.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). There is practically no change in the intention of the law. There was some confusion found in the enforcement of the Act as to the definition of the term 'packer,' a doubt arising as to whether it referred to the person on whose behalf the fruit was packed or the individual labourer who packed the fruit. The change makes it clear that it is the person on whose behalf the fruit is packed who is responsible for the packing. Then, it has been found in practice that the trade wish to adopt a standard of marks, and in this Bill we provide for marks of two different kinds—one set being XXX, XX and X ; the other being No. 1, No. 2 and No. 3. The reason the alternative is given is that in the maritime provinces the X marks are used, while in Ontario the numbers are used. People may use, along with these, their own private marks if they choose. We wish gradually to introduce these marks, but we do not wish at present to make them absolutely the only marks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the first change is concerned, there seems to be every reason for it ; but the other seems to be remarkably indefinite. What would you regard as a designation inconsistent with XXX ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would be one of an inferior grade ; for instance, No. 2 with XXX. The point more particularly is that a designation must not be used inconsistent with X or XX. For instance, if 'specially selected' were used with XX, it would be inconsistent; or if No. 1 were used with X, the two would be inconsistent. The difficulty arises in the fact that certain dealers have their own special grades, and if they were to use XX as the proper designation of the fruit, and were to accompany it with another designation of their own, which meant 'special excellence' or 'highest grade,' that would be inconsistent with XX ; and though they might truthfully say that the fruit was legally marked, yet the marking would mislead the purchaser.

Mr. CLARKE. Have these changes been made at the suggestion of the fruit packers or fruit exporters ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, largely on the recommendation of fruit inspectors, who are charged with the enforcement of the Act, and after discussion with the fruit dealers, and as a result of the experience of the last season.

Mr. CLARKE. Was any intimation given to the fruit exporters as to the amendments

which were likely to be made in the Act of last session ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. They were discussed with them by the inspectors and when the inspectors were here about two weeks ago, they made these recommendations to me.

Mr. CLARKE. They discussed them previously with the fruit exporters ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I must say that this section strikes me as very indefinite—indeed, so indefinite as to be practically useless. If a dealer puts any other designation whatever upon a package of fruit, it must mean either the same thing as one of the marks already there, or it must modify it in some way. If it modifies it in any way is it to be regarded as inconsistent with it ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It must mean practically the same thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it means the same thing, what is the use of putting it on ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Because certain dealers have marks which are known to their customers, and we do not wish to debar them from using those marks if they wish.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot understand how 'specially selected' can be inconsistent with XX or X, because that particular variety or class of fruit might be specially selected. The third-class might be specially selected as well as the first-class.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It would not be so considered by the trade.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But in dealing with an act of parliament it would be so determined. I am taking the English language in its ordinary acceptation ; I do not know anything about the technicalities of the trade. However, I do not suppose there is anything in this that can do any harm, though I fail to see that it can do any good. In fact, my hon. friend admitted last session that the chief merit of the Bill was that it could not do any harm. None of us were able to see how it could do any good.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It has been found to do a great deal of good already.

Mr. HENDERSON. Subsection 'a' requires that the packer shall mark the package with the initials of 'his' christian name. In the event of the exporter being a woman, how would the marks be designated ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe that 'his' is supposed to include 'her'.

Mr. HENDERSON. Under what authority ? Is there an interpretation Act which makes 'his' stand for 'her' ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I believe there is.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret very much that a Bill of this importance has been left to be dealt with by a thin House at the close of the session, when men who thoroughly understand the marking of fruit are absent. I think it a great pity that this Bill has not been dealt with two months ago.

Mr. WADE. I would like to ask the minister if he has considered the question of making any description of No. 2 and No. 3 grades. I have had several communications from fruit growers who think that would be desirable, if possible.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The inspectors thought it was hardly feasible at the present time to make a correct and reliable definition of those grades.

Mr. GILMOUR. Is it designated anywhere, either in this amendment or in the original Act, what XXX means ? If it is, this Act is of some service. If it is not, it is meaningless, and a man might put XXX on anything.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In section 6 of the original Act the definition of the first quality is given.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is this change ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is simply to put in section 6 of the Act the words 'No. 1' as well as 'finest,' 'best' and 'first quality.'

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are two ways in which this Act works. One is that the fruit shall be marked certain grades, and if the inspector finds it is not up to the grade he is authorized to put on the words 'falsely marked.' There is another part of the Act which provides that the fruit shall be equal, all through the package, to its face, and there is no means of authorizing the inspector to label the package 'falsely packed' where that provision of the Act is violated. I therefore ask to be given the authority to have the package labelled 'falsely packed' as well as 'falsely marked.'

Mr. CLARKE. I sent copies of the Bill to several fruit exporters in Toronto, but have

only had a reply from one of them, so that I take it there cannot be any serious objection to the measure on the part of the others. The gentleman who did write me suggests that the words 'offered for sale' should be added after the word 'package' in the first line of section 9 and also in subsection 3, He gives as his reasons :

> Owing to unavoidable hurry at times in getting fruit under cover, also deterioration when held any length of time, a shipper should not be held responsible for marks excepting when offering the fruit for sale ; were it otherwise every one handling same would become liable over and over again during a season ; I would therefore urge you to secure the insertion of the saving clause proposed 'offered for sale.'

It would be a harsh provision to have the Act amended as proposed in this Bill, and my correspondent suggests the advisability of adding the words 'offered for sale' so that a penalty will not be imposed upon the person whose name or initials are to be found on the outside of the barrel, unless the fruit contained in the barrel is being offered for sale.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think the addition of those words would make the Act practically unworkable. When fruit is hurriedly put into a warehouse, the seller need not mark the package at all. It is only when the fruit is offered for sale, that the package need be marked. If the merchant is going to repack the fruit, he does not need to mark it until it is repacked. In the second place, the fruit is very frequently already sold and in the hands of a purchaser, and legal technicalities might interfere materially with the working of the Act, if these words were inserted. In the third place, we have often to deal with fruit in transit for the foreign market, and I do not know how we could deal with it if these words were inserted. The fruit is in Toronto, and whether it is being offered for sale or has been sold or to whom it belongs, are questions which would raise a number of legal technicalities and obstruct the working of the Act. I think the danger which my hon. friend's correspondent fears is not a grave one, because he is not required to mark these packages at all until he is ready to offer them for sale.

Mr. CLARKE. If this Act be found to work harshly, I suppose the hon. gentleman would consent to an amendment at some future time ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have been enforcing the Act in a very lenient way up to the present and do not propose to administer it harshly at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of the third clause ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It is the same as in the original Act, the only difference being that the inspector must give notice when he marks the packages 'falsely packed,' as he does in the case when he labels them 'falsely marked.' The object is to let the shipper or seller know that his fruit has been found to be wrongly marked, so that he take what steps he think necessary to protect himself. That is necessary when the fruit is in transit.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are we to understand that if the inspector finds certain packages falsely marked, he will condemn the whole shipment, or only the barrel so marked.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is a matter of regulation. I think I will have to make a regulation by which a certain number of barrels will be examined, and if found falsely marked or packed, the whole of that particular shipment will have to be thrown out. Last year we only marked the barrels examined, and serious complaint were made from the old country. In one case a lawsuit resulted over a large shipment, in which some barrels were marked and others were not, because not opened. I will have to make regulations to deal with this matter more strictly than in the past.

Mr. COCHRANE. Frequently the shipper or his agent buys the orchard. Sometimes he has the picking done himself or he may pay so much for the whole orchard and repack the fruit after delivery. Supposing a lot of barrels were marked by the apple grower as instructed by the shipper and were not up to the standard of the inspection, and the purchaser intended having them repacked before being put on the market, how would the Act work then ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In such a case the barrels need not be marked at all. If they were inspected and the markers found them incorrect and fraudulent, I think that the person on whose behalf the apples were packed would be responsible and not the owner of the orchard.

Mr. WADE. I do not think that the hon. gentleman could, under this Act, make such a regulation as he speaks of. He could only have such fruit marked as not being up to the standard, which was really examined.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that is probably correct.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The regulation I propose would be that when a certain number of barrels are found wrongly packed or marked, the inspector would have to go through the whole lot. I do not propose that he should mark any package without examining it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If out of a dozen barrels we found two falsely packed, would the inspector examine every barrel of the shipment ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In the case of two out of ten, I would not consider it necessary for the inspector to go through the whole lot. But if he found seven or eight out of ten wrongly marked or packed, he would be instructed to examine every package.

Mr. COCHRANE. If the inspector went through the whole lot, would the shipper not have the privilege of repacking ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. Where does the responsibility end in this matter? Suppose a retailer buys 50 or 100 barrels wrongly marked and offers them for sale. If the customer finds that the apples are not as represented, has he any recourse against the retailer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Is that not likely to do injustice to the retailer ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The intention of the Act was that the retailer should have his recourse against the person who sold the apples to him.

Mr. CLARKE. I think a case arose in Toronto where information was laid against the retailer. My recollection is not clear as to the circumstances, but I remember that it seemed to me at the time a very great injustice to the retailer that, after he had purchased so many barrels of apples and taken them into the store and sold certain barrels, one or more of which were found not to be as marked, proceedings should lie against the retailer. It is the person who packed the fruit and not the retailer who should be proceeded against.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The person who packs is responsible, but, by another section of the Act, anybody who offers for sale fruit improperly marked is also responsible.

Mr. CLARKE. Yet there is responsibility upon the retailer for every barrel, although he has had nothing to do with the packing.

Mr. WADE. Let him buy from a reputable party.

Mr. CLARKE. All the wholesale dealers are reputable parties. But does not the minister think it would be unjust to the retailer who buys twenty-five or fifty barrels of apples from a reputable firm and finds after they are sold by him, that some packages of the fruit are not as marked, that he should be proceeded against ? Would it not be better to provide that when a customer informs the department, the department should proceed against the wholesale man or shipper ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not think it would do to debar the purchaser from proceeding against the retailer. But I may say that, under such circumstances as the hon. gentleman has indicated, the department would not proceed against the retailer, but against the parties who packed the fruit, or for whom it was packed. It would not do, however, to relieve the retailer of all responsibility.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any provision under which the retailer has a remedy against the person who supplies him ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The whole Act would give him that—he has the same remedy that the person who purchases from him has against him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what way ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If he has purchased fruit, marked of a certain grade from A. B., a dealer or shipper or packer, he can proceed against that party if the fruit is not as marked.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For penalty ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes, and for damages also.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

INCORPORATIONS OF BOARDS OF TRADE.

Bill (No. 132) to amend the Act respecting the Incorporation of Boards of Trade (the Minister of Trade and Commerce), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I may explain that this Bill is to facilitate the incorporation of Boards of Trade in mining districts, and to reduce the unit of population in the districts for which Boards of Trade may be incorporated in certain cases. This Bill applies only to British Columbia and Yukon Territory.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Department of Public Works—Further amount required for contingencies, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). We require an additional amount for telegrams, stationery and printing. We are receiving a great many telegrams from all parts of the country, unpaid, of course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the telegrams do not absorb the whole of this $3,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It includes printing, advertising, stationery.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is the printing done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. At the Printing Bureau.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the hon. gentleman quite sure about that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure of that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to know how the total vote compares with that of the previous year. There are so many supplementaries, and the thing is in such a state of confusion, that we cannot exactly compare the expenditure of one year with that of another.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year we asked for $2,000 in the supplementary estimates, and this year for $3,000.

Parliament buildings, Ottawa—Addition to building over engine house and improvements in main vestibule, including elevators, &c., $21,500.

Mr. BELL. What will that make the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $56,000.

Mr. BELL. Does that cover the whole cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I would like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that his elevators are not very satisfactory. If there was a fire, all the members of the Railway Committee in that committee room would be burned up. If both elevators go wrong at once there would be no way of getting out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure the trouble is not with the elevators. Sometimes during the session the power has been short. During the recess I will see that that trouble is remedied.

Mr. BELL. Another trouble is the noise; the echo in that Railway Committee room is a very serious evil, and makes it almost impossible to do any business there. I suppose that will be attended to by the hon. minister in some way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that in every new building there is something wrong with the acoustics. We have remedied that to a certain extent by the draperies the hon. gentleman has seen. The chief architect informs me he will be able to remedy it still further.

Mr. BELL. I would suggest that possibly another remedy might be found. The chairman's table and platform might be shifted to some point nearer the middle of the room at one side. It is almost impossible to hear anything now at the extreme end of the room.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know where to place the seat of the chairman. For a time we put it just across where my hon. friend would like it to be; but on reflection we changed it. Of course, if the committee would like it to be changed, I have no objection.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen, elevator attendants and caretaker, $12,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the cause of the increase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the first place we have been obliged to buy 1,000 tons more coal on account of the greater number of public buildings we have in this city. Moreover, after public tenders last year, I was obliged to pay 65 cents per ton more for coal. I have just received tenders for next year, and the price of coal has still increased.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What kind of coal is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hard coal.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How do you buy it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By public tender.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much does this increase the vote over the previous year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By $12,000. We will be obliged to ask for more in the supplementary estimates. The total increase in the amount will be $24,000. We are obliged to pay $15,134 for an additional 1,000 tons of coal. We are obliged to pay the balance, because the price of coal has been increased.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Coal does not cost $15 a ton ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we are paying $6.45 a ton.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the increase on the total coal, together with the additional 1,000 tons, makes an increase of $15,000 altogether in the cost of coal for the buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman taken into consideration the question of making further provision for the public service in Ottawa by building instead of renting so many buildings about the city ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have considered the matter, but as the government have decided to erect a museum, a mint, and an astronomical observatory, my colleagues have thought that this year's budget is large enough, and we have not resolved to erect any new public buildings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not urging the expenditure of any more money. I believe that possibly there might be a saving of money. The difficulty that has been mentioned in the past is that you will have to buy land. I never could see the slightest necessity for buying more land. I believe that you have all the land required for putting up additional departmental buildings for the public service. As far as the observatory, the mint and buildings of that kind are concerned, I do not profess to know about them, but it seems to me that there is ample room for increasing the western public building, and there is ample room where the Supreme Court building is to erect another building. I think it would be well to consider whether or not that cannot be done, so as to save a considerable sum of money that is spent in rent, because, I believe the interest on the cost of these buildings would be less than the rent which the government are paying out in the city of Ottawa annually. Of course, I would not profess to speak about that with as much knowledge as that possessed by the hon. gentleman and the officers of his department. There is, however, no difficulty about the land.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Supreme Court site has been pointed out to me several times and it is a very fine site indeed. I must admit that in my personal view it is better to erect the buildings required, but my hon. friend knows already, and he will perhaps know later on, that when budgets have reached a certain volume it is pretty difficult to get more money. We are paying out in the city of Ottawa $18,000 in rent. I am going to reduce that amount by $1,000 or $2,000, because I am going to improve the post office and provide accommodation there for the Department of Customs. We are now renting an office on Sparks street for that department. We are paying, as I was saying, about $18,000 for rent, and, I suppose, $400,000, or $500,000, would erect a very fine building for the public service. I hope that next year we will be in a position to have a more definite policy upon that point.

Mr. CLARKE. Are not the office buildings which have been rented for the public service in this city under lease for ten years ? What is the shortest lease ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the shortest lease is one year. We are not bound by any length of time except in the case of the brick building at the corner of Metcalfe and Slater streets, where we are bound for ten years, of which two years have gone.

Mr. CLARKE. There are no other buildings leased for ten years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BELL. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he has any intention of building a new House of Commons chamber ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Suggestions have been made that as the library is too small we might perhaps make an exchange, but this is a big question and at the present time I have not the information necessary to enable me to express an opinion upon it.

Mr. BELL. I suppose that those of us who are so favoured by our constituencies may expect to remain in this chamber for some years ? And if so, it seems to me that the hon. minister should direct his attention to the subject of the ventilation of the chamber. I shall not say very much about it, because I know it is a subject which has been discussed very often, but really, it seems to me an extraordinary thing that the House of Commons should be condemned to spend year after year in a chamber whose ventilation is absolutely disgraceful and prejudicial to the health, and that the matter should get so little attention. What is the reason that it is absolutely impossible to provide the House of Commons with pure air ? I think it is a most serious reflection upon the hon. Minister of Public Works, who has proved himself in every other direction so energetic and so capable. I hope that he will direct himself to the question of providing a remedy for what is unquestionably a scandalous evil.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have, over and over again, called the attention of the chief architect to the ventilation of this House. Of course, we cannot change the nature of this chamber. It has been constructed on certain lines that we all know. It is a room in the middle of the building. As to the ventilation the chief architect tells me that he cannot see very well how he can change it now. It is as good as we can make it, although I grant it is not good.

Mr. BELL. It is not modern. It is an antiquated system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If we open the windows over our heads there is a draught and everybody is sick. I want parliament to be in good shape and in good health.

Mr. CLARKE. How long is the census building, at the corner of O'Connor and Sparks streets, leased for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Three years.

Mr. CLARKE. What portion of that time has expired ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have leased it for five years, but two years have gone, so that we are not bound for more than three years now.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it expected that the census will be completed in that time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not for me to answer that question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose you have an arrangement so that it can be renewed if necessary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We can always renew.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At that price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no desire to renew the lease of that building. I had enough trouble to put it through before.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before leaving the matter referred to by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) of the ventilation of this chamber, I desire to say that during this session, we, on this side of the House, and more particularly those of us who sit on the middle row of seats, have found very great inconvenience and discomfort from the system of ventilating the chamber. I do not object to the air not being so pure at all times; we can put up with that, but there is another matter we do desire to enter our solemn protest against, and it is that the fans that are used to force fresh air into the chamber are turned on while we are sitting in the chamber. When a cold blast of wind is driven directly against our heads, being uncovered, no man is free from a severe cold. During the greater part of the session, I have been subject to a cold. I am sure this is a matter the minister can remedy by instructing the engineer that these fans shall not be turned on after six o'clock until the members have left the chamber.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Get out.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Customs says 'get out,' but we are not provided with suitable and comfortable rooms in other parts of the building as he is. We are compelled to remain here, and do our work and it is absolute cruelty to subject us to such treatment. I have spoken time and time about it, but without having any remedy applied. I think Mr. Chairman you will remember that when you sat on this side of the House you suffered in the same way. We will put up with impure air if we have to, but we cannot put up with a Yukon blast blowing about our ears continually.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I come often to this chamber when the House is not sitting and I generally find a good many members here so that the difficulty is to turn on the fans when there are no members. I assure the House that during the recess I will give my best attention to the ventilation of the chamber. I will consult not only my own officers, but men who have acquired experience in that line of business.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would gather from the statement of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that what the Minister of Public Works does is to turn the fans on against the members of this side of the House so as to kill off the opposition, and that he does not do so on the other side. If there is any truth in that, it is of course taking a most unfair advantage of us.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend may rest assured that that side of the House has been blown up enough without me.

Maritime provinces—General repairs, harbours, rivers and bridges, $8,000.

Mr. BELL. Is there anything in this vote for the works on Pictou Island, to which I have called attention several times.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that we have taken the amount out of the general vote of last year to do that work and the work is going on now.

Slides and booms—repairs, &c., $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Trade is developing and there are more demands for works of all kind. We make a rough estimate for the general vote. We cannot tell of course whether storms will destroy one wharf or ten wharfs throughout the country and the estimate is always approximate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But this is for slides and booms. The explanation of the minister is very satisfactory so far as it is definite, but it is not very definite.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These works are quite outside of the ordinary vote. These are revenue bearing works.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much revenue do you get ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I never handle a dollar of the revenue, but I think the revenue reaches about $130,000 a year. These works which pay best are on the St. Maurice and the Ottawa rivers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The total expenditure is how much ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $107,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So that the work is really paid for out of collections ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Telegraphs—Land and cable telegraph lines of the sea coasts and islands of the lower rivers, and Gulf of St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service, $17,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This sum is asked for in connection with our cable and telegraph system. We have cables between Anticosti and the north shore, and between the Magdalen Islands and Meat Cove on the Island of Cape Breton, and also in New Brunswick. The steamer 'Newfield' was wrecked, and we have been obliged to buy another steamer, the 'Tyrian,' and to equip her, and this sum is asked in connection with that.

Mr. CLARKE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he is prepared to give the House and the country a full statement as to the policy of the government with respect to the improvement of the telegraph and cable service in the gulf. In view of the lamentable record of losses in the gulf last season, I think we should have a comprehensive statement as to what steps the government are taking to mitigate the evils to which that route has been subject.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that we have completed our telegraph system to Belle Isle. We have laid a cable between Belle Isle and the north shore, and we have equipped two Marconi stations—one on Belle Isle and one on the north shore. When the supplementary estimates come, I think my hon. friend will find that I have not forgotten that important question. I think our telegraph system down by the sea should be completed. I feel that we should be at home, if I may so speak, with our telegraph system, so that it will be connected with all the cables of the continent.

Mr. CLARKE. We shall have full explanations from the hon. minister before the supplementary estimates pass ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the hon. minister had any communication with the shipping interest on the subject ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. I suppose the correspondence will be brought down, so that we may see if anything can be done to effect some improvement in the insurance rates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will bring down all the correspondence I have.

At one o'clock committee took recess.

Committee resumed at Three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount is asked to supplement last year's vote, it is to pay for accounts that are due.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the 'Tyrian' to be used entirely as a cable steamer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have you sufficient work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many miles of cable have you to lay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total mileage of our system is about 6,000 miles, including the Yukon Territory. We have 230 miles of cable to lay.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. minister was kind enough to provide for a new cable between House Harbour and Amherst, Magdalen Islands last year or two years ago. The cable is, I understand, on board a steamer, but has not yet been laid. Will the hon. gentleman attend to this matter this year, as our telegraphic service there is very poor indeed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cable was purchased in England and has reached Canada, and as soon as the season permits, it will be laid down.

Yukon public buildings, including revote of $23,723.32, lapsed $84,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A part of this vote is composed of a revote, amounting to $23,723. That sum lapsed because the accounts for last year did not reach Ottawa in time. The balance of the vote is to cover expenditure incurred on public buildings in the Yukon, besides the appropriation. In other words the resident engineer, Mr. Fowler, has been obliged to spend more than he thought on the public buildings out there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What public buildings has the government erected in the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The government house, which is a residence for the commissioner, a building for the post office and custom-house, and administration building, in which all the branches of the public service are located and a court house. We have several other public buildings in the Yukon, and I gave the list in the previous debate. In the supplementaries we have arranged in such a way that the Yukon government will have charge of all local business just as has the government in the North-west Territories, and my department will keep charge only of the federal business, that is to say, the post office and the government house. It would be easier for the Yukon government to take charge of all the local buildings there as they are on the spot and know more about them than I do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are there official residences also for the judges ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but we pay the rental of the government judges residence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the furnishings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not furnish the judges house residence, but we had to provide the furnishings for the buildings I have mentioned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How is it the hon. gentleman wants $60,000 more than he thought last year would be required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was very difficult to form an accurate estimate of the cost of work in the Yukon, especially when there was no telegraphic communication, and Mr. Fowler, the resident architect, under estimated the cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. gentleman's department a resident engineer in the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These estimates were made, I suppose, in the Yukon and not in Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These estimates were sent by Mr. Fuller, who was our resident architect. But the estimates were exceeded. However, Mr. Fuller is here in Ottawa, and if my hon. friend would like to have him before the Public Accounts Committee, there is no reason why he would not do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that there is any need of that but——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was just explaining that the reason why we asked for this vote is that the resident architect exceeded his appropriation. But he tells us that, these buildings having been commenced, he was bound to complete them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is quite right. But what is the vote last year which was exceeded ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The appropriation last year was $145,000 ; as against this Mr. Fuller has drawn cheques to the amount of $228,947, a deficit of about $84,000, for which I am asking this vote. Of course, out of that, as I have explained, over $23,000 had lapsed from last year's appropriation, so I am really only asking for a vote of $60,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not quite understand that. If there is a difference of $84,000 between what was estimated and what was expended, how can $23,000 of this be a revote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because the money has not been spent ; the accounts did not come in time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I understand the hon. minister to say that cheques were issued for $228,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister has explained the matter to me, and as I understand it, the appropriation was then exhausted. As a matter of fact before we had telegraph communication we never knew where we were in these matters. Our officers would delay and then the slowness of postal communication would cause further delay. But the case is as I have stated—we had an appropriation of $145,000 against which we have an expenditure of $228,947.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the vote of last year does not expire until the 1st July next. I do not understand the minister's statement that a portion of the vote has lapsed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister explained that what was exceeded was the vote of last year, and out of this year's vote we have had to pay this $23,000, therefore we are short by that amount on this vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did not you get it revoted last session ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because, I am informed, the session was over when we learned of it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, I cannot help myself in these matters. The money has to be paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand now—the lapse is one lap back ; but it seems to be a pretty wide margin of error—$84,000 in $145,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I grant that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How were the buildings erected, by tender or by day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that we gave small contracts for material, and so on, but most of the work was by day's labour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How would it be possible to have so large an error as that in doing the work in that way ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot explain more than I have already done. As I have said, we had a resident architect, a man who has been several years in the department and who was recommended to me as the best man for that work. We controlled the expenditure as much as it was possible to do from this distance, but the appropriation was exceeded. In a country where charwomen are paid $5 a day, money goes pretty fast.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The money goes pretty fast—I am disposed to admit that. But what margin of error does the minister think we ought to allow in future ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to say there will be no more errors in this, because these works have been completed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What has been the total cost of these buildings that the minister has spoken of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I find that the total cost of the buildings up to 1st January, 1902, so far as reported to Ottawa, was $297,435.45.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the estimate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really cannot say. It is rather difficult to make an estimate out there.

To refund the Yukon local council the balance of their outlay in connection with the construction of the Ogilvie bridge, viz.: $32,403, together with the sum of $15,748.27, advanced by them so as to permit of the Hunker Road being completed ready for traffic in 1901-02..	$48,151 84
To pay Palmer Bros., in full and final settlement of all demands in connection with their contract for the construction of a wagon road from Williams Roadhouse to mouth of Gold Run..	19,800 00
	$67,951 84

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What funds do the Yukon local council administer ? Why is there a refund ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to answer the question as it does not belong to the Department of Public Works. But so far as I can say, they are funds collected from the royalties and so on. Out of their local funds they have advanced a sum for roads which we are asked to reimburse to them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who had the contract with the government for building this wagon road ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Messrs. Palmer and Russell had a contract with the Department of Public Works for the construction of this road. That work was recommended by Mr. Ross, the commissioner, and it was on his recommendation that the contract was awarded.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the length of the road ?

The MINITSER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Fifteen miles and a half.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Had you authority from parliament to enter into contract for building that road ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had a vote for roads last year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this in excess of that vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to complete payment for the construction of that road.

Mr. CLARKE. How much was paid before on account of this road ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had voted $10,000 before.

Mr. CLARKE. Then the road cost $29,800 for 15 miles. Is that right ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the total cost of that road was $31,479, and we have paid $11,000. The length of the road is 16 miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There was a contract, apparently, according to the wording of the resolution. What was the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The deputy minister reminds me that in point of fact the commissioner was the real party who contracted for the road, with the consent of all the officers. The contract price was $10,418 for the first section ; for the second section, eight miles in round numbers, the contract price was $10,950.80. Then there were extras that Mr. Ross, the commissioner, granted. I may say that Mr. Ross being a man of experience, when he went there I asked him to certify all the expenditures for the Department of Public Works. I thought it was safer to have him supervise my own officers, and in everything I am asking from the House to-day I have the sanction and approbation of Mr. Ross.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Were tenders called for by public advertisement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire, Mr. Chairman, to call your attention to the fact that there is so much noise in the Chamber that it is difficult to hear. While the committee is going on in supply we will have to have better order. On Friday evening it was almost impossible to hear the minister who was in charge, and it is very difficult this afternoon. Unless we have better order I shall move that the committee rise.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I cannot be heard from this side of the House I will go across.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Very frequently when the committee begins work there is a system of interviewing going on in the House. Members gather in little groups around certain seats for the purpose of transacting business, which causes a hum that renders it almost impossible for the average member to hear what is going on. I hope that will be avoided as far as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may point out to to the minister that on Friday evening he was making a good deal of noise himself while the estimates of the Department of Agriculture were going on. I am glad to see that he is being taught a lesson on the present occasion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must apologize for my past faults. I have the best intentions for the future.

Mr. ROCHE (Halifax). I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that from our seats up here we hear nothing whatever of what is going on down below, and we have to amuse ourselves as best we can.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Tenders were asked for for this work, and thirteen were sent in. The lowest tenderer was a gentleman named Forsyth, but he had to be passed over because his securities went back on him. The next lowest tenderer was Mr. Palmer, the man to whom we gave the contract.

Mr. EARLE. When was the contract let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. July 27th, 1900.

Mr. EARLE. That was previous to Mr. Ross going in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, perhaps so. But he was consulted. I remember very well, when our final settlement took place.

Mr. EARLE. That is the account that Palmer & Russell had a dispute with the department about ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there was a difference.

Mr. EARLE. What was the difference ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were extras for about $10,000, or $12,000, and as I did not know exactly what to do, I referred the whole thing to Mr. Ross, in whom I had implicit confidence, and he settled with them with the aid of my officers.

Mr. EARLE. That is unfair to the lowest tenderer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The lowest tenderer was passed over because, before accepting his contract, his securities went back on him, and for no other reason.

Quesnelle Atlin telegraph line—Yukon system, $107,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the explanation here ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This money is asked to pay two different accounts. First to pay back accounts incurred in 1899-1900 and also in 1900-1901, amounting to $55,640.09. It is also to pay the cost of the gap that had to be completed during last session. When I came to the House on a previous occasion I stated that we had every reason to believe that the gap to be filled would be about 50 miles long. Of course, this is a wild country, and nobody had ever previously travelled over the ground between Hazelton and Telegraph Creek. Instead of having to complete a gap of 50 miles, we had 111 miles of telegraph line to build. Now, we had to carry our provisions on boats and in other ways, and we had to spend $30,000 to take the men in in the spring and bring them out in the fall. We would seem to have spent $79,000 for that 111 miles of gap, but we have really and practically spent only $49,000 upon that work, as $30,000 had to be spent to take the men in and bring them out again. I am asking this amount of money to pay $55,000 of old accounts and to pay the cost of this gap. During the last winter there were a couple of months in which there were 27 feet of snow. For the next season, as soon as spring is open, I intend buying cable and laying it down so that in the winter months there will be no interruption in the telegraph system.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not run straight across the country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is altogether out of the question. They were obliged at times before reaching these points to shovel five or six feet of snow on both sides.

Mr. BELL. At what season of the year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was in the month of April that they started. It cost us $30,000 to take them in and bring them out.

Mr. BOYD. I have heard it remarked that in building this line, the engineers or those

who were responsible, ran past one another about 50 miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They did not. If my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) will be good enough to look at the map he will find that there was nothing of the kind.

Mr. BOYD. Then it is not the case that they did run past each other ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I say on the report of the engineers who were there and who are here to-day, on the report of Mr. Boyer, who is a most reliable officer, that nothing of the kind occurred.

Mr. BOYD. My information was that the parties building the line ran past each other about 50 miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am quite sure that information is incorrect, as the map shows.

Mr. BOYD. I am pleased to hear that it is not so.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This map has been prepared by the officers who built this line.

Mr. EARLE. I asked some information from the hon. minister the other evening which he was not then prepared to give. What is the total length of the Yukon telegraph line from Ashcroft to Dawson, the total cost and the number of men employed?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total length of the Yukon lines, including the Port Simpson to Hazelton branch, is 2,135 miles. Here are the distances : first section, Ashcroft to Quesnelle, including the branch from Ashcroft to Lilloet station and other branches from Quesnelle to Barkerville, 281 miles ; second section, which extends from Quesnelle to Atlin by way of Hazelton and Telegraph Creek, 397 miles; Hazelton to Telegraph Creek, 333 miles; Telegraph Creek to Atlin, 214 miles, making a total distance from Quesnelle to Atlin of 944 miles; branch line from Port Simpson to Hazelton, 200 miles ; Atlin to Dawson, including branch to Cariboo crossing, 611 miles ; branch from Dawson to the American boundary, 97 miles, making in all 2,135 miles.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $786,224.41 not including $94,000 for supplies and provisions which were left at the different camps on different occasions, and which have been paid out of construction money.

Mr. KEMP. Does that include this estimate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the total estimate. If the total sum of $786,224.41 is divided by the total mileage of 2,135 miles, then the general cost per mile would be $368.23, and if the House wants to know how much per mile was the cost on the different sections I am prepared to give it.

Mr. BOYD. How many telegraph offices have you ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have 70 offices including refuge houses and about 119 employees.

Mr. BOYD. What kind of wire did you use ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. 8 wire. As I have said, next winter season we contemplate laying a cable on the most difficult part of the line so as to avoid the great damages caused by the storms. Between Hazelton and Telegraph Creek last winter there were 27 feet of snow, which accounts for the interruption in the service. We expect that by using the new device we will be able to have an uninterrupted service the whole winter round. The cost of the different sections of the line is as follows :

From Ashcroft to Barkerville 281 miles, less 62 miles to Lilloet making 219 miles ; total cost $24,000 or $110 per mile.

From Quesnelle to Atlin 944 miles, total cost $500,494.75, or $540.77 per mile.

From Fort Simpson to Hazelton 200 miles, total cost $64,637.52, or $323.18 per mile.

Atlin to Dawson including branch to Bennett 637 miles, total cost $178,480.53 ; cost per mile $280.19.

From Dawson to the boundary, 95 miles, total cost $18,611.39, or $195.90 per mile.

Mr. KEMP. On which section did one of the civil servants in the employ of the government contract with the government to supply the poles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Bennett and Dawson line.

Mr. KEMP. Had any civil servants contracts on any other sections ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not admit that a civil servant had a contract at all, because Mr. Rochester is not a civil servant. He was a temporary employee for a time. I have already explained to the House how this matter happened. Mr. Rochester started from Ottawa and the intention of Mr. Charleson was that Mr. Rochester who had long experience was to be employed as foreman of works. When he had been a few months there he contracted for the poles. We were then paying $3 for the poles and he offered to supply them for $2. Mr. Charleson rightly or wrongly accepted his offer, and after his contract was completed he began again as foreman

of construction. Let me say at once that Mr. Richardson who was then in charge of the construction of the line was the gentleman who accepted all the poles from Mr. Rochester. These are the facts as they are.

Mr. EARLE. I asked the other evening a question with regard to the amount of business done by that telegraph line. Can the minister tell us the amount of messages and the revenue received ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The revenue since the 1st of July, 1901, has been as follows: July, $7,478.78; August, $7,583.52; September, $8,904.13; October, $8,976.16; November, $6,670.83; December, $6,509.36; January, 1902, $6,950.48; February, $7,683.71; March, $8,898. I may remark that the line was interrupted for several weeks, otherwise I suppose our receipts would have been larger.

Mr. EARLE. Can you tell me what proportion of the revenue is derived from the government service, and what proportion from general business ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is our net revenue. For next year we expect a revenue of $125,000 at least. The expenditure during the last six months or a year has been very large, because we were still building. We shall be able to reduce the expenditure very largely.

Mr. EARLE. Will you be able to reduce your rates ? The impression is that if the rates were lowered to a reasonable figure, the business would be very greatly increased.

An hon. MEMBER. What are the rates?

Mr. EARLE. I think they are about $4.75 for ten words from Victoria or Vancouver to the Yukon. I am informed that if a message is sent from Ashcroft to London, the full Yukon rate is added to the cable rate, whereas in cabling over any other line there is only the usual local rate added to the cable rate. I understand that in cabling anywhere along the government line, the full Yukon rate is added to the cable rate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, I would be only too glad, if possible, to reduce the rates. We have not had many complaints. The rates, I grant, are not low; but that line has cost a large amount of money, and the rates must be judged according to local circumstances. Everything is high out there.

Mr. EARLE. But that does not affect the case I mention. If you telegraph from Ashcroft to Victoria the rate is perhaps 50 cents; but if you cable from Ashcroft to London, the full Yukon rate is added to the cable rate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is the hon. gentleman sure of that ?

Mr. EARLE. I have been told so by a party who has cabled.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad my hon. friend has called my attention to that. I will immediately look into it.

Mr. BOYD. What class of instruments are used in those seventy offices ? Are they repeaters, or can the hon. gentleman give me some idea of what batteries are used ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the prices of the instruments here, but if my hon. friend wants them, I will give them with pleasure.

Mr. BOYD. The average cost of that line is $368.23 per mile, with offices about 30 miles apart. In Manitoba it costs about $150 a mile to build and equip a telegraph line with offices about 10 miles apart, although we have to bring the telegraph poles three or four hundred miles. This line must have been built through a wooded country where the telegraph poles must have been very near. In the district of Keewatin you can get large cedar telegraph poles at 50 or 75 cents. What kind of poles were these, which cost $2 each ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think we could have used cedar there. We had to use the native timber.

Mr. BOYD. How could the poles cost $2 each ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cost of transportation has been the greatest expense. Some parts of the work have not cost even $150 a mile. For instance, that part of the work from Ashcroft to Barkerville cost only $110 a mile. In other words, in a civilized country it did not cost nearly so much. The last gap cost over $700 a mile, because we had to pack provisions, wires, and so on, for a distance of 100 miles, and in some cases the men had to shovel away snow and ice to a depth of 6 feet.

Mr. BOYD. What wages are paid the operators and what are their duties ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The average price paid was between $80 per month and three dollars a day. I am speaking of the whole staff. For the coming year we have reduced the wages. The line was opened in a very hasty way, and we have reduced all the salaries, so that I expect next year the expenditure will be about $125,000.

Mr. KEMP. The cost of the poles appears to have been $2. I understand that there are no great transportation charges because they were floated down the river. I hope that the hon. minister does not approve of officials of the government taking contracts of this kind. I understand that the contractor was on salary before he took this

contract and that after he completed the contract, he went back on salary again and has been in the employ of the government ever since. I also understand that while he was carrying on the contract he kept the books of the government. I hope the hon. gentleman has taken steps to find out what the poles really cost, because the government would be entitled to the profits, the contractor being an official of the government. A civil servant has no right to take government contracts, and the officials implicated should be severely reprimanded.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to admit that Mr. Charleson did right in giving Mr. Rochester this contract. I told him that if I had been in his place I would not have done it. But we must look into the circumstances. Our employes were in a wild country. The poles had been supplied to Mr. Charleson by the Victoria Trading Company for the line between Bennett and Caribou Crossing at $3 each. Mr. Rochester who has been employed in bush operations all his life, offered to supply the poles for the remainder of the work between Bennett and Dawson for $2 each, and Mr. Charleson gave him the contract at that price. My hon. friend is not quite correct in saying that Mr. Rochester continued in the employ of the government while he was carrying out this contract.

Mr. KEMP. He kept the books.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend should be fair. Mr. Charleson was alone and had no bookkeeper. Mr. Rochester is a first-class bookkeeper, as my hon. friend knows, because he heard Mr. Rochester give his evidence before the Public Accounts Committee. Mr. Charleson had no other man to keep his books, and Mr. Rochester agreed to keep them free of charge while carrying out his contract. He kept the books at night. I do not say that that was right or regular. But I say there has been no stealing, so far as I can see. I think that Mr. Charleson should not have employed him. I would not have done so, because I would have anticipated criticism, and of course fair criticism, but the facts are as I have stated.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could not Mr. Rochester have bought the poles for the government instead of Mr. Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not prepared to agree to that. My hon. friend and myself are pretty able men, but if we would venture to start a trade in poles, I think we would lose a good deal of money and a good deal of prestige—both of which we require.

Mr. COCHRANE. Mr. Rochester was bookkeeper for the government and resigned his position to become a contractor. That is to say, he did not draw any pay as bookkeeper after he had contracted to furnish the poles for $2 apiece. Would it not have been just as easy and much better for the country if Mr. Rochester had bought the poles for the government at $2 apiece instead of Mr. Charleson.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If he had bought the poles for the government, I would not be obliged to give the explanations I am now giving. But I cannot help it. The poles were bought and paid for and I cannot do any thing more. I told Charleson that he could have spared me all that trouble if he had acted differently.

Mr. KEMP. How much increase in salary did Mr. Rochester get after the contract was completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He did not get any increase until the next spring when he had full charge of the work, which was more difficult in that wild place than it was between Bennett and Dawson. That increase of salary was not kept very long for I reduced it as soon as I learned of it.

Mr. KEMP. The minister has told us that he reprimanded Mr. Charleson for this transaction. Did he reprimand him by letter or verbally ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When Mr. Charleson came back, I told him that he had not done what I would have done. He said he had not done anything wrong and had done for the best, but I told him that it would give me a great deal of trouble to defend him as I am now doing.

Mr. CLARKE. Do you save $1 a pole on the price ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From what I could learn, I really believe the price was a fair one.

Mr. BOYD. You have not learned what class of wood was in those poles and the size.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It could only have been the kind of wood that grows in that country—a kind of spruce, I understand.

Mr. BOYD. You will have to replace the poles inside of three years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure my hon. friend would not advise me to import the wood.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the diameter of the bulk and the height.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot tell you that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was only curious to know how it was the minister came to the conclusion that the price was a fair one, since he does not know the kind of pole or its size or its height.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the very best information. The gentleman who was in charge of construction is a Mr. Richardson, who is an employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway on their telegraph line. He has built nearly all their lines, and it was because he was an experienced man that I instructed him to supervise the structure of our work. He came back and, of course, I asked him for all possible information and he told me the price was fair. He was before the Public Accounts Committee last session, and I think he made that statement.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be desirable to know whether he was aware of the size of the poles at the butt, their height and material. If he did not know anything more about it than the hon. minister seems to know, his opinion would not be of much value. In what particular section was it that Mr. Rochester supplied the poles ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It may be true that my opinion on these matters is not of much value, but Mr. Richardson was on the spot and received the poles, and he has been a telegraph constructor all his life. The section for which Mr. Rochester supplied the poles was between Bennett and Dawson City.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister has spoken of the difficulty of getting in supplies, explaining that in one section it cost $30,000 to take in the men and their supplies to the ground and back. Would the same difficulty exist on this portion of the line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, not so much.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where would the supplies come from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The supplies would come from Vancouver.

Mr. EARLE. From whom were the supplies bought and how were they purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say at the moment how it is done this year, but last year and the year before they were bought by tender.

Mr. EARLE. My information is entirely different—that there was no tender asked for a dollar's worth of supplies that went to the Yukon, either for the Public Works or for any other department, and that, moreover, this business was peddled out, as was done some years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I remember distinctly that the last time we discussed this matter in the House, it was shown very clearly that tenders were asked for groceries and provisions.

Mr. EARLE. Where ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In British Columbia.

Mr. EARLE. I am positive that that information is incorrect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am corrected by my deputy minister, who tells me that circulars were issued and that we got eighteen tenders and that out of these eighteen tenders Kelly, Douglas & Company were the lowest.

Mr. EARLE. My information is that the very opposite of that, even that firms contemporary with Messrs. Kelly, Douglas & Company, in Vancouver, including many Liberals, who declare that supplies were bought regardless of tenders, and that they were given no opportunity to get the business. I am as positive as I am standing here that that is correct.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The information from my officials is what I have given—that tenders were called for and Messrs. Kelly, Douglas & Company were the lowest, and that since then, provisions have been bought at this lowest tender price. It happened that I was away when these circulars were sent out, although, of course, I am responsible for all that has been done. But I am sure that my officer would not make a mistake upon this point, and that tenders were asked for and that they were asked for exactly as my hon. friend (Mr. Earle) would do. In his large business he would not advertise for tenders, except in the way we did. I do not say that it is right or that it is wrong; I am only giving the facts.

Mr. CLARKE. Were there eighteen tenders from eighteen different firms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have some recollection of the discussion, and I think the information furnished was that a number of circulars were sent out. I believe I was consulted, when they were sent out, as the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) was away, and the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), who was acting Minister of Public Works, was also absent at the time. I think these circulars were sent to parties in Victoria, Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal, and some cities in the east. I am sure that my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Earle) will find that that statement, as regards the original purchase of groceries, is entirely correct.

Mr. EARLE. It may be, and I hope it is. But my information is different. Not only from my own knowledge of the business there, but from the statements of parties in the trade in Vancouver, some of

them life-long Liberals, who complain very bitterly about it. It is a well known fact that everything is carried to Messrs. Kelly, Douglas & Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was not so in the original purchase; as to later purchases, I do not pretend to be informed. In the original purchase circulars were sent out, as I have stated.

Mr. EARLE. But I am speaking of the purchase of supplies for the telegraph line for this year 1902.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that Mr. Charleson has bought his supplies at the same prices that were quoted by Messrs. Kelly, Douglas & Company when the former tenders were given.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When were the original tenders asked for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In 1899, I suppose—I was away.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Three years ago?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two years ago.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Prices have changed since the tenders were asked for.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Prices of provisions have not lowered.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They certainly have lowered in some cases.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What prices have lowered—sugar? Or bacon?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Flour and many other articles. Is it not customary to ask for tenders each year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have the figures now under my hand, and I save my neck once more. Here are the people from whom we bought provisions last year: Messrs. Kelly, Douglas & Company, $5,908; the Hudson's Bay Company, $7,655; Messrs. J. Y. Galbraith, Telegraph Creek, $4,265; Messrs. Cunningham & Son, $4,220; and other small purchases—these are for provisions. Hardware seems to have been bought right and left.

Mr. EARLE. These are dealers in the interior, except Messrs. Kelly, Douglas & Company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Kelly, Douglas & Company have only a limited amount.

Mr. EARLE. The accounts are not all in yet up to the 30th June.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have here the figures up to the completion up to 31st January, 1902.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it the intention to continue buying supplies for the current year on the same contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman will ask for new tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will say to the House that I intend to change the system under which we have bought in the past. I am going to try to get quotations, as has been suggested to me by some hon. gentlemen in the House, and ask people to sell on those quotations. I shall be very glad to welcome suggestions from hon. gentlemen on either side of the House as to the best way of purchasing.

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand from the minister that in future tenders will be asked from people who are in business regardless of politics? I do not mean advertised tenders necessarily, because sometimes the purchases are so small it would not pay to advertise. But in cases where a fair amount of purchases are to be made, will the minister authorize requisitions to be sent to firms in the different localities, regardless of politics, and let them quote their prices, and will he accept the lowest tenderer?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is going too far. Extremes are always to be avoided. Moderate men like my hon. friend are always to be preferred. I am a moderate man on this question. My position is this: I must first serve the party to which I belong.

Mr. KEMP. No, no. Country first.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Other things being equal. That is my duty.

Mr. KEMP. Country first.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am speaking of patronage. There are a great many good men in both parties, and I find there are enough good men in the Liberal party to supply the government in many lines at the lowest prices. I may, however, mention to my hon. friend that on many occasions in the past I have asked for tenders and quotations from men who differ with me in politics. I am prepared to appeal for the truth of my statement, to the lists of my purchases from Montreal and Toronto, especially from Montreal, where I have asked for quotations, for instance, for hardware, for boilers, and things like that. My instructions to our officers are: When you find enough competition in the Liberal party, our duty is to stand by the party; but when you cannot, then go outside the party. I have done so repeatedly, and I will do it again. We are asking for tenders for nearly all the works, and the lowest tenderer invari-

ably gets the contract, in my department, at any rate. But let me add that I will change to a large extent the mode of purchasing. I am willing to meet the trade, and I will improve on my predecessors, on myself even. I have just instructed my officers very lately to purchase direct from the manufacturer. That is a good policy to follow.

Mr. KEMP. I am afraid the minister has qualified his first statement to such an extent that the country will get no benefit. Now there are many friends of the government who support the government in election times, who are in business in a wholesale way, but they don't happen to come to Ottawa and go about the departmental buildings here, bothering the ministers to secure contracts. But if a requisition was sent to them they would be very glad to quote prices. Then there is another class of people who come to Ottawa and lobby and work among the different departments, and the minister must know they come. They are a class of people who are not able to sell at the lowest prices, but who, through their influence in many ways, are able to get orders. The other class to which I have referred are doing business in a wholesale way, and although they may be supporters of the government, I know as a matter of fact that some of them never get an opportunity of quoting. It is frequently the men who are not in as good a position to quote low prices that get the business, because of their persistence in visiting the offices and presenting their claims upon the government, telling what they have done for them in this election or that election, or what they will do, or some other nonsensical thing. I would strongly urge upon the minister to qualify his last statement, and to send out requisitions broadcast to business firms regardless of their politics.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am willing to make an appointment with my hon. friend for next session, and if I do not convince him that I have bought at the lowest possible prices of the market, I want him to tell me.

Mr. REID (Grenville. The minister is not quite so good as the Postmaster General, who, when he advertises for tenders for the mail service, gives the contract to the lowest tenderer irrespective of politics.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do the same thing in every public contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But the minister won't give the Conservatives a chance to tender. If he would let those who are opposed to the government have an opportunity to tender, and if then he finds that supporters of the government tender on the same terms, then it is all right that he should give his own friends the contract. Why should not Conservatives have an opportunity to supply the goods if they are willing to do so at a lower price than men who support the government?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman must know that we are all in politics, all of us. We are playing the game the best we can. When I ask for public tenders for public buildings, for a wharf, a breakwater, or any other important work, I always accept the lowest tenderer. I challenge any man from either side of the House to point to a single case in my department where I have not awarded the contract to the lowest tenderer, whether he is a Conservative or a Liberal. For doing this some of my friends on this side of the House have called me an old Tory. Now, I am accused of being bad because I do not give everything to my hon. friends opposite. Why, they have been eighteen years in office, and it is time that the poor Liberals who were so long in the cold shades of opposition should now have a little show. But my hon. friends opposite when they cross the floor of the House, will do just as I have been doing, and if they do not do worse, it will be a blessing of Providence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the average cost of the poles for the whole line?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not bought any poles except on that section, because our men made most of the poles themselves.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There must be some idea of what they cost, because the reason advanced by the hon. minister was that Rochester could get them for $2 each, and that the cost had been $3 each at some particular time. If you know they cost $3 each, you must know what they cost on each section. You have the same information in regard to each section.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There was an arrangement for a small part of the line with the Victoria Grading Company. We were to pay them $3 per pole, but that arrangement was cancelled and Mr. Rochester got the contract at $2 per pole. Later on, instead of going on with that subcontract, the men made the poles as they went along with the work. But my hon. friend must not lose sight of the fact that all of the sections were not alike. A mile of telegraph line in the gap we filled last year cost more than a mile elsewhere. It is quite impossible to give the price of each pole, because, suppose we had fifty or one hundred, or two hundred men carrying on this work it is impossible to be able to say that a pole here or elsewhere, would cost so much. These men were paid by the day and they were doing their work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was it only on the line between Dawson and Bennett that poles were obtained by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many were purchased at $2 and how many at $3 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We got 330 from the Victoria Grading Company at $3, and it was proved before the Public Accounts Committee that the number of poles supplied for the balance of the line between Dawson and Bennett was 6,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Were not tenders called for in respect to those that were supplied by the Victoria Grading Company?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where did Mr. Rochester get those which he supplied?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman has no information whatever as to where Mr. Rochester got those poles?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. None, except that Mr. Rochester, in the Public Accounts Committee, said that he made a sub-contract with Mr. Johnston. He admitted that. Beyond that I cannot say where the poles came from. I do not know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At what price were they to be delivered by the sub-contractor to Mr. Rochester?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know. I have no right to know, either.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who was the sub-contractor ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Johnston, I understand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where does he live?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know. I have never met him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did Charleson call for tenders before he awarded this contract to Rochester?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And the hon. gentleman thinks that is a proper course?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Asking for tenders under the circumstances might have been difficult, but all the same, I say again—I have nothing to hide—Mr. Charleson might have avoided giving that contract to Mr. Rochester. It is not necessary to repeat it. I admit, although I believe that the price, if I have been rightly informed by those who have been on the spot, and by Mr. Richardson, who is a very competent man, was reasonable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was Richardson doing there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He was supervising the construction of the line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For whom ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the government.

Mr. BELL. Under the control of Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, Charleson was at that time a kind of general officer, not only for the completion of the telegraph line, but for works elsewhere and Richardson was in charge of the construction of the telegraph line.

Mr. BELL. That would mean that he was foreman of construction for a portion of the line under Charleson.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BELL. And took orders from Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Charleson was a superior officer. Richardson would be in the position of my chief engineer here in relation to myself.

Mr. BELL. Do you make them do what you want ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I have never tried to make them do wrong.

Mr. BELL. I would not suggest that the hon. minister would try to make them do wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister says we have no right to know the price at which Johnston supplied poles to Rochester. Why have we not a right to know that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For a very simple reason. My hon. friend is a lawyer and he has factums to be printed; suppose that he comes to 'La Patrie' office when he has a Montreal case, and we would be glad to see him there, he will give us a contract for the printing of the factum. Suppose that my sons gave to another printing office the work of printing the factum, that they sub-let the contract, he would have no right to know how much they paid for getting the work done. It happens every day in the Department of Public Works that we give a contract for a public building, for a bridge, or some other public work and the contractor gives a sub-contract. What right have I to ask this contractor how much he has paid for his material ? I have no right to do that. The

contract is given and the contractor buys his stone, his iron or his timber and we have no right to know how much he pays for it. In this case the principle is absolutely the same.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long after Rochester left the service of the government was it before this arrangement was made with him ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He left the service of the department—he did not leave the service, but he did so for two or three months when he got that contract. He carried out his contract and then resumed his position as foreman.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is something like Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Comparisons are odious.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) suggests that it was odorous. As a matter of fact this contract was made while he was in the employ of the government, under salary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he left the employ of the department, even the ablest lawyer cannot mix me up on occasions like this. He cannot do it. That man took the contract and carried it out at $2 per pole. While he was carrying out that contract he did not get a dollar from the Department of Public Works. That is the whole case.

Mr. EARLE. Did Rochester, the contractor, inspect the poles furnished by him on behalf of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I said repeatedly and it has been proven in the Public Accounts Committee that Rochester had nothing to do with the inspection of the poles. Richardson inspected them. The thing was done in the ordinary way of business, and although I say it again, it should not have been done, because we would not have had all this discussion and it would have been regular if it had been done in some other way.

Mr. EARLE. Are these people still in your employ ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, Richardson is not in the service of the government.

Mr. EARLE. Richardson or Rochester ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Rochester is just completing our accounts.

Mr. EARLE. And Charleson ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Richardson and Charleson are just completing the accounts of this line.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On what date did Mr. Rochester leave the government service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It was established before the Public Accounts Committee, but I cannot remember now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course this is not the Public Accounts Committee and when the minister is putting through his estimates I should like to know the facts. There was some negotiation for the supply of these poles, and while that negotiation was going on between Mr. Rochester and Mr. Charleson was not Mr. Rochester in the employ of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose he was.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, that is perfectly frank. Then the position is, that Mr. Charleson who was superintending the building of this line for the government entered into a negotiation with an officer in the employ of the government for the supply of these poles at $2 a piece, and eventually he awarded a contract for some 6,000 poles to Mr. Rochester without asking for tenders from any other person. The minister does not know officially or otherwise at what price these poles were supplied to Mr. Rochester by the sub-contractor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that Mr. Rochester had not much to do with getting these poles out and matters of that kind. What was Mr. Rochester doing while this contract was being carried out by the sub-contractor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Rochester was the contractor and he gave a sub-contract and I suppose he was looking after the delivery of the poles on his own account.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did not the sub-contractor cover everything that he was obliged to do.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but we had nothing at all to do with that man. Mr. Rochester was our contractor and I suppose he had to see that the goods were delivered. They were not moved after they were delivered to Mr. Rochester by the sub-contractor.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but Mr. Rochester was our contractor and he was obliged to see that he delivered the goods. I was not watching over it myself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps it would be better if the minister had been watching over it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, he did not steal any poles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I really do not understand yet what Mr. Rochester was doing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Rochester had to look after the construction of the whole line and the poles are only a part of that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At what particular date of the negotiation did Mr. Rochester leave the employment of the government so as to cease drawing a salary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Deputy Minister tells me that he thinks Mr. Rochester left the service in the beginning of May and the contract was made then.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Made on the day on which he left the service.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When did he resume.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In October.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That was the date when the poles had been delivered.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did he resume in the same position and at the same salary and for the performance of the same duties.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am informed that he resumed service at the same salary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact it amounts to this, does it not—if I am wrong the minister will correct me :—That Mr. Rochester remained there from the 1st of May until October, and instead of drawing a salary he took his profit off these poles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is about the substance of it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is the substance of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). For the matter of appearance he did not draw his salary during the time he was making a profit because of course he could not receive both—that is right I suppose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He did not draw his salary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But he had charge of the books in the mean time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As there was no other bookkeeper on the spot and as he opened the books he agreed to work at night on the books without charging a dollar to us. What my hon. friend says is perfectly true. From May to October instead of being employed as an employee of the department he acted as a contractor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When were the first poles delivered under the sub-contract by Mr. Johnston.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Upon my word I don't know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the minister will find out from his officer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be only too glad to get the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long did Mr. Rochester remain in the employ of the government in that same position after the sub-contract was performed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He is still in our employ. He remained as foreman of works until the whole work was completed, and I may say in passing that Mr. Rochester has proved to be a very able man and in spite of what is being said here to-day—

Mr. EARLE. You had a thoroughly practical man independent of him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me finish the sentence. In spite of what has been said here to-day I think Mr. Rochester is such an able man that he can be employed for some other work. He is an energetic man and a sober man. Of course when I learned that a sub-contract had been given I took special care to go through his accounts and the whole work, and I make bold to say, unless I make a very great mistake indeed, he is a thoroughly honourable man and able too.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not made any criticism so far either on his ability or upon his honour. What was his salary, and what were his duties, and what were his living expenses before this contract was entered into ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. His salary was $200 a month, and I understand that they had no living allowance, but lived together in a mess under canvas which they thought was the best way. He was foreman of works.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifox). What did that involve.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It involved construction under Mr. Richardson.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did he continue to mess in the camp with the rest while the contract was going on ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Perhaps the minister would be able to find it out from his officer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will get the information. I would not be surprised if he continued in the mess as he was keeping accounts for us without charge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). According to the Auditor General's Report, J. Y., Rochester received from February 1st to October 31st, $15 per day, and yet the minister says he only received $200 per month.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but he had full charge when Mr. Richardson left. Mr. Richardson constructed only that part of the line between Dawson and Bennett, and Mr. Rochester had full charge of the work in the more difficult part of the country and received more pay. I may say that when I found that I reduced his salary myself later on.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That was in 1900?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). From October last it was reduced to $200 a month ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is he getting now in the city of Ottawa ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $200 a month, but no allowance. He will not be employed for more than a week or so now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has Mr. Charleson given any explanation why he did not ask tenders from any one but his own officials ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, he has not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister asked for any explanation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I asked Mr. Charleson why he gave the contract to Mr. Rochester, and he said it was the best bargain he could have made. Suppose we had asked for tenders. The line was built in the summer, and there was great pressure to get the work finished. It would have taken 3 or 4 weeks to get tenders, and the result might have been that the line would not have been completed that year. Would my hon. friend advise such a course ? In those days papers were scarce in the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There would not seem to have been great difficulty in asking for tenders from all the employees in the government, if it was a proper thing to do.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All the employees were not capable of making poles. A bushman is better qualified for that work than others.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That only shows how absurd and wrong the whole thing was.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must protest against that statement of my hon. friend. No minister could possibly control the expenditure or the work on this telegraph line, owing to the want of means of communication. To-day such a thing could not happen. If I had been informed then that Mr. Charleson had given a contract to one of his employees, I would have told him it was wrong, as I did tell him when he came here. But that does not show that any wrong was done, though it was a wrong proceeding.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and I have not the slightest doubt, on the minister's statement to-day, that the government could recover every dollar of profit Mr. Rochester made on the contract. I believe that Mr. Charleson had no authority from the government to give a contract to one of his employees, and I have not the slightest doubt that this government has the right to every dollar of profit he made, although I know that two ministers of the Crown have prevented that information being brought before the public in the Public Accounts Committee. Unless Mr. Charleson possessed extraordinary powers, beyond those which any man in his position should possess, he could not have made this pretended contract with one of his employees, without any outside competition at all, and then have the man go through the form of leaving the public service when as a matter of fact he remained in it, as the minister admitted to-day; but, instead of receiving a salary during that time, he was doing very much better by making a large profit out of this contract created in this very indefensible way.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. How does my hon. friend know that Mr. Rochester made a large profit ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Shall I tell the hon. gentleman ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With pleasure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because the hon. gentleman and his colleagues refused to allow that question to be asked in the Public Accounts Committee and suggested to the witness that he need not answer it, which leads me to suppose that they did not want the facts to come out; because I understood that the objection came, not from Mr. Rochester himself, but from two of the ministers.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If that is the only ground on which the hon. gentleman bases his statement, it is baseless. In the Public Accounts Committee there are rules, and it is the duty of the ministers of

the Crown to see that they are followed. I have been here a good many years, both as a newspaper man and as a member of parliament, and never have I known a question to be asked as to the prices paid to sub-contractors. My hon. friend has no right to say that ministers of the Crown have prevented rightful information being given. We have followed the ordinary rules of evidence. Nor has my hon. friend any right to state that Mr. Rochester has made large profits. But if he has, does that prove that Mr. Charleson made a bad bargain? Not by any means. A man may make a large profit on a government contract, and the government may make a good bargain at the same time. The proceeding was not right; I am not going to say that it was. I would not defend it. I told Mr. Charleson in a very firm manner what I say now. It should not have taken place, but all the same there is no evidence that the bargain was a bad one. At the same time, let my hon. friend admit that he has no ground for stating that we have prevented rightful evidence being given in the committee, because we have followed the ordinary rules of evidence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the objection to this evidence?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The objection to it was the objection of the witness himself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). After it was first suggested to him.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; he was not there, while I was. Mr. Rochester made the objection first, and the chairman ruled. At the next meeting of the committee, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) tried, in an insidious way, in his able way, to induce the witness to go back on the ruling of the chairman, and then we said, 'Mr. Rochester, you are not obliged to answer.' But Mr. Rochester had first declined to answer, on the ground, which was well taken, that it was his own private affair. Before a court of justice my hon. friend would take the same ground; he cannot deny it; and he would be sustained by any court in the land.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I had anything to do with it, I would probably have a judicial inquiry and ascertain the rights of the parties in a court below. In that case Mr. Rochester would probably find that he would have to answer this question without very much discussion before the judge who tried the case. The minister may be right as to who first took the objection. I was informed the opposite; but I do not know, as I was not there. It does not make the slightest difference, however, whether the facts as to what took place on the first occasion are as the hon. gentleman says or not. There is no doubt at all, according to the minister's own statement, that upon the question being put, he, himself, and another minister of the Crown suggested to Mr. Rochester that he was not obliged to answer. It was perfectly proper for Mr. Rochester to answer, as far as he is concerned, if he chose, and I do not see why a minister of the Crown should suggest to him that he should refuse to answer. I do not see any special reason why ministers of the Crown, in a matter of this kind, should act as the advocates of an officer of the Crown, who had taken a contract from the government under these very extraordinary circumstances.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When a witness is examined before a committee, I see no objection to any member of the committee saying to the witness that he was not obliged to answer a question put to him. A witness who is a layman, and who is being examined by a lawyer, may be under the impression that he is compelled to answer every question, but I see no harm in any member of the committee putting him right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What particular harm would there have been in his answering the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was for him to say.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It was a perfectly fair transaction according to the Minister of Public Works, although he admits that it is one which should not have been entered into. But if it was a perfectly fair contract between the government and Mr. Rochester, what special detriment could there have been to Mr. Rochester's interests in answering the question?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was no objection to Mr. Rochester answering any question relating to his contract with the government, but the point was whether he was obliged to answer a question as to what his own sub-contract with another party was, which was quite a different matter.

Mr. BOYD. I wish to refer again to the salary of the operators. The hon. minister has told us that those employees are now receiving $80 per month, and that it is his intention to reduce their pay. Considering the cost of this work and the reasons given for the enormous expenditure, I think that instead of lowering the wages of those operators, their pay should be increased. I do not hesitate to say that telegraph operators working in that country should receive a higher salary than $80 per month. Only a night or two ago, a judge in the Yukon district was given $5,000 as a living allowance on account of the expense of living there, and considering this large sum allowed one man for living expenses, it seems to me that an operator ought to be

paid $150 a month and his board. The hon. minister admits the charwomen get $5 a day, and the Auditor General's report shows that an ordinary labourer there gets $4 a day, and that Mr. Rochester got $15 a day, and yet we have skilled men, men doing, not ordinary labour, but expert labour, getting only $80 per month, and we are told that they are to get less in the future. I do not think that that pay is sufficient, considering the country they are working in. It takes longer to learn to be an expert operator than to be a judge, and the $5,000 living allowance given to one judge would give each of these seventy operators $70 per month extra, and I say that they should receive it. There was evidently no scarcity of money for the purpose of construction. The construction has cost one-third more than it should, and I am perfectly satisfied, after watching the Minister of Public Works, that he is not satisfied with himself, for he has had to get another member of the cabinet to defend his expenditure. And notwithstanding the enormous cost of construction and all that, the minister is not able to tell us what kind of poles have been used and their size. Had the poles to be brought a long distance, there might be some excuse, but they were cut along the line. Every one employed in the work of construction evidently was paid whatever wages he saw fit to ask, but we are to pay skilled expert labour only $80 a month, and that pay is to be reduced. Then the hon. member for Victoria asked what were the averaged earnings and we were told $7,000 per month. Is that the gross earnings and does it include the telegraphing of the government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend is of the opinion that the telegraph operators are not paid sufficiently at $80 a month, but he must not forget that those men are lodged and provisioned.

Mr. BOYD. I know all that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We must also not forget that we have no trouble getting telegraph operators at that rate.

Mr. BOYD. Nor would you have any trouble getting judges at $5,000 a year either.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be very much surprised if, when we can get operators at $80 a month, I would be complimented by hon. gentlemen opposite for deciding, out of the kindness of my heart, to give them $150 a month. I am perfectly sure that I would be censured for doing that. We did not compel these men to go there. They went of their own sweet will and are glad to remain at the wages I have mentioned besides lodging and provision. As regards the size of the poles, the diameter of the butts is between nine and ten inches, the diameter of the top is five inches, and the length 22 feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are the operators paid $80 per month and their board and all expenses.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. When did Mr. Richardson, who had charge of the construction of the line, enter the employ of the government, and when did he leave ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He entered in March, 1899, at the very beginning of the work between Dawson and Bennett, and left in October, 1899.

Mr. CLARKE. Was he in the employ of the government when these poles were purchased from Mr. Rochester.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and accepted delivery of them all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it a fact that the minister is paying labourers $4 a day and their board.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot really say, but the hon. gentleman must remember that while the operators are employed by the year, the labourers may be only employed for a month or two.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the operator is a married man, does he get provisions for his family ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we only give a certain quantity of provisions to each man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the cost of operation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The cost of operation this year would be large. When the supplementary estimates for this year come down I will apply for the necessary amount to meet this expenditure, and then, if my hon. friend desires I will give him all the information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be all right. The hon. minister mentioned the item of revenue—$20,000 a month, as I understood.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, $8,890, or something like that, for the month of March.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does that include messages sent by the departments of government ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Apart from that, what is the revenue ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no statement to show that, but if my hon. friend wants it, I will get it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That also can be given on the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can hardly promise that, as the figures will be a little difficult to get.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the hon. minister has not the data here, and will have to send for them ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The question having been asked, I will take care, next year to have detailed statements of the revenue. And, as we are discussing that point, I would like very much to know the feeling of the House as to the rates. Am I expected to make a paying business out of these lines ? I think I can do so, if I maintain the rates as they are now. I do not wish to be judged, so far as the working of the line is concerned, by last year, because that was the first year, and every one connected with such matters knows that the first year, is, so to speak, only a construction year. But in future I think I could make a paying business by charging the present rates. This is not a party question, and I would like to know the views of the House upon it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can the hon. minister tell us even roughly, what part of the revenue is from government, and what part of it from private business ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of the revenue, of last month, I am quite sure, departmental business cuts a very small figure indeed.

Mr. COCHRANE. What are we to understand by the statement of the minister that he could make this a paying business ? Does he mean to pay something over expenses, or to pay expenses and interest on the capital expenditure as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I make it pay interest on the capital with a balance to the good, I think that will be all right.

Mr. COCHRANE. Certainly.

Mr. CLARKE. There is an opportunity for a great object lesson here. There were great difficulties to be overcome—there is no doubt about it—in the construction of that line, as there are in maintaining it in an efficient condition. The obstacles are so great that, as I understand it, the minister intends to have a cable laid to overcome the difficulty of snow on a part of the line. It seems to me that he ought to charge only such rates as are necessary to yield a revenue that will pay working expenses and interest on the indebtedness. If the government can do that and can give us a low rate—low considering the conditions—it will be, as I say, a great object lesson, and will be an argument in favour of the government taking over all the telegraphs of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be glad if the House would give its attention to the telegraph system in British Columbia and the Yukon. We have constructed 2,135 miles of telegraph in the Yukon, and also have a certain number of miles in British Columbia. From Nanaimo to the coast, we have a telegraph line that will connect that part of our system with the prospective Australian cable. The time may not be distant when our telegraph system in the Yukon may be connected with advantage with that cable. I think we should make ourselves as much at home as possible on land and sea. Regarding the matter from that standpoint, I take the liberty of calling the attention of the House to the maps of our country, asking hon. members to study them. These are not party questions, and I think a more careful study of the map would help us to solve many difficulties to the advantage of the country.

Mr. BOYD. Speaking with some experience in this business, I would suggest that the government is much more likely to make money by lowering the rates than by keeping them at high figures. They have their staff, which they must keep in working order, and they must keep the batteries and supply the electricity. The outfit is there, and the men are there, and might as well be employed. I understand that a message costs about $5.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is $4.50 between Dawson city and Ashcroft.

Mr. BOYD. At that rate, if a man can wait for a letter he is not going to telegraph. But, by lowering the rates, you will induce him to send two, or even three, messages where he would send only one. The expenses are about the same, whether we send ten messages or ten thousand. The men on the staff would just as soon be employed. If you keep operators employed steadily as some of the men here are kept during the whole working day, passing messages through their hands at the rate of one a minute, a comparatively low rate will make money for the line. But, with high rates, the men will sit with their heels on window sills. From practical experience, I would say : Lower the rates. Moreover, whenever the government is prepared to take over the whole telegraph system of the country, they will have my support; for I believe we could have our telegraphing done a great deal cheaper than we have now. I have said before, and I say again, we ought to have our telegraphing done for a cent a word anywhere within reasonable distances in Canada.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made the press rates on the Yukon line one cent a word. The rate was three cents a word, but I changed that, for, at these rates, the newspaper men could not use our line. Since then, we have made pretty good business. The trouble is, if I

lower the rates and the result is not favourable, it will be difficult to raise them again. I am sure there is a good deal in the suggestion that has been made. When the session is over, I intend to give my best consideration to the rates on our telegraph lines in general. And when the supplementary estimates come up for discussion, I hope we shall discuss the subject at greater length. There are good opportunities now to make ourselves independent in these matters. Our telegraph system has been completed to Belle Isle, and now it is finished to Murray Bay. It would take very little to complete it and carry it up to the city of Montreal; and instead of relying on New York for our coronation news, we may make Montreal a distributing centre for the news. From the British standpoint and from the Canadian standpoint it would be better.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I fully endorse the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). I think the rates we are paying for telegraphing in this country are rather too high, much higher than in cases where lines are owned by the government. I hope to see the day when the whole telegraph system of the Dominion of Canada will be under the control of the government. I am glad to find that that sentiment is increasing rapidly on both sides of the House. Look at our condition to-day. We are laying a telegraph cable between our own country and Australia and New Zealand, and the moment you land in British Columbia you are at the mercy of a telegraph company. Then when you come to the Atlantic you are at the mercy of another telegraph company. All the lines from Australia to Great Britain and to the continent should be owned by the government. I hope when our friends go over to London to discuss all these large questions among the representatives of the different colonies, this question will come under their consideration.

Mr. BOYD. I would like on another occasion if the minister would give us the average number of words that have been sent daily since the line was opened, or the average number of messages.

Mr. EARLE. I would suggest to the minister that he should take action during this busy season of the year, and if he is going to make any change in prices, it should be made early.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will discuss the question to-night. But I must warn the hon. gentlemen that if I find I am losing too much, I will raise the rates again.

Mr. EARLE. I am satisfied he will make more money by lowering the rates to a figure where the line can be generally used.

Mr. CLARKE. The minister can readily ascertain from experts what the capacity of the line is. There are certain fixed charges that must be borne.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The line is all right. From what I can learn, we can do a much larger business. It is a question whether we are receiving all the business that is to be had at the rates we are now charging. I have often discussed the matter with my officers, and they do not share the views that I have expressed here. I have been advised by them that it would not be wise to decrease the rates. But having reduced the expenditure I think we may fairly try to reduce the rates a little.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand the minister is going to make a comprehensive statement on some other item of his policy respecting telegraph lines, and telephones as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not much to do with telephones. I am not the minister of telephones, and I do not know who is. I cannot find the minister of telephones, so far.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We will limit it to telegraphs, then.

Telegraphs — Port Simpson — Hazelton telegraph line, $25,100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is practically the same. We require more to complete from Port Simpson, because, instead of the line being 130 miles long, as we expected, we find it is 200 miles long.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why did the hon. gentleman not have this $107,000 for the Quesnel-Atlin telegraph line in the main estimates last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had not sufficient information, the country had never been explored.

New Brunswick—St. John immigrant building, including interest to contractor on overdue amounts, $12,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you want this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To carry out the work on the immigration building at St. John. The total cost of the work is estimated to be $33,596.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is there interest on overdue accounts ? Were the contractors not paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had not enough money to pay the contractor, and we are obliged to pay interest on what we are owing him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why did you not have enough money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because we did not ask for enough. The contractor went faster than I thought he was going. We are paying 5 per cent interest.

Mr. WILMOT. Was there any competition for tenders for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there were public tenders and the lowest was accepted.

Quebec—Peribonka—immigrant building, $1,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in the Lake St. John district. A large number of immigrants are settling there, coming from Holland, Belgium, Finland and all parts of the continent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what part of the province is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the Lake St. John district. I would invite the hon. gentleman to visit that place. We will give you the freedom of the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. gentleman take me in as an immigrant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the hon. gentleman went there I think he would settle.

Mr. KEMP. I thought the object was to bring Canadians back from the United States and induce them to settle in that district ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. There are some Canadians from the United States and the North-west Territories, but this is purely immigration from abroad. This season on one train, there were 700 people who came from the continent. Large numbers of settlers are going in and they are of a good class. I am informed by the Colonization Company of Quebec that these people have enough money to buy property and settle in a comfortable way.

Mr. KEMP. Were the agents of this government or the local government instrumental in getting people to go to that district ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is in the city of Quebec a colonization company which is a kind of independent company working with the corporation of the Lake St. John Railway Company. Mr. Dupont went last year to the continent of Europe, and I understand he has been very successful indeed. The local government have helped and this government have helped the railway company by giving them $8,000 a year during the last five or six years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is to complete the building.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Roberval, immigration building, $2,650.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The very same object.

Mr. CLARKE. Does that complete the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

St. Jerome public building—improvements, repairs, &c., $1,775.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are small repairs to the public building which is in existence at St. Jerome in the county of Terrebonne behind Montreal.

Quebec Military buildings—rolling mill for cartridge factory, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work that is under contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Rolling mill or cartridge factory ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) knows, the Department of Militia and Defence manufacture arms in Quebec, and I am the builder for the department.

Drummondville public buildings, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To complete.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $15,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, by contract and by public tender.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why did you not have it in last year's estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We were short. We give contracts for public buildings and when we come to pay for them we find we are short.

Ottawa—Majors Hill park, plant house, &c., $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman kindly explain this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During last session of parliament the House gave me a sum of money—$8,000—if I remember rightly—less than that, for greenhouses in Major's Hill park. When we were about to arrange for the work Sir Sanford Fleming made us a gift of a very valuable collection of plants. Then I thought that while we were at work it would be just as well to have a green house of larger dimen-

sions than the one we contemplated at first, I took it upon myself, I may say, to change the plans that had been entertained and to build a more expensive green house. I think Major's Hill park is an ornament to the House and it is a portion of the government grounds. Although we have not decided altogether on the site, we contemplate the idea of erecting our museum on the Major's Hill park ground. A few thousand dollars more or less under circumstances of than kind. I think, do not amount to much. I am asking the indulgence of the House for the change which I have taken upon myself to make. I think that these park grounds should be made as nice as we can make them without spending too much money. I am sorry to say that under the system of contract which has been in existence for some years the grounds have been allowed to run down too much. I have changed the system. I have given charge of the grounds here and of Major's Hill park to Mr. Davis who is a very capable man. For these reasons I am asking the House for this amount of money.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is this a new building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is not yet painted, but I think it is all right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $14,000 to complete ; including the heating and fittings. Part of the work has been done by contract by the W. C. Edwards Company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the use of it particularly ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, it is to winter our plants. We must have plant houses and greenhouses to winter the plants that we use on the ground here and at the same time it beautifies the city and the government property.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman erected this building before he came to parliament and asked for a grant with which to build it. I passed there the other day and I found it completed. I inquired what it was and they said it was a new building that the government had erected.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I had a grant last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. To erect this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, to erect this building, but when I changed the plans I found that I required more.

Dominion public buildings—improvements, repairs, &c., $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason for this increase ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is not an increase. My hon friend must not lose sight of the fact that the number of our public buildings is increasing. Many of them are run down and they are in very bad shape. We want this money for small repairs.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These are all over Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Brockville drill hall, $2,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To pay the balance of the contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How much was the total contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was for $42,000, the work having been awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Toronto Post Office—building for branch office in west end of city, site, &c., $15,000.

Mr. CLARKE. What will the new building cost in the west end ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will cost, we expect, about $35,000.

Mr. CLARKE. $35,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. How much of it will be for the site ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $6,000 for the site.

Mr. CLARKE. From whom was the site purchased ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the Land Security Company.

Mr. KEMP. Is it the intention of the government to improve the old post office ? There is nothing in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, but if my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) allows me, when the supplementary estimates come down he will find, I hope, that we will have some money to improve the old building. Our intention at first was to enlarge the old building, but the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) has made up his mind to have a new system. He thinks that sub-stations will give a better service. When the mail is delivered at the main post office in Toronto it takes a good deal of time to deliver newspapers and letters, but in future they will be delivered direct to the sub-stations and the distribution will be quicker.

Mr. KEMP. We had quite a discussion on this point the other evening. Hon. members speaking on behalf of Winnipeg, Montreal, Charlottetown and Toronto, questioned the Postmaster General in regard to these matters. It appears that Montreal is also in

a bad position regarding post office facilities as well as Toronto. This question of sub-post offices is an important matter for the Minister of Public Works to consider. It is departing altogether from the principle that has been adopted in all large cities on this continent and in other places. It would be a great credit to the city of Toronto and to the country, if we had one first-class post office building in that city, and I suppose the same would apply to Montreal. For my part I do not think the policy of sub-offices is a wise one. If these branch post offices have to be erected at a considerable expense, that principle will involve the doing away with the central building to some extent. If the present post office in Toronto is not suitable, then a first class building should be erected. The responsibility does not rest altogether on the shoulders of the Postmaster General because the Minister of Public Works has charge of the public buildings, and he ought to have something to say on the matter. If the present post office in Toronto is not in the centre of the business part of the city, then the government could dispose of that property to advantage and erect a first class building in the centre of the city. This principle of doing away with a central building is a radical change, and I would like to hear the views of the Minister of Public Works in respect to it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On questions of policy of this kind the Minister of Public Works is only responsible as one member of the government. When my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) is Postmaster General, some time in the future, he will make recommendations to his colleagues and they will accept them or not. In the present case it is evident that the Government in Council have agreed to erect sub-stations, and I become a builder pure and simple, carrying out the instructions of my colleagues. The government have decided on the recommendation of the Postmaster General to adopt the sub-station policy, and I am charged with the duty of erecting buildings not only for the Postmaster General but for all my colleagues. As to the wisdom of such a policy, I think my hon. friend, on reflection, will agree that there is a good deal in it. Toronto and Montreal are becoming large centres of population and the people want rapid distribution of the mails. In Montreal a letter which reaches the post office in the morning is often not delivered at my house until 11 o'clock. The Postmaster General thinks that by subdividing the work he will get better service all around.

Mr. KEMP. In what other place in the world is this system in existence ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have enough of my own work to defend without having to defend the Postmaster General. On this occasion I am prepared to defend the erection of this building.

Mr. CLARKE. This matter was brought to the attention of the House a few days ago when the Postmaster General was present. The difficulty in Toronto is that the main post office is now in the wrong part of the city. Toronto has made substantial progress westward, has annexed some municipalities in that direction, and the great bulk of the population is now far west of the general post office. We believe that what is the more pressing necessity is the construction of a main post office building further west and north of the present site, which is not even on the line of the tram cars.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The post office in New York is very far from the centre of population, and sub-stations are in existence there.

Mr. CLARKE. In view of the opinion expressed by the Postmaster General, I speak with a good deal of diffidence, but I think it will be found that his idea will not facilitate distribution. The erection of a main post office building within easy access of the Union railway station and on the line of the tram cars is what we want to give us a more rapid service.

Alexandria Reformatory—balance of arbitration, $174.02.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is it that we have so many of these small votes to complete contracts which are supposed to be let by tender?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The policy of the department has been to vote only the money that we expect to spend during the year, and then afterwards we ask for the balance. Suppose I am erecting a building in Halifax which will cost say $200,000, I ask for only $20,000 or $30,000 which I will expect to expend during the current year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But these contracts usually provide that the work shall be completed within a fixed time, and it seems to me it would not be a very difficult matter to provide for an adequate vote each year without bringing in all these supplementary estimates and dividing it up so that one cannot get an adequate idea as to what the whole work will cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is very difficult to make an accurate estimate.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The trouble is that in all these contracts the cost is far in excess of the original estimate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was the original tender for the Brockville drill hall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must not lose sight of the

fact that in addition to the contract there are the fittings, the heating, and so forth.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was the original estimate, and what is the amount of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers tell me that their estimate was $55,000 for the whole work, heating and all, and it will be completed for that amount. The estimate for the building was $42,200. The amount of the contract is $42,000, and there are no extras.

Mr. CLARKE. Is this Alexandria reformatory built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. CLARKE. What did it cost to get rid of the obligation ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember; a small amount of money.

Mr. CLARKE. Then, it is not the intention of the government to have a reformatory for boys ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not there.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, it takes $13,000 to fit up the interior of the drill hall in Brockville ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Heating, fitting, sidewalks, footpath, and things of that kind.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Lethbridge immigration building, $2,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. The total cost will be $5,600. This will complete it.

Kamloops public building, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This work is under contract. This vote is to complete it. The total cost is $20,000.

New Westminster public building—reconstruction, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The original building was burned down. This work is under contract, and this vote will complete it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has there been no public building in New Westminster since the time of the fire there some years ago ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have rented one.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total cost of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $72,000.

Vancouver drill hall, $7,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $100,000. I understand that the cost of the site was given free of cost by the provincial government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose all these buildings were constructed by public tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes

Public buildings generally, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is there a general item of this kind in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have so many public buildings, it is out of the question to see in advance what small repairs are required. The caretaker writes to the chief architect that such and such repairs are required, and we have to provide for them.

Salaries of resident clerks of works, assistants, $2,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I can see no reason why this should not have been in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We were short on this appropriation because we have more work than we ever had, and it is necessary to have more officers.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many more officers have you employed since this time last year on these buildings ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is pretty hard to have all these details at a moments notice. Some day when my hon. friends are in my place and I am in theirs, they will appreciate the difficulty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these resident clerks of works men who are temporarily employed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, they are officers who have charge of certain districts. In Quebec we have Mr. Belland; in St. Annes, we have Mr. Waterbury; in Halifax, we have Mr. Doddburn; in the North-west Territories, we have Mr. Paradis ; and in British Columbia, Mr. Henderson.

Mr. EARLE. That does not cover Mr. Henderson's salary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, travelling expenses, and so on.

Toronto Post Office locomobiles—maintenance of, $5,000.

Mr. CLARKE. We want a very elaborate statement from the minister about these

locomobiles. I have seen them in all stages of decrepitude on the streets of Toronto. One-third of their time was spent in the blacksmith shop, and the unfortunate postmen who were obliged to use them had to spend part of their time in the hospital. They have proved a dismal failure. The hon. minister is not responsible for the purchase of these machines, because the purchase was recommended by the Postmaster General, but we ought to know what they cost in the first place, then how much it has cost to maintain them, and how much time has been lost by the employees who attempted to utilize them. I hope the hon. minister, in view of his expensive experience, will abandon these machines or pass them over to the Post Office Department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is a locomobile ?

Mr. CLARKE. It is a machine which is one-third of the time on the road, one-third in the ditch, and one-third in the repair shop.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. While I was representing to the best of my ability, my country in a foreign land, my progressive and economical colleague, the Postmaster General, unloaded those locomobiles on my department. I have to carry the load and to give the best information my limited ability will permit. Those locomobiles do not seem to have given the satisfaction which the Postmaster General expected from them, and I am not going to ask anything for their maintenance in my estimates for next year, but this year I have to foot the bill. The Postmaster General tried the experiment and we have to pay for it. I do not know anything more about the matter except that as the service did not turn out very satisfactory, we are going to put an end to the employment of these machines in Toronto.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many did you buy ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My department has nine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman would get them repaired, he might take them over to England and challenge the Australians to a race between London and Brighton.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think that His Majesty can be crowned without those.

Mr. KEMP. Before the locomobiles came into use, the mails were gathered by officials using horses and wagons. After these machines go out of use, will the hon. minister have charge of the carriages and horses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope not. I have had enough of the locomobiles. They were unloaded on me while I was away, and the Postmaster General will have to answer for any expense he may incur in the future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much did they cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They cost $1,000 each. It was an experiment. It is true, it has not succeeded very well.

Mr. KEMP. Why does the Minister of Public Works allow the Postmaster General to experiment in this way at his expense ? The policy in regard to the post office building in Toronto is the policy of the Postmaster General, but the Minister of Public Works does not approve of it. Here is another policy which the Postmaster General has forced on the Minister of Public Works Why does he sanction it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, in his absence, the Minister of Public Works appoints, as master of the administration for the time being, the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General wants to be economical and at the same time to make improvements. So he unloads his experiments upon me.

Mr. KEMP. Then the Minister of Public Works has to father these schemes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let the hon. gentlemen wait until the Postmaster General is in his seat, and then he will answer them all.

Rideau Hall, including grounds — Improvements, renewals and maintenance, $7,500.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was the total spent on Rideau Hall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have spent a large sum of money on Rideau Hall, but largely to fit it for the reception of their Royal Highnesses on their recent visit. I venture to say that the Vice Regal buildings are in better condition today than they have ever been in the past.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Are the expenses of this service any more than they were under the Conservative regime ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There were years when the Conservatives spent less. During the last year or two of the Conservative regime, when Mr. Foster was Minister of Finance, they did not spend so much on Rideau Hall. But then their party was killed—killed outright.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to complain about the expenditure on Rideau Hall. But, when hon. gentlemen opposite were on this side of the House, one of their number used to relive in finding fault with this expenditure. I merely wished to know if the expenditure had grown less.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. A couple of years ago I gave a statement of the expenditures on Rideau Hall.

Under Lord Dufferin the expenditure was never less than $30,000 a year. Under other Governors General we have spent a little less. The expenditure, I think, is wisely made.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am not finding fault with it; but, as fault has been found with the expenditure under the Conservatives, I wished to know the facts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One thing I would like to know is this—If everything about Rideau Hall is in such fine condition, why does the hon. gentleman want this $7,500 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To pay for putting it in such fine condition.

Lighting Dominion public buildings, $18,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The appropriation has been the same for a good many years, but, for the last two or three years we have had a deficit of $3,000 or $4,000 a year. We have more public buildings, as hon. gentlemen know, and we must, of course, spend more money. These accounts are paid just as they are sent to us. This question of lighting is supervised by the department. It is a work that cannot be curtailed.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen, elevator attendants and caretaker, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just explained how this item arises, we are obliged to ask for more because we have more public buildings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought the hon. minister had an item this afternoon that covered this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said this afternoon that it would be necessary for me to ask for $24,000 because we spent $15,000 additional for the purchase of coal alone.

Ottawa public buildings—gas and electric light including light for roads and bridges, $7,300.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As my hon. friends know, we have installed a new electric lighting system. We have more public buildings to provide for under this item and the expense is greater.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How is the lighting done, by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a contract. This covers the cost of gas also, which is used in some of the departments, including the Inland Revenue and the Museum. The main reason for this increase is the installation of an electric light system for the Senate, the same as we have for this chamber.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the light paid for by meter ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. It is a flat rate—two dollars per light per year.

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings—Yukon Territory—rents, heating, inclusive of fuel, lighting, water service, scavenging, janitors, watchmen, repairs, &c., $48,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have already explained this item on the main estimate. It is the last year I am to ask the House to give my department any appropriation for this purpose. As I have said, these items will be transferred to the Yukon government with the exception of the federal buildings, that is the post office, the administration building and the residence of the Governor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who supervises the expenditure of this money ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Up to a few weeks ago, our resident architect was Mr. Fuller, and he had full charge of that expenditure, under Mr. Ross, commissioner of the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What rents do you pay in addition to the four buildings mentioned this afternoon ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The rents include the following. Gold Commissioner's residence; residence for Judge Dugas; residence for Judge Craig; mining inspector's office; Silver Creek; mining inspector's office, Gold Run; mining inspector's office, Stewart River; mining inspector's office, Dominion Creek; mining inspector's office, Hunker.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the total amount of rents ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total is $4,267.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These judges have an allowance of $5,000 in addition to their salary. Do we also provide them with house rent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. So far, we have paid their rent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much do we allow for rent in addition to the $5,000 expenses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Judge Dugas, $150 a month; Judge Craig, the same.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understood it, then each judge gets his salary, $5,000 living expenses and $1,800 for rent. That is, he gets $6,800 as a living allowance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, the Department of Justice has control of this whole matter, and I only obey orders. When the Governor General in Council decides that a judge must be lodged and housed, they simply notify me, and I have to make provision.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In addition to that, there is the heating. Does the government pay for the heating of Judge Dugas' house ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the main estimates were discussed, I gave a complete statement, covering a page of foolscap, giving all these details.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister must know whether the judges get their heating.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I gave the information a month ago, but I do not remember it now. I am informed that they get fuel, I do not know the amount per annum. It depends upon the price of firewood.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then there is the lighting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They get that also.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And water service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so, yes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And men to attend to their houses ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, according to that, a judge in the Yukon gets a salary of $5,000, $5,000 living expenses, $1,800 a year for rent, and his heating, fuel and water service ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and the judges are complaining very bitterly, indeed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He gets about $14,000 or $15,000 a year. The Minister of Justice should explain that, let us understand it thoroughly.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). Under the law, he is entitled to $5,000 a year for his salary at the present time and $3,000 a year for living allowance. I am telling what the law is. I have nothing to say further than that.

Mr. WILSON. I think the Minister of Justice stated the other night that that is to be changed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am telling you now what the law is, and I will tell you by-and-by what the law will be.

Mr. WILSON. If you will explain it now it will save the trouble of explaining it hereafter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I am telling you what the law is. Next year, by virtue of a statute passed here, the judges will have $5,000 a year salary and $5,000 a year living expenses.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That comes right back to the point I stated. It was stated in this House that a judge in the Yukon would have $5,000 a year living expenses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is what he will have next year after the 1st of July. What he is getting now is $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are just now dealing with the supplementary estimates for the coming year, when we will have to pay $5,000 a year for living allowances.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This coming year is the $5,000 to include the rental ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If the Minister of Justice tells me to pay rents I shall do so. But he has just said that for the next year the judges will have $5,000 a year for living allowance.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think it is only fair that we should know whether the $5,000 includes rental. The Minister of Justice should state whether, out of that $5,000, the judge is to pay his own rental, lighting, fuel and living expenses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Some days ago we had all this up in the House, we discussed the whole subject here, and when the question arose as to the additional allowance to be given to the judges next year, and I was asked how it was intended this amount should be spent, I then went over the list I had, showing how much would go for rent, how much for lighting, how much for fuel, and I gave all the details to the House to justify the increase.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not remember that this particular fact was mentioned by the Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I read from a list provided by the commissioner of the Yukon, showing the amounts to be expended, so as to justify the increase from $3,000 to $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The rental was mentioned, was it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, $150 a month. I mentioned the wood and the lighting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What we are anxious to get at now is whether the $5,000 he is to be paid covers every one of these items the Minister of Justice has mentioned.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That certainly was the intention at the time the item was put in the estimates, that $5,000 would cover everything, and we would have no more of these outside claims. That is the intention now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I did not understand it as the Minister of Justice has explained it now, and I think I was quite justified in getting it fairly understood.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course you were.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Who hires those people ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) It is the department which hired them.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) By whom are they paid ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) So far, we have paid them ourselves.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Under whose control are they ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) They are under the control of the resident architect, Mr. Fuller, who is here now. As I have said before, all public buildings used for what may be called provincial purposes, will be handed over to the Yukon government in the future, and only the Dominion buildings will remain under our control, such as the government house, if it may be so called, and the post office. As to all the other provincial buildings, they will be transferred to the Yukon government, because they are used for local purposes.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Has the Department of Public Works notified Mrs. Louise Collinet that her usefulness was gone ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) We have nothing to do with that staff.

That is quite another story. We pay the sheriff and the caretakers, but those officials are not under our control. Mrs. Collinet is the matron of the court-house. There are a certain number of employees who are under the control of the Department of Justice, with whom I have nothing to do. I have no doubt but that Mrs. Collinet belongs to that class of employees, and I may say that I know nothing about her.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) The following is a copy of the correspondence relating to that woman :

Dawson, April 4, 1902.

Madame Louise Collinet :

Madame,—From this day forth, your services are no longer required at the Court House.

By order,

(Signed) C. A. DUGAS.

I hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of a letter in the hand-writing of Judge Dugas, and signed by him personally, and that I know the signature of said Mr. Justice Dugas.

(Sgd.) GEORGE BLACK,

A Notary Public in and for the Yukon Territory.

Here is Mr. Fuller's letter :

Department of Public Works, Canada.
Office of Resident Architect.
Dawson, Y.T., July 1, 1901.

Louise Collinet, Matron,
Court House,
Dawson, Y.T.

Madam,—Rations having been withdrawn from you, it has been decided to allow you therefore $30 per month, which you will receive in addition to your wages of $80 per month. You will continue therefore to be at the service of Mr. Justice Dugas, and act under his guidance for any work which you shall be required to do as matron of the court house.

You will arrange with the judge for your meals, which, under any circumstances, must not be taken within the court house.

No fire is to be made therein for the purpose of cooking, &c., nor are strangers to be received there by you unless specially authorized.

(Sgd.) T. W. FULLER,
Resident Architect,
Department of Public Works.

Now, I am going to read the letter written by Mrs. Louise Collinet to the Department of Justice :

Dawson, Y.T., April 7, 1902.

Deputy Minister of Justice :—

On August 15, 1899, I began work as matron of the court house in Dawson, and maid-servant for Mr. Justice Dugas, at $80 per month and rations. These rations I drew, and they were taken by Mr. Justice Dugas.

On the 1st of July, 1901, I received the letter, a notarial copy of which is inclosed, and after that my rations were withdrawn, and said $30 per month I was forced to pay to Mr. Justice Dugas. Up to that time I was from time to time ordered by him to take instructions from no one regarding the court house, save himself, and in good faith I refused to perform the orders of other court officials.

After the new court house was finished, I learned that I was required to be at the court house from 6 a.m. to 8 a.m., and from 9 p.m., to 11 p.m., and at all other times I was required to be in attendance as cook and maid-servant at the judge's residence. The judge's family consisted of the judge himself, his wife and son Aimé, Mr. J. A. Longpré and Mr. Pierre Leduc. The combined duties were too severe, and having expressed a wish not to work more than twelve hours per day, I, on the 4th day of April 1902, received the letter from Judge Dugas, a notarial copy of which is inclosed, and was discharged.

I ask to be reinstated and my duties defined, and that the judge be admonished not to slander me without cause as he has done since I left. I am quite willing that my services and private character hould be investigated, but think it unfair that I should be robbed of my good name, by the falsehoods of a Supreme Court judge.

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) LOUISE COLLINET.

That letter was sent to the Department of Justice, under date of April 7, 1902.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) To whom was it written ?

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) To the Deputy Minister of Justice. When Mrs. Louise Collinet was engaged by the depart-

ment a man named Willie St. Denis was also hired at the same time. Both have been discharged on the same grounds, and on the 1st April, 1902, Willie St. Denis wrote to the Deputy Minister of Justice, as follows :

Dawson, Y.T., April 1, 1902.

To the Deputy Minister of Justice,
Ottawa, Canada.

Sir,—On September 6, 1899, I began service as caretaker of the court house, and man-servant for Mr. Justice Dugas. On the 21st day of March, 1902, I was discharged from my dual position without cause. I ask to be reinstated in my position or some reason given for my discharge. I wish my appointment made from Ottawa and my duties defined, as for the period of my service my chief duties were as man-servant in the judge's private residence, and out of the $160 per month allowed me for my services, I was forced to repay $40 per month to said Mr. Justice Dugas. Said Mr. Justice Dugas discharged me because I refused to act as chamberman in his house, wait on his tables, prepare wood, draw water and do general cleaning work in his residence in addition to my duties as caretaker of said court house. I wish to know whether such were a part of my duties and whether said judge had a right to force me to repay his said $40 per month.

Yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) WILLIE ST. DENNIS.

On the 12th April he wrote again, as follows :

Dawson, Y.T., April 12, 1902.

To the Deputy Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa, Canada.

Sir,—On April 1, 1902, I addressed a letter to the Deputy Minister of Justice, which letter ere this must have reached his destination. In that I complain of my wrongful discharge from the position of caretaker of the court house here, and persecution by Mr. Justice Dugas.

I after being discharged, obtain the position as night watchman in the post office, and gave first-class satisfaction in that position, as has been testified to by the postmaster, Mr. Hartman, and Mr. Bertrand of the Department of Public Works here.

I was on the 11th day of April, 1902, discharged from this latter position, without cause, and was to-day informed by Mr. Bertrand that he has been forced to discharge me by Judge Dugas who dislikes me, and insisted that a nephew of J. E. Girouard, Jean Marier, who arrived in Dawson Monday last, be appointed in my stead.

I ask to be reinstated in one or the other of my positions, and believe I had a right to the first, from which I was driven by the persecution of Mr. Justice Dugas.

Yours respectfully,
WILLIE ST. DENNIS.

Now, I should like to know from the hon. Minister of Public Works, whether these two persons, employed as caretakers of the court-house at Dawson City, are under the immediate control of the Minister of Public Works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Heretofore the caretakers have been under our charge, but in the future they will not be under our charge. I cannot, of course, say anything as to the people to whom my hon. friend (Mr. Léonard) has just alluded. I do not know anything about their case. The letters are all of recent date, and I have not read them. This is the first I have heard of them. I cannot believe that a judge could be repaid by people of that class. Of course, I do not know anything about it. It is all new to me. I will inquire into the case. I will write to Mr. Bertrand and ask for an explanation in regard to these people. But, until I hear more I cannot have any faith in charges of that kind. People who are dismissed are generally not in a very good humour. In fact, I do not know anything about the case. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is within reach of the voice of my hon. friend (Mr. Léonard), and surely, if a judge would be guilty of such a thing it would be very extraordinary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister should at least know whether or not such an order was issued as purports to have been issued, dated 1st July, 1901, from the resident architect of his department to this woman Louise Collinet :

Dawson, Y. T., July 1, 1901.

Louise Collinet, Matron,
Court House,
Dawson, Y.T.

Madam,—Rations having been withdrawn from you, it has been decided to allow you therefor $30 per month, which you will receive in addition to your wages of $80 per month. You will continue therefore to be at the service of Mr. Justice Dugas and act under his guidance for any work which you will be required to do as matron of the court house.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Who writes such an order ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). T. W. Fuller, resident architect of the Department of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fuller is here now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite so. The letter continues as follows :

You will arrange with the judge for your meals, which, under any circumstances, must not be taken within the court house. No fire is to be made therein for the purpose of cooking, &c., nor are strangers to be received there by you, unless specially authorized.

(Sgd.) T. W. FULLER,
Resident Architect,
Department of Public Works.

It would be desirable, so far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, to know why the matron of the court house should be at the service of Mr. Justice Dugas and to act under his guidance for any work which she should be required to do as matron of the court house. It should be a matter for the hon. Minister of Justice to investigate why the matron of the court

house should be at the service of Mr. Justice Dugas and under his guidance in any work which she shall be required to do.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot understand it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is something that the hon. minister will have to understand and the committee will have to understand. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice as to whether or not such a letter has been received in his department as that which has been read by my hon. friend (Mr. Léonard) ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Such a letter was received at the Department of Justice and immediately forwarded to the Department of Public Works, as we had absolutely no control over this lady who calls herself the matron of the court house not having anything to do with her appointment.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The secretary of my department, who is on the floor now, says that he received these documents to-day. I did not know anything about them until they were read on the floor of the House now. I will inquire of Mr. Fuller to-morrow and ascertain what he has done in the matter. I cannot understand it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). These statements are of a very extraordinary nature.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They are very extraordinary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And I think the item should stand until the hon. gentleman is able to explain them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no reason why the item should stand. I have promised to bring down the information to-morrow. Let us go on with the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We can take up some other item if necessary, but we must have an explanation of the matter.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I shall bring the information to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This woman alleges—I do not know with what truth—that while she was ostensibly acting as matron of the court house she was really a servant in the private residence of Mr. Justice Dugas. Further than that she states, what I can hardly believe to be true and what I would certainly very greatly regret to believe to be true, that of her allowance of $110 a month she was forced to repay a portion.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot understand that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Letters which have been received in the Department of Public Works certainly call for some inquiry. I should think not only would they require an inquiry by the Department of Public Works but also by the Department of Justice, although the hon. Minister of Justice has sent the whole of the correspondence to the hon. Minister of Public Works. It would seem to me a very improper thing that any such transaction should have taken place, and I am not disposed to believe for the present that it did take place, but there is the statement of this man Willie St. Denis that he has repaid a portion of his allowance to an official occupying a judicial position. So far as that is concerned it ought to have some inquiry, not only from the Department of Public Works, but the Department of Justice as well.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I willl wire immediately to Mr. Justice Dugas and the employee he is accused by of having received a commission, because it amounts to that. I will wire the contents of the letter and in the morning I will call Mr. Fuller in and lay the matter before him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the judge be violating his position if he collected tolls from an employee of that kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no use asking that. It is a clear case if it is true, but I cannot believe it. It has no sense.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of course I know nothing about this. I was always under the impression, and still am under the impression, that when a judge gets $5,000 a year of salary and in addition to that $3,000 a year for living allowance, he ought to apply that living allowance to the reasonable charges of his household, and payment for all these things which men require for living should be paid out of the $3,000. With respect to this woman who made the complaint I understand the facts to be that she went up there as a matron, and as an employee of the government originally she would have been entitled to rations, but that living with the judge the rations went in the common fund. She was boarded by the judge and the rations used by the judge for the purpose of her maintenance as well. I understand there is nothing beyond that. If that is what really took place it is not a serious matter, but when you go beyond that and extend it to say that instead of rations she received $40 a month for her living allowance and that this $40 a month was paid over to the judge—well, if she lived with the judge and it was a matter of bargain between them, that they would put their allowance into a common fund there was nothing very wrong about that either. But if the judge received the money and did not supply this woman with her board, of course that is a matter that ought be investigated, and so far as I am concerned, he is going to hear about it if it is a fact.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Fuller will have to tell us to-morrow what are the facts of the case, and if I have the information before the orders of the day are called to-morrow I will give it with pleasure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not think it was a desirable thing this matron drawing rations should live with the judge, and that the judge should draw the rations instead of her. I would not consider that a desirable position for a gentleman occupying a seat on the Supreme Court of the Yukon, even if it did not go beyond that. I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice would regard it as a very desirable condition of affairs either.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. They must be living under very abnormal conditions in that country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Justice puts it very mildly to say the least when he says that. As the hon. gentleman very truly remarks, there is something beyond that in the statement, not only of this woman, but the man as well, who says he was performing the duties of manservant for Mr. Justice Dugas, and that he was making an allowance to that gentleman out of the amount which he received. I will not ask that the item should stand on this account, because I appreciate the reasons which influence the Minister of Public Works, but it must be distinctly understood that at some future occasion we shall have an opportunity of obtaining information and discussing it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If I have the information I will bring it down to-morrow morning.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Would the hon. minister also inquire on what grounds Judge Dugas discharged from his service a person hired by the month, without giving that person a day's notice ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I know nothing about that case. I cannot understand it.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) At all events, as a member of this House, I lay before the House the fact that those employees made an allowance to Judge Dugas, out of the amount which they received, to be retained in his service. The Minister of Justice told us that those sums were paid over to the judge by those employees because they were boarded by the judge. But I should like to know since when a manservant or a maid-servant have to pay their master, to be retained in his service ? On the contrary, it is the master who pays the servants.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that in future the judge has to provide his own residence and is to receive an allowance of $5,000 for living expenses. In the report of the Auditor General I find that we have spent $4,128.67 for fitting up a residence for Mr. Justice Dugas. What arrangement is to be made about that residence in the future ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Department of Public Works has been guided in this matter by the Department of Justice. When we are asked to supply a judge's residence with light or anything of that kind we do it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does this building belong to the Department of Public Works?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have rented it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You pay for fitting it up and pay rent as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, it often happens, even in the city of Ottawa, that we have to repair buildings that we pay rent on. We will pay no more rentals in the Yukon after the 1st of July.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Judge Dugas received $5,000 as salary last year and $4,128 was paid for his rent and for fitting up his house. Judge Dugas has his house this year complete, so that actually he is getting an increase of $2,300 on his salary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have paid the amount as the hon. gentleman says, but there will not be such an expenditure after this year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who contracted the debts ? Who authorized the payments ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not in a position to give more information, I am sorry to say.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. Minister of Justice could explain that item. Two nights ago he stated that Judge Dugas was to receive last year $5,000 salary and $3,000 for living expenses, whereas $4,128 in addition was spent on these various items for living expenses.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Last year, so far as my information goes, and so far as the law goes, Judge Dugas was entitled to receive for his salary $5,000 and for his living allowance $3,000, and for next year he is entitled to receive $5,000 for his salary and $5,000 for living allowance. Of any expenses beyond that I know nothing whatever.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And for next year I shall not pay one dollar.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is concerned, he has assumed charge of his department only recently. We are not attacking the Minister of Justice. We are making our charge upon the government. It is a mere accident, so far as we are concerned, that one minister goes out and another comes in.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Department of Justice is not responsible for this. It is not money expended by us at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thoroughly appreciate that; but it is money expended in connection with the administration of justice in this country, over which the department of my hon. friend presides. Last year this gentleman got $5,000 of salary and $3,000 of living allowance, and this sum of $4,128.67 was expended for him in addition, of which I think $900 was for rental. If you deduct $900 from $4,128.67, you have $3,228.67 expended on this rented house.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, no. We have spent $990 for fuel, $776 for lighting, and $1,800 for rent. In past days the policy of the Department of Justice was that we should pay these items in the Yukon, and I paid them. Outside of these, the expenditure is very small.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the $3,000 living allowance for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not for me to say. We have simply been instructed to pay for the rent, the fuel and the lighting, and we have done so. It will not happen again. There is not much pleasure in the poor Minister of Public Works being sacrificed because he carries out the orders of the other departments.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am as sorry as I can be for the Minister of Public Works, and I think some of the other ministers should take a turn when any of these items prove too much for him. Let me run over some of these expenditures again. We have the Dawson Electric & Power Company, for installing 16 lights, 2 four-light fixtures, 1 two-light fixture, 2 brackets combined, into one, and 1 stand lamp $152.75 ; lighting, from October to April : 13 lamps, 192 nights, and 4 lamps, 173 nights, $776 ; F. A. Delage, repairs, $535.70; D. A. Matheson, 45 cords of firewood, $990 ; McLennan, McFeely & Company, sundry repairs $340.15; P. G. Overton, painting, $41.20; Cortland, Starnes, rent $900; Yukon Saw Mill Company, lumber, $339.87; amounting in all to $4,128.67. What I want to know is under what rental agreement is this house held from Mr. Starnes ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No man could carry all these details. I understand that we have paid $150 a month for the house since the judge occupied it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Justice stated a few minutes ago that the amount allowed to the judge for living expenses was to include these items. If that is true, did the Justice Department in addition give an order that they were to be paid over and above that amount ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say more than I have said. The amounts have been paid, and I do not see a way of getting them back.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see a way of getting them back. If Judge Dugas was paid $3,000 for living allowance, and it was intended to include all these items, he should refund the money. I do not think that is unreasonable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have only paid what I was instructed to pay and nothing more. If the Department of Justice wishes to inquire into this matter, it can do so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Justice Dugas has been paid $3,000 for living expenses. Besides these the Department of Public Works has paid $990 for his heating, $928.75 for his lighting and installing his lights, and $1,309.92 for repairing his house, in addition to $1,800 for his rent. If his living expenses mean anything, surely they must include his heating and lighting. The Minister of Public Works tells us that he has paid these moneys by the instructions of some person. What department or person ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just said that the Minister of Justice instructed me to pay the rent for the judge's residence and fuel and light. We did that in the past. Things were in great confusion for a year or two—not much order anywhere. There were no funds available elsewhere, and we paid those sums, rightfully or wrongfully I do not know, but I suppose rightly as usual.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not treating parliament or the country fairly to lead us to suppose that $3,000 is the entire contribution of the country to the living expenses of Mr. Justice Dugas or any other judge, and I am coming to some of the other judges. Why were these items of heat and lighting paid besides the $3,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no other explanation than the one I have given. It was the policy of the past, and Judge Dugas has complained over and over again that he could not live on his salary, in spite of all we have been paying him. I quite grant that it seems extraordinary that we should have to pay for the lighting and so on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does the item in the Auditor General's Report on page V—49, for court house and judge's quarters, Dawson, $430, mean ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That means the court house and the judge's room there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under the heading of Judge Dugas' residence, I do not observe any rental. How is his rental provided ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are paying $150 a month for his rental also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where does that appear in the Auditor General's Report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have got it down in my notes that we are paying that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have only such information as is found in the Auditor General's Report. On page V—49, I find under the heading of 'Judge Craig's residence, Dawson,' that we paid the Alaska Commercial Company for a stove $25; the Dawson Electric Light & Power Company $49.50 for installing lights, and $494 for lighting; and that we paid D. A. Matheson for firewood, $759, and the North-west Mounted Police for firewood $86.63. We paid also to the Yukon Saw Mill Company for 4 book cases $70. Did Mr. Justice Craig have the residence and did the country pay for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The position is as I have described it. We have simply paid in the past for the judge's residence and lighting and fuel. I am not in a position to explain every item in the Auditor General's Report. The Public Accounts Committee would be the better place to have those explanations.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the hon. minister give us the items composing $48,000 he is asking in this vote ? If some of these go into next year, we will have to strike off the amount in next year's estimates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These are obligations that we have to pay to the 1st of July this year, and that will be all.

Mr. TAYLOR. If Judge Dugas and Judge Craig went out there on a salary of $5,000 and $3,000 living allowance, who is it that has violated the law by paying them more? It must be either the Department of Public Works or the Department of Justice. These items were paid at Dawson and the vouchers sent here, and the Auditor General passed the voucher. The accounts did not pass through the Auditor General's hands before payment at all.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman will not ask me to repudiate our obligations. We have rented those houses and must pay for them till the 1st of July.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then you can deduct what you have overpaid from the judges salaries to the 1st of July. Each judge is entitled to $5,000 salary and $3,000 living expenses and to nothing more, and if the country has paid anything more, he ought to be made to refund it. Each went out there under a stipulated bargain of $5,000 a year salary, and $3,000 a year expenses. And he could live there for $1,000 a year if he wanted to. This $3,000 living expenses was to cover house rent, fuel, light, &c. Why does the Minister of Public Works come to the rescue of this judge and say : We will pay you $4,000 more in the form of house rent, lighting, cord wood and so on ? Somebody has authorized it or it would not have been paid. Either the Minister of Justice's department is responsible, or else the Minister of Public Works' department has done it of its own accord. But it is contrary to law, and surely the hon. minister does not want to force through the House a vote that is contrary to law. We do not want to repudiate a just debt. But here is debt that we did not fairly incur. If it is paid, it should be taken from the judge's salary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Here is a case in which the Minister of Justice should exercise the power of his office. The hon. minister states on the floor of this House that Judge Dugas was appointed with an allowance of $3,000 for living expenses. The Minister of Public Works asks us how it comes that the Auditor General would pass this item of house rent if it was not right. It was because the $3,000 living expenses was put in that way so that the Auditor General could not question it. The Minister of Public Works states that this was in addition to living allowance expenses. But the Minister of Justice tells us that this $3,000 living allowance was to include the rent. That being so, the Minister of Justice should see to it that Judge Dugas is brought to some settlement, or he is not fit to occupy the position of Minister of Justice.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Minister of Justice can only say that, so far as any expenditures in the past are concerned he will be glad to inquire into them, and when he has informed himself will be ready to come back here and talk about the matter. I can only tell what the judges were entitled to receive. And I will be responsible, for the future, to see that this $5,000 is given as a living allowance, and that the judges shall not get rent, fuel, light, and so on in addition. I will undertake that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But is it not the hon. minister's duty to see that the wrong of the past is righted ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is my duty to ascertain the facts, and, having ascertained the facts, to consider what I will do. But my hon. friend surely will not ask me to take as facts all the statements made here to-night. They are made, of

course, in good faith, and to the best of belief of those who make them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But I am taking the hon. minister's statement that Judge Dugas was appointed with a living allowance of $3,000, which was to include these items.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not withdrawn any statement which I made.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the minister has made the statement that this living allowance was intended to include these items, and if, as a matter of fact, these items have been paid over and above the living allowance, is it not his duty as Minister of Justice to see that this money is refunded? And will he not do that, so that, next session, when he comes before the House, he will be able to tell us that the money has been refunded?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Next session I shall be glad to answer any questions that shall be put to me. But I am not going to say now what I will do next session.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But will not the hon. gentleman say now what he will do about an expenditure that was made wrongfully—I do not say wilfully so, but perhaps through some clerical mistake?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There has been no clerical mistake. I have been told by the late Minister of Justice that I was bound to pay for rental, fuel and light. Right or wrong, that is the way I was instructed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is a fair statement on the part of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), and exonerates him from responsibility. But it makes clearer the duty of the Minister of Justice to see that this wrong is righted. I ask the Minister of Justice if he will see to it that this is made right.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The appeal to do what is right is heard, and will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Justice must recollect that this does not in the slightest degree depend on statements made by my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Léonard). We are depending upon the public records in the report of the Auditor General. If the living allowance of $3,000 excludes these items of rent and so on, the Minister of Justice can come next year and say that the increase of $5,000 also excludes them. Or if my hon. friend should not happen to be Minister of Justice when these items are discussed next year, the hon. gentleman who occupies the position at that time might do the same as, apparently, the late Minister of Justice—if we are to accept literally the statement of the Minister of Public Works—has done. I do think, with all respect, that it will be necessary for the Minister of Justice to investigate this matter. I do not understand him to say that he will not investigate. On the contrary, I understand that he will. And it requires a thorough investigation. Because, of course, apart from anything the Minister of Justice may say, we know that a living allowance should include rental and a number of other items that have been charged. These things are not to be dealt with according to the opinion of the Minister of Justice for the time being as to what is right or what is wrong, but according to the law and to the vote of parliament. The vote of parliament was for a living allowance, and outside of that, these gentlemen have no more right to have their houses furnished than any judge in Ontario or Nova Scotia. Would the hon. Minister of Justice say that, outside of this living allowance, a judge in the Yukon had a right to have his house furnished, to have electric light provided or to have carpenter work done at the public expense any more than a judge in any other part of the Dominion of Canada? I cannot understand on what principle he would be entitled to it. And I do not think the Minister of Justice can suggest any.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not tried to suggest any.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I quite understand that.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will understand the position I take. By statute the judge is entitled to receive a salary of $5,000. In addition, $3,000 yearly is placed in the estimates as a living allowance. I understood that this $3,000 was paid to these gentlemen for the purpose of placing them relatively in the same position as if they were living in one of the older provinces, an allowance being necessary on account of the increased cost of living in the Yukon. Now, I cannot deal with understandings and policies with respect to expenditures; I can only deal with facts, with the statutes and the estimates. I find that the statute provides a salary of $5,000 and the estimates contain a living allowance of $3,000. That is all I know. Next year this difficulty cannot occur, so far as I am concerned. Because when the question arose about increasing the living allowance to the judges of the Yukon, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked me to explain. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the 'Hansard' report of what I said, he will find that I took up the list of expenses, and said that the allowance was to be increased because of the amount of expenditure that is necessary to put a judge in the Yukon in the same relative position as one in the older provinces. Going over the list, I found the first item was $150 a month for house rent,

then so much for light, so much for fuel, and so much for servants' wages. I think I even gave the price of bread and beef and other things out there. In view of that, if anything was paid to these gentlemen in addition, I do not know how I could explain it to the House—it would be impossible for me to do so. Of course, I have no control over any expenditure except that of the money placed in my charge. In this case, there is a salary and a living allowance, which is fixed at $5,000. Beyond that, my authority does not go. If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works states in his place that he was requested to provide these gentlemen with residences and, in addition, to supply them with furniture for these residences, and further to supply light and fuel, and so on, that is a matter with which I have had nothing to do, though, of course, I accept the responsibility for what was done by my predecessor. But all I can say is that no such thing as that can occur in the future. I cannot permit it, and in view of the debate which has taken place to-night, the Minister of Public Works will not permit it either. I may say that when the matter came before council for consideration, the justification for the increase to $5,000 for living allowance was that these gentlemen should receive it directly and not indirectly, outside of their salary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me say that not only have I been asked to pay for the rent, but that the Department of Justice has written me a dozen letters at least asking me to build residences for the judges. Not very long ago I received requisitions to build residences for those judges, and in the meantime, pending their erection, I have been requested to pay the rents, and for lighting and fuel. The Department of Justice has over and over again urged upon me the erection of residences for those two judges. Whether my hon. friend will do it in future is for him to say.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume the Minister of Public Works has authority from the late Minister of Justice authorizing the payment of these amounts. If he will bring that down it will relieve the minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not say that I have the written authority for everything that the government has decided to do, that is not the way business is done. But I say I have many letters asking me to erect residences for the two judges there, and in the meantime it has been decided to pay for rent, fuel and lighting.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely the Minister of Justice would not violate the law without authority.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know that I have violated the law.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works of course relieves himself of the responsibility by reason of the Justice Department giving him the instructions; and the Minister of Justice relieves himself from responsibility by saying that it was done by his predecessor. However, I think that the Minister of Public Works is entitled to a little share of this responsibility.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I take it all.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Perhaps now we can find out exactly whether in this $3,000 the rental was included. We have the Minister of Finance here who will perhaps explain it, because when Judge Dugas was appointed to the Yukon this $3,000 living expenses was of course brought up in the council. Was there not a statement showing how these living expenses were made up, and whether the rental was included in that $3,000 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am afraid I can hardly undertake to tell the hon. gentleman how every item approved by the council was made up. In regard to the Yukon affairs, we recognized there were conditions out there which differed from those in old Canada, and allowances were made upon a liberal scale regarding the officers in a way that would not be done in the older portions of the Dominion. As this regards the departments of the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Public Works, I would hesitate to express an opinion about it, but I do not hesitate to say, from the discussion that has taken place here to-night, it is quite evident that Judge Dugas received a sum of money which the present Minister of Justice did not suppose he would have received under the arrangement. Before the Minister of Justice takes any action in that matter, it is only right he should endeavour to find out the circumstances under which this order was given. But we do not divide responsibility. The government as a whole must accept the responsibility. Whatever may be said as to the liberality of this allowance in the past, the present Minister of Justice has declared that there shall not be any such allowance in the future. I agree entirely with the hon. gentlemen opposite that the payment of the allowances in this loose way is entirely objectionable. We should give a reasonable, even a liberal sum for living allowance in that country, but that should include everything of the kind, and there should not be a penny expended in the manner of these charges that appear in the Auditor General's account. I am inclined to think as respects the past that the judge has been receiving a more liberal allowance probably than he should.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the case might be put more forcibly even than the Minister of Justice or the Minister of

Finance has put. I was trying to discover the vote out of which this has been paid. It has been paid apparently out of the Yukon public buildings. It would be just as right for the Minister of Public Works to pay the rent for the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice out of the vote for Dominion public buildings generally for Ontario, as for these expenditures to have been paid out of the votes from which they have been paid. I do not see the least distinction between the two. It would be just as wrong, just as unjustifiable, for the Minister of Public Works to have paid the house rent for himself or the Minister of Finance as to pay for this house rent out of this vote, whether he did that by direction of the Minister of Justice or of any one else. I would hesitate to suppose that the late Minister of Justice would have ordered these expenditures to have been paid out of a vote of that kind. It seems to me that this question demands the very closest investigation on the part of the Minister of Justice and on the part of the Minister of Finance, who is the guardian of the treasury. I appreciate the fact that they cannot give a full explanation at the moment, or say what course will be pursued without looking into the question. I think it well that the matter has been brought to their attention to-night, and I trust the investigation which they make will be thorough and complete, and one that will enable them to come down to the House with a satisfactory statement with regard to these matters at some later date.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a still more objectionable feature in regard to this vote. Here is a vote of $3,000 for living allowance and $5,000 salary, $8,000 altogether. Surely the Auditor General is aware whether the rental should be included in this $3,000. How did it pass the Auditor General's Department? That is the extraordinary part of it. Perhaps the vote was set free for public buildings in the Yukon territory, and the money was taken out of that. The Auditor General is responsible to this House, and he is under the direction of the Minister of Finance. There is no justification for his course whatever. What is the use of our voting particular items for particular purposes if they can be applied to other purposes. The Auditor General is the guardian of these votes to see that they are properly applied. He does not seem to have done so in this respect.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Will not the hon. gentleman admit that the word 'rents' cover these things? We had a vote last year under the head of 'rents' for public buildings in the Yukon. The policy of the Department of Justice from the very beginning was to erect residences for the judges, and until they were erected we have been paying rents.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think it would be fair that we should take refuge behind the Auditor General in this matter. My impression is that this money was paid out of a letter of credit, and the Auditor General probably was not aware of it until after the payment was made. If so, the most that can be said of it is that the Auditor General when he had the accounts submitted to him should have drawn attention to the matter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is the fact. There was a credit given to the department for a certain sum of money, and out of that sum this expenditure has been made. Then it was the duty of the Auditor General when he found an expenditure which was not justified by vote of parliament to draw attention of parliament to it. He should have said that here was an expenditure over and above the amount that was voted by parliament for that particular purpose.

Harbours and rivers — Nova Scotia—Ecum Secum—wharf, $3,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This amount of money is required for the balance of the contract to complete the work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where is that?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Guysborough county.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $3,950.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much was voted last year?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not the information under my hand but I will find it.

Gabarus Bay—breakwater, $3,500.

Mr. KAULBACH, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he has given any recognition to the appeals which I have made in regard to the breakwater at Petit Riviére and also the breakwater at Mill Cove in St. Margaret's Bay in the county of Lunenburg, and also the retaining wall at Battery Point at the mouth of Lunenburg Harbour. In regard to the latter I would say that a retaining wall is an absolute necessity and unless attention is given to it in the course of a very short time it will endanger the lighthouse erected on the banks as it stands on the very brink of a wall of clay and unless attended to in a very short time, will tip over the precipice. I would ask the hon. minister to give it the attention it deserves.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer tells me that he does not

remember that we have any information at hand. I did not catch the first name that the hon. gentleman mentioned.

Mr. KAULBACH. The Petit Rivière breakwater.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Is this a new work or is it just a case of repairs ?

Mr. KAULBACH. It is a work that has been suffering for want of repairs. A large amount of money has been spent there. I have repeated this appeal every year since the hon. gentlemen have been in power.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will give instructions to the engineer to pay a visit there and report.

Mr. KAULBACH. Suppose the hon. minister places a certain amount of money in the coming supplementary estimates for the work this session?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The supplementary estimates for this year are completed, and I would not dare to reopen them, but if the amount is small and if the work is not too extensive you can take the amount out of the general vote.

Mr. KAULBACH. No, it requires a larger amount than that.

Ingonish (North Bay) strengthening breakwater—repairs, $1,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the last item is carried perhaps the hon. minister has the information now with reference to the first item of $3,200 that I asked for. I understand that he asked for the full amount last year and said that the work was let by contract. Now, he comes forward and asks for $3,200 to complete the work, and he says that the contract was $3,900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year we had $1,300 only.

Mr. TAYLOR. And the work was $3,900 and he now asks for $3,200..

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The contract was for $3,950. We are now asking for $650 for contingencies and that brings the whole amount up to $4,600. We have spent up to December, $1,399. So that we require the amount which we are asking to complete the work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will this vote complete it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Prince Edward Island, West Point—extension of pier, $1,550.

Mr. HACKETT. What is that money required for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to pay the balance of the contract for that work.

Hon. Mr. TARTE.

Mr. HACKETT. To pay the balance of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, to pay the balance to the contractor Mr. McDonald.

Tignish—repairs to breakwater, $600.

Mr. HACKETT. What is that for—a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is to pay for work done on that breakwater.

Mr. HACKETT. When was the work done—last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

New London—repairs to breakwater, &c., $2,200.

Mr. HACKETT. I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to the work at Skinner's Pond. An expenditure of about $2,000 was made two years ago for this work. Nothing has been done there since. This is a very necessary work and I may say that there was a channel opened through the sand from the pond to the gulf. That channel was closed up last fall. At the time of the opening of the channel a dam was built across the old outlet from the pond and this was closed up. When the sea had closed the new channel the pond overflowed its banks, there being no outlet from the pond, and the consequence was, that the farmers found that the ground up to their doors was flooded with water. They petitioned the hon. Minister of Public Works that some action should be taken last fall. I forwarded that petition myself, and I would ask, inasmuch as this expenditure of about $2,000 was made two years ago, that he followed it up by a further expenditure to assist the farmers and fishermen living on that part of the coast where they are very much in want of this accommodation. It is very much required. There is no harbour from Tignish to Miminegash, a distance of 30 miles along the coast. These people are obliged to use small fishing boats, whereas if they had Skinner's Pond harbour kept open sufficiently to admit a larger sized craft, they could pursue their industry with greater success and perhaps the hon. gentleman will see whether we can get an amount placed in the supplementary estimates next year for this purpose.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not remember that our resident engineer has called attention to that work. I thought it was completed. I was under the impression that all the work necessary there had been done. The chief engineer will take note of it, but at the same time Mr. Hegan has not called our attention to the necessity of any further work there.

Mr. HACKETT. That may be, but the people petitioned last fall. I am aware that the hon. minister received the petition because he replied to my letter forwarding the petition. That should be sufficient notice. He said that he would consult Mr. Hegan, the engineer about the work. It is no fault of the people who have been urging upon the department the necessity for this work. Will the minister say that it will be provided for in the supplementary estimates?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say that because the supplementary estimates are closed.

Repairs, maritime provinces generally, $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that that item be struck out.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HACKETT. Cannot the minister apply that amount to Skinner's Pond.

Mr. WILMOT. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the works at Oromocto on the St. John river. What amount will likely be expended there.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two plans are prepared for the work on the Oromocto river and tenders will be asked for it in a short while.

Mr. WILMOT. I am very glad to hear that. Does the minister intend to prosecute the work of clearing out the shoals.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Instructions have been given for a dredge to go there and as soon as a dredge can be got the work will be completed.

Mr. WILMOT. Under the charge of Mr. Shewan the resident engineer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. KAULBACH. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the much needed work of the dredging of La Have river, Mahone bay, and Lunenburg harbour. There is no work in all Canada that is more necessary than the dredging of these three places. There is a very extensive shipping fleet there, and accommodation is absolutely necessary for it. Last year the minister told me he had no dredge, but I find dredges going to other places of less importance. Why cannot this work be attended to during the coming season. It was promised last year and promised the year before. There was a sum in connection with this work placed in the estimates just previous to the last election, but it was not expended. Will the minister promise me that he will send a dredge there this year. This work is in the public interest and there is nothing at all political about it. I would strongly urge this work on the attention of the minister.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend from Annapolis (Mr. Wade)—

Mr. KAULBACH. From Lunenburg.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, from Annapolis, called my attention a week or two ago to this matter and because of the great importance of La Have river I fully realized that something has to be done. It is a very fine river. I was there two or three years ago and representations were made to me, but there was then no dredge available and there is not to-day. I have tried at the request of my hon. friend (Mr. Wade) and other friends to relieve the situation by ordering some rudimentary work to remove a sand bar that was formed by the flood this spring and we are trying to remove it now.

Mr. KAULBACH. This interest shown on the part of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) is very commendable no doubt, but the minister might have referred to the hon. member for Lunenburg as having appealed repeatedly year after year for this work. If that fact were shown and credited me it would have looked a little better and more commendable on the part of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think I will have to intervene. My hon. friend from Lunenburg (Mr. Kaulbach) could not very well have called attention last year to a sand bar which was created by the flood this year, although I have no doubt that my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) would have been quite ready to call attention to it this year. There is dredging urgently needed on the La Have river, Lunenburg harbour, and Mahone bay, and I must do my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) the justice to say that he has repeatedly brought it to the attention of the House. There was a special obstruction caused this year in La Have river apart from the necessary dredging. It was that which my hon. friend from Annapolis brought to the notice of the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Wade) was for many years a resident on the La Have river, and knows it perhaps better than any man in the House. Accordingly the Minister of Public Works took steps to do the little work connected with the removal of that sand bar. There is great difficulty in finding dredges. I told my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) a year ago that I would recommend the La Have river to be dredged almost before any work I was prepared to advocate in Nova Scotia. But the trouble is that the smaller class of dredges which suit in other places are not adapted to the La Have river, and so far the Minister of Public Works was unable to carry out his intention of having dredging done there. He is now having a large dredge built which will be suitable for work on the La Have river, and with the assistance of that dredge that work can be done. In the case of Lunenburg, for the last year or two, there have not been urgent works except dredging.

My hon. friend has urged us repeatedly to send dredges there, and I have been as anxious as himself to see them sent; but we really have not had the dredges to do the work.

Mr. KAULBACH. It is very kind of the minister to refer to me in the way he has done, and I appreciate it; but my reason for referring to the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Wade) was that the hon. minister drew out the hon. member for Annapolis to speak of dredging in the county which I have the honour to represent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have referred in so many kind words to the efforts of my hon. friend from Lunenburg that I thought for once my hon. friend from Annapolis might have a little credit.

Mr. WADE. If you will allow me a word, I may say that I have received communications from people who are interested in having the dredging done on the La Have river and in the removal of the bar which has been referred to by the Minister of Finance. I am free to admit that while my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) represents the county of Lunenburg, the people on the La Have river have no confidence in his ability to secure dredging for them. He represented the county in the time of the late government for many years. The only dredging done in the county was in the harbour of Lunenburg, and there are people mean enough to say that his own property was benefited by it more than any other. It is only natural, therefore, that friends in Bridgewater should have written to me to urge the minister to do this work. On the very evening that I received the letter, I brought the matter to the notice of the minister, and the statement he made, I think was very satisfactory.

Mr. KAULBACH. If the hon. member for Annopolis got a letter of that kind, I think that he should in courtesy have handed it to me, and left me to make the appeal; and then he might have supported me. That would have been kindness on his part, and what I might reasonably have expected from him. With reference to the dredging in Lunenburg harbour, the hon. gentleman knows right well that no part of it benefited me in any way, and I am sorry that he should have referred to it as he did. On the contrary, I objected to the dredging being done where he refers to, because I wanted the harbour deepened for the purpose of improving it as a harbour of refuge for the fishermen; and the dredging where it was done was endangering the bank of my property, as was well known to the public.

Ste. Genevieve—protection of piers, $550.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) What kind of work is the hon. gentleman doing there?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) As the hon. gentleman is aware, there is a bridge at Ste. Geneviève that was built by the Dominion government, and under an arrangement entered into between the government and the municipal authorities at Ste. Geneviève, the government are bound to do the necessary works for the protection of the piers. Although the county is not favourable to the government, I shall see to it that those works are properly done.

Valleyfield—Dredging channel in Valleyfield Bay, $4,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is this for?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a pretty large trade at Valleyfield, and this work is being done in the harbour, not in the canal. We are dredging the channel from the lake into the bay.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it opposite the town or above the entrance to the canal?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is above the entrance to the canal.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Is this for the canal?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) This has nothing to do with the canal. This work is being done in the bay, at the entrance of the harbour. My hon. friend, who is familiar with that bay, knows that it is very shallow. There is only about from 6 to 7 feet of water, and a great many boats which visit that port find it very difficult to enter the harbour. We are dredging a channel from the lake to the wharf.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How deep are you making it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are dredging to 9 feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There has been 11 or 12 feet of depth there right along.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, only 5 or 6 feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Steamers drawing 9 or 10 feet of water have been going there for years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not in the channel to the canal, but in the channel from the lake to the wharfs.

Mr. LOY. If I might be allowed to explain, this channel is near the entrance of the canal down towards the port of Valleyfield. This channel has been used a great many years and is now being used by coal barges, and barges laden with grain and lumber. In low water in the summer season there is only about 6 feet of water, and in consequence these barges are not able to load and unload to advantage. This is a very important work, and I am only sorry that a larger amount is not voted for it. When I state that the largest industry in

Valleyfield now gets 20,000 tons of coal a year, and that many barges laden with grain and lumber come into the harbour, you can well realize the importance of deepening the channel to a sufficient depth. It should be at least 10 feet deep. I may say that in consequence of its being so shallow, and in consequence of the shoal at the entrance to the harbour, in very severe winters, the ice forms to such a depth as to shut out the water for the mills which are dependent upon it for their power. So that the deepening of the channel will be a double advantage, increasing the water for power purposes, and also enlarging the channel for navigation.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Did the minister make all that expenditure to redeem one of the many pledges given to the electorate during the last election ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) I had no time to give pledges, as I hardly spent twenty-four hours in the county.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I was there for eight days, and I know something about it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Translation.) The hon. gentleman must have made pledges.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I could not afford to do so.

Point Pelee Island wharf, $1,290.

Mr. EARLE. I see that the government are spending a great deal of money for the construction of wharfs in all the older provinces. I would ask the minister if it is his intention to extend the same principle to the province of British Columbia, where we have large fishing interests, and where up to the present the government have not spent any money for wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Senator Templeman called my attention to the importance of British Columbia and its claims to have wharfs built in that province, and when the supplementary estimates come down, I shall probably be criticised for having provided too large a sum for this purpose.

Mr. PRINGLE. In this item I see no allowance for a wharf at the village of Aultsville in the county of Stormont. I was under the impression that the hon. gentleman would bring down an amount of $5,500 for that purpose. I would like to ask him if it is his intention to build that wharf?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These estimates are only for the current year. When the supplementary estimates come down, my hon. friend will have to judge whether we have acted as he wishes us to do. Until then my lips are sealed.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that a wharf is badly required there, and that the wharf which was there has been destroyed owing to its having been used by the government contractors.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My engineer tells me that we have had an examination and a survey made there lately.

Mr. PRINGLE. I understand that.

St. Maurice district—accommodation at Grand Mere for storing and sorting logs, &c., Governor General's warrant, $63,000.

Mr. MORIN. Does the government sort the logs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the government furnishes the accommodation for sorting the logs, and the lumbermen do the sorting themselves. I explained the other day the nature of this work. If my hon. friend would like to have an idea of the work we are carrying on there, this map will explain the whole thing. We have fifty miles of work done, and those works are paying. Last year we netted about $20,000, and I wish we could net as much everywhere else.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why was the Governor General's warrant required ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Last year the lumber companies suffered great damage because our accommodation for sorting was not large enough and they could not drive all their logs during high water. They made representations to us, and we changed the location of the work at Grand Mere, so as to give more storage place. The work had to be completed by the 1st of May, because later on it would have been of no use.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is built for this $63,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Five piers, 9,000 or 10,000 feet of booms and other works.

Slides and booms—St. Maurice district—to complete payments for timber supplied in 1900-1 for improvements made to boom works at Shawinigan, &c., to facilitiate the floating, sorting and storage of logs, $11,300.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How much has been spent on these works altogether ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About three quarters of a million—they have been in existence for fifty years.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Each year, there is some expenditure of this kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not every year, but as may be necessary. The booms are paying pretty well, and I hope they will pay better.

Roads and bridges—bridge over the Belly River at Pace's Crossing to complete payments to the North-west Territories government for the construction of this bridge, $959,67.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why is that a Dominion bridge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, the government of Canada build bridges in the North-west Territories—large bridges.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is not the first, then ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there are several.

Roads and bridges—Des Joachims bridge—reconstruction, the Ontario and Quebec governments contributing—to complete, including approaches, $32,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that this item be reduced to $16,000.

Motion agreed to.

Public Works—chargeable to income—miscellaneous—chief engineer's office—salaries of engineers, draftsmen and clerks, notwithtanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $10,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of this ?

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman, last year, asked for $49,700 for this office the same as the year before. And now he comes forward with a request for $10,500 for the balance of this year. What is the reason ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because, this year we have more work than we ever had—nearly twice as much, and it is impossible to carry on all this work with the same staff in the engineer's office.

Mr. TAYLOR. But surely the hon. gentleman had all this before him when he made up his estimates and put down the same sum as for the year before ? And now he asks for $10,500 more merely to complete this year. He must have employed a great many more men.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But, $10,000 is not a very large amount of money considering the work we do. We are spending about $3,000,000 in dredging, contractors, &c. We have to have a staff large enough to control our work. I am sure that I do not do an injustice to any other branch of the Public Works Department when I say that the chief engineer's branch is administered to my entire satisfaction ?

Miscellaneous—to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway interest at five per cent on sundry freight charges, the settlement of which was unavoidably delayed from 1900 to 1902, $1,514.51.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that this item be struck out

Motion agreed to.

For purchase and fitting of ss. 'Tyrian' as a cable vessel, purchase of Marconi instruments and testing of his system of wireless telegraphy (Governor General's warrant), $50,093.17.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was paid for this vessel ?

Mr. REID (Grenville).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $20,000. In addition we have spent for fitting her up $25,000. We spent about $5,000 on the Marconi system.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who was she purchased from ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the Nova Scotia Steamship Company. We had a cable ship which was wrecked, and we had to buy another one. The other steamship foundered on the 20th of September, 1900. Then we rented this steamer for some time, and when we were contemplating returning her to her owners we found it would be necessary to spend $5,000 or $6,000 to place her in the same position she was in when we rented her. I thought it was more advantageous to buy her. This vessel is absolutely necessary for the Department of Public Works. The vessel was in running order when we purchased her.

Mr. REID (Grenville). $25,000 was a very large amount for fitting up a vessel which was in running order when he purchased her. Has the minister any memorandum of the items that went to make up that sum ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About $6,000 was spent on repairs, and the balance was spent on fitting up the boat as a cable boat for laying cables.

Working expenses, Levis, Kingston and Esquimalt graving docks, $7,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a general law which authorizes us to pay two per cent for twenty years on moneys invested in building graving docks. Mr. Robertson has been negotiating, I understand, with the imperial government to get an Act of incorporation. I do not know as they have succeeded. I hope he will be able to give St. John a graving dock with the guarantee we have placed on the statute books. We placed on the statute book last year a law which authorized us to guarantee two per cent to any company which would build a graving dock whose plans will have been approved by the Department of Public Works and we hope that the company formed by Mr. Robertson will be able to build that dock. We have not a separate account for the three graving docks and we have been obliged to spend more than we thought we would. That is why we have to ask for a supplementary vote.

Slides and booms—St. Maurice district, working expenses, $10,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I see an item No. 88 which is for the same thing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That item is for construction of works. This is for maintenance and working expenses.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought the hon. gentleman said last year that he would require $1,000 for working expenses.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, the more dams and slides there are the more money we are called upon to spend.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman made an estimate last year and now he says that he is short by $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We did not foresee the fact that we would have that large increase of work at Grande Mere for which I have just asked parliament to give me $63,000, and it is in view of these increased works that we have this increased expenditure for maintenance.

Ocean and river service—further amount required for maintenance and repairs of Dominion steamers, including Governor General's warrant of $26,000, $50,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Explain that please.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Chairman, this item of $50,000 is required to pay the expenditure for the maintenance of this service for the current year. It will be noticed that in the estimates of last year only $160,000 were voted, whereas it required about $200,000 to carry on this service. I find it has been the practice in the department to carry over from one year to the other balances of accounts. I am desirous of squaring them all off and keeping within the estimate of parliament for the various services.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understand the hon. minister has now charge of the steamer 'Scout,' between Kingston and Montreal. Is that the case ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. The Railway Department has turned over that steamer to the Marine Department, and it will henceforth be in our charge.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And all the buoys between Montreal and Kingston will be looked after by the Marine Department ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

To provide for the removal of a submerged wrecked schooner in Petit de Grat harbour, Richmond county, N.S., $350.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to the wreck of the steamer 'Rothesay' just beyond the town of Prescott. It is in a dangerous place and very little would remove it. I think the matter has been brought to the attention of the government before, and if it can be removed it will avoid the wreck of some other steamer. The machinery is about five or six inches below the water and small boats have run upon this and several lives have been very nearly lost. I think the department asked for tenders a short time ago. It would only cost $200 or $300 to remove this wreck. If the minister can see his way clear to have that wreck removed I believe its removal will probably save life and property.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is some question as to the responsibility in this matter. Now that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) has brought it to my attention I shall make careful inquiry. I agree with him that it is dangerous and some action must be taken to remove this obstruction.

Lighthouse and coast service, $35,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who has charge of the light at the head of the Cornwall canal.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope that the minister will make this year provision to buoy the different channels of the 1000 Islands on the Canadian side. On the American side they have these channels for small excursion steamers all buoyed. I drew the attention of Sir Louis Davies last year and he promised to have it done. I think I also spoke to the present minister (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) about it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) brought the matter to my notice and I asked the engineer to report, and in the supplementary estimates next year we will have an item for it. The care of the buoys in the rivers as well as in the canals will now be in my department and I shall ask for a grant to place that service in a more satisfactory condition.

Mr. REID (Grenville). With regard to that light at the head of the Cornwall canal, an arrangement was made that the lockman should attend to it, but now that it is under the care of the Department of Marine and Fisheries the lockmen may not consider it their duty to do so, unless they are instructed to that effect. The light is a very important one.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. This matter will also come under the jurisdiction of the engineer who is to be appointed especially to attend to that section of the river. I shall have a report made in regard to the light which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid) has referred to.

Fisheries—Further amount required for fish breeding establishments, $30,000.

Mr. HACKETT. It was announced in a Prince Edward Island newspaper recently that the minister intended to build a combination hatchery for salmon and lobster on the island. Is that under consideration ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but I am not prepared at the present moment to definitely state what will be done. My personal opinion is that the establishment of hatcheries has proved satisfactory in other countries and also in Canada. If we find that the results have been as good as we expect I shall ask parliament for a grant for the coming year to establish more hatcheries. Of course that must depend to some extent on the information given by the experts as to the proper locality to establish a hatchery. I have no doubt it would be in the interest of the fisheries of the Dominion to establish a hatchery on the island, but I cannot say now what will be done. The estimates have not been sufficient, and it has been the practice, unfortunately I think, to carry over from year to year accounts that should have been provided for in the current year. I am anxious to stop that practice. For instance a vote of $3,500 was taken in the first instance to establish hatcheries in British Columbia, and the total cost was $10,258. The estimate for the Gaspé hatchery, was $7,000, and the cost up to the present $18,000; the Margaree hatchery estimated at $5,000, cost $8,780. This money is required to complete these works and also I trust to clear up the accounts in the department so that there will not be overdrafts. I think it is a very bad practice not to take a sufficient vote to cover the expenditure of the year, because this results in men being kept out of their money in the latter part of the year, which I do not think conduces to the good management of the department nor is satisfactory to those interested. My object is to establish a system on such a basis as to avoid that. I can understand that sometimes, in taking an appropriation for new work, it is very difficult to estimate properly the exact cost, in that case the fund should not be taken out of an appropriation for other purpose. If the department makes a mistake of that kind, I think that the matter should stand over until parliament meets and we can get a subsequent appropriation.

Mr. KAULBACH. I desire to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, for the information of the fishermen of Nova Scotia, if a commission has been appointed, or any inquiry instituted as to the effect the wholesale slaughter of young herrings, or sardines, caught at Grand Manan, in the county of Charlotte, opposite the coast of Maine, has upon the fishermen of Nova Scotia, and the sacrifice that is occasioned by such slaughters. I understand that American sail boats visit this quarter, and take from weirs prepared for the capture of these fishes, immense quantities of these young fishes, and dispose of them to packers of sardines at Eastport, in Maine, where they are in good demand; and any quantity not cared for, and cured as sardines, is sold as a fertilizer. I am informed, and I verily believe this statement to be correct, that often in one day fifty tons of these fishes go to destruction and are disposed of or sold as a fertilizer to Americans, or to farmers of the county of Charlotte, which the fishermen of Nova Scotia complain of as the worst kind of destruction or waste, and regard without a doubt the cause as to the scarcity of herrings on the shores of Nova Scotia. I would ask what are the customs officers of the county of Charlotte doing that they cannot watch such practices and report them, or where are the vessels in the patrol service that they do not do their duty, and protect the interests of the fishermen, and the customs in a manner they are expected to do?

It is well known that Grand Manan waters is the great nursery or spawning ground for herrings, and if these fishes are caught, and in many cases ruthlessly destroyed in the manner I have described, when young and not allowed to grow, and from the shores of Bay of Fundy, and the east coast of Nova Scotia, the waters of these shores will in a short time be depleted entirely of this valuable description of fish. Herrings are a bait the deep sea fishermen of Nova Scotia mainly depend on for a catch of cod; and when they are scarce, or not to be had, the success of that industry is imperilled and very precarious, and the inshore fishermen naturally must suffer in a similar manner.

As the open season by regulation of the Marine and Fisheries Department, commences on the 10th of May—the present month—only a few days off, I would ask the hon. minister to carefully take charge of this matter, investigate these statements I have made, and have found correct, at once stop this wholesale slaughter and destruction of these fishes, and follow up the customs officers and the fishery officers of that district, that they discharge their duties with vigilance and in the most efficient manner possible. I have brought this matter to the notice of the government on a previous occasion, and now ask that it receive the attention it merits. Will the hon. minister kindly inform me if any inquiry has been made in this particular?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter referred to has been brought to the attention of the department frequently. I find that there is a great divergence of opinion as to what policy is best to adopt in regard to the herrings in that district. Some claim that there is not the slightest danger of their being depleted at all by our allowing them to be taken as they are at the present time, while others take the opposite view. However, the matter will be thoroughly looked into. I may say, in this connection that, as the committee well know, the whole fishery question between the province and the Dominion is not in a very satisfactory shape at the present time, and I decided not to take very active steps in regard to some of these matters until the various questions

of jurisdiction were settled. An invitation has been sent to the various provincial governments to hold a conference here at as early a date as can be arranged, perhaps during the next two weeks, to discuss all these matters, when I hope some satisfactory arrangement may be arrived at. If not, I have intimated to them my view that it is most desirable that a stated case be prepared for submission to the courts, so that we may know once and for all the position of the Dominion and the provinces respectively with regard to these various questions. The subject of the customs regulations is receiving the attention of the Department of Customs at the present time.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the minister whether the hatchery on the Cedar river is finished, and whether it is stocked ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The work is completed, and the stocking and putting in good shape is going on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a matter which I wished to mention to the minister in connection with the lighthouse and coast service. It is the necessity of having a lightship for the Halifax harbour. I brought this matter to the attention of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries two or three sessions ago—in fact, I think on two or three different occasions. Since then a statement has been placed in my hands on the matter, and, as it will take only a few moments to read it, I will take the liberty of reading it to the minister now. It is prepared by a gentleman who is intimately acquainted with the necessities of the harbour. I think there was a lightship at the mouth of the harbour a good many years ago; and, in the opinion of this gentleman and others who are familiar with the subject, the reason that lightship drifted and failed to be of service, and had to be abandoned, was that it was not properly moored. The statement which has been given me is these words :

A lightship is wanted off Halifax harbour because the existing lights and fog signals are all inside of the dangers to be avoided instead of outside. The dangers to be avoided are the Sambro ledge on the west and Thrum Cap shoal on the east. The latter is well inside the bay formed by Chebucto Head on the west and Devil island on the east, but the former runs a long way out, nearly two miles beyond Sambro island.

In clear weather, i.e., not foggy, the lighthouses on Devil's island, Sambro island and Chebucto Head are sufficient guides to the entrance, though even then it is worth noting that the 'Daniel Steinmann' was lost with 100 lives through mistaking the light on Sambro for that on Chebucto—the explanation given at the time being that the rain squalls blowing across the fixed light on Sambro caused the captain to mistake it for the revolving light on Chebucto. He ran in for it expecting to pick up a pilot, only to find himself among the maze of reef outside of Sambro island.

But in foggy weather the lights are useless, and the guides to the entrance are two automatic buoys, one to the south-east of Sambro and one further to the eastward, and fog bombs on Sambro island. An automatic buoy is a very imperfect guide. Unless there is considerable sea on it makes very little noise. Even when it is making a good deal, it is universal experience that it is quite uncertain whether you will hear it or not. It is not a loud noise and easily drowned by the noise on board a steamer. The sound often seems to act in a peculiar way, so as to be inaudible half a mile away, and yet perfectly plain several miles off. In a strong breeze it can seldom be heard any distance to windward of the buoy. In every way it is a poor mark to run for in the fog and if you do not hit it the penalty may be to find yourself among the ledges, just as the 'Portia' did. The bombs on Sambro island are said to be very hard to locate and misleading, and they, too, are of course inside the danger. A few years ago the ship 'John Macleod,' with a cargo of sugar wandered about for two or three days in the fog looking for something to show her a course to the harbour, but found none, and eventually was lost on the Sambro ledge.

This is the remedy he proposes :—

What is wanted is a lightship with a powerful fog horn moored well clear of the outer Sambro reefs. Such a mark could be run for in any weather day or night with perfect ease and confidence. Pilots could be kept on board.

There should be no difficulty in mooring such a vessel. The bottom is mostly sand and gravel, good holding ground. The experiment formerly tried of a lightship was bound to fail, because they tried to make the ship ride to her own anchors and two enormous chain cables, the weight of which was certain to drag her under in a seaway. What is wanted is to take weight of the cable by a large mooring and fasten the ship to the mooring. In that case a properly designed vessel would ride easily in any weather. The lightships in Great Britain and the States are mostly moored this way, I believe. Even if she could not or any accident happened, she could slip the mooring line and run up the harbour, without losing anything.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Did the hon. gentleman mention the name of the lighthouse ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will mention that in confidence to the hon. minister. The writer is a gentleman who has taken a good deal of interest in the subject, and the hon. minister can inquire as to whether the suggestions he made are valuable or not. I know nothing about the subject myself, but take a little interest in it on account of having brought the matter to the attention of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries on several occasions. I asked this gentleman, who locally takes a great deal of interest in the subject, and is personally interested in the safety of the harbour, to give me a statement of his views in writing. He wrote this rather hurriedly, supposing no doubt that I would not read it to the House, but I thought it better to give his own language than attempt to sum up his remarks by any language of my own.

I trust that the hon. minister will consider the matter because there is a strong feeling among masters of vessels that something of the kind should be done, and it is quite easy to make the harbour perfectly safe by night and by day. The only subject for consideration by the minister is the best way to do this, and this gentleman thinks it can be done by a lightship, and that there would be no difficulty in doing this with the improved modern methods of constructing and placing lightships.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I had the great pleasure of visiting Halifax a short time ago, and was told that it was a magnificent harbour with a wide channel and that it had never suffered from fog or ice all the year round, so that I am rather surprised to hear of any application for any improvements in connection with that harbour. However, I suppose that this is a little outside the harbour, and I may say that the matter was brought up some time ago and an investigation and report made. The opinion come to was that there was no such pressing necessity for this lightship, which the informant of my hon. friend seems to think there is. However, we have always to recognize that nowadays, when vessels are so much larger and swifter than formerly, aids to navigation are required that were not thought necessary some years ago. If the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to give me the memo. he has just read, I will look into the matter and give some information concerning it, when the estimates for next year come down, and I would also promise him that it will have most careful consideration by the department at an early date.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I do not think that any person in Halifax would make the statement that we do not have occasionally a little fog along the coast, though, so far as the harbour itself is concerned, I do not think that any improvement is required, as the harbour is as open and clean and safe as any harbour in the world. But what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is referring to is not the harbour but the coast before you reach it, some miles outside, and it must be understood that we are not making any reflections on the harbour when we speak of the coast outside. We have a little fog on the coast occasionally, but nothing compared with the Bay of Fundy and over at St. John. The harbour of Halifax is as perfect as it can be, but there is no harbour in the world where there is not a little fog outside. If it were so perfect, as to be free from fog along the coast, we would not require lighthouses or anything of the kind, but in common with all harbours some little protection is required there as elsewhere.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Fisheries—further amount required for salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $20,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the same explanation applies to this ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes; we never had a sufficient vote. I want to balance the account and take the amount that is really needed and keep within it in the year's expenditure.

Fisheries—to pay damages and costs sustained by Messrs J. & C. Noble, as awarded by the commissioner appointed by Order in Council 16th August, 1901, $18,563.

Mr. BENNETT. Persons who are at all acquainted with the circumstances in connection with this case will consider the vote a most extraordinary one. This is a most unsatisfactory matter to discuss in the House, because the minister who is in charge of the department had nothing to do with it, and those who are to blame, if there are any to blame, are not here to meet the charges. To hon. gentlemen who were in this House ten or twelve years ago, this claim of Noble Brothers is quite an old friend. This firm were engaged in business of fishing on Georgian Bay. I know very little personally of their operations, but I shall read from 'Hansard' the opinion of a gentleman in this House showing that they were not by any means persons deserving of much consideration. In a discussion on this same claim the hon. member who represents the adjoining riding to that in which Noble Brothers live, spoke of them in the following terms. I quote from page 2014 of 'Hansard' of 1895:

> I know that I have been spoken to dozens of times by fishermen with regard to the reputation of the Nobles, and I merely give this as a justification for the seeming harsh course which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries adopted in this case. When I have been endeavouring to get these men off time after time, it has been said to me : Why take the Nobles part, they are perfect outlaws ; they fish with nets that are larger than the law allows ; they fish out of season, they violate the law in every way. They say : You cannot prosecute them because they are so strong and have such powerful influence at their backs, the department is afraid to prosecute them, but they pile unto us because we are individually alone, and we cannot bring that force to bear against the department which they can.

These remarks were made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), who, I regret to see, is not in his place, but who, if he were here, I am sure, would join with me in protesting against this vote. These remarks were made when the present Hon. Senator Landerkin, then the representative of South Grey in this House endeavoured to bring the same case under the review of parliament. Let me now refer to some of the circumstances of this claim. These Noble Brothers, who were engaged, as I

say, in fishing, year in and year out, season in and season out, had openly and in the most flagrant way defied the laws of the land in connection with the fisheries. This is shown by the evidence in the case laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That evidence shows that they supplied seine nets, trap nets and other illegal fishing gear to half-breeds and Indians, and in return, took a share of the fish caught by these illegal means. After they had been trespassers against the laws for years, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, determined to bring them to time. They were notified that, in consequence of the flagrant outrages they had perpetrated in the past, evidence of which was before the department, they would not be granted licenses. Having a large fishing plant, consisting of tugs, fishing smacks and a large quantity of nets, they came down here in 1893 after having received notice that no consideration would be allowed them for the future. They proffered their money to the license inspector, Mr. Elliott, but finding that a license would not be issued, one of the firm came down to Ottawa. The hon. member for East Grey, knowing Mr. Noble, accompanied him to the minister and endeavoured to intervene on his behalf. And the hon. member for East Grey gives this account of the interview:

> Mr. Noble admitted himself in the presence of the minister that he knew of the change in the regulations the fall before. He admitted also that after he paid his money, that he was told before his boats went out that he was not likely to get his license. When that information came to his knowledge he came down to Ottawa to intercede with the department in hopes he might induce them to give him his license, and on the very day he was here, and when we were pleading on his behalf in the office, a telegram came from the fishery overseer saying that his boats were out fishing in the Georgian Bay.

Let hon. members get the full meaning of these facts. Here were two partners who had been officially advised that the department would refuse them a license. One of the partners comes to Ottawa to see the minister, and while he is actually laying his case before the minister, the inspector advises the department that, in open violation of the law, a license not having been issued to them, this firm were out on the lakes with their plant. I do not intend to speak personally of the operations of these men, because I do not know the facts. I can only say that, if general repute about Georgian Bay, where their operations are carried on, goes for anything, not a word that was said by the hon. member for East Grey concerning these people is too hard or too strong or too severe. The inspector, in pursuance of his instructions seized the tug and fishing plant of these men, and, it was tied up—there is no doubt about that—for a whole season. They had openly violated the law, and the minister was quite justified, as the House at that time believed, in acting as he did. And what next happened? These gentlemen employed solicitors to prosecute a claim against the department. The minister granted them a hearing before Judge Johnson—I believe it was—as commissioner. The evidence was thoroughly gone into. When the case came before the department, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that time, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, told these people point blank that they could have a fiat at any time to go into the courts if they thought their claim against the government was a good one. As often as this fiat was offered to these wrongdoers—for they were wrongdoers—so often was it declined. After a time Sir Charles Hibert Tupper left the department, but the gentleman who succeeded him also declined to allow the claim. Meantime, some very powerful friends of the Conservative government, relatives of these Noble Brothers used every occasion to put the pistol to the head of the department to compel it to yield. But Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper refused to recede an inch, but told them they could rest upon their rights, a fiat would be given and they could go into the courts. But, knowing the ground upon which they stood, these people, very properly, from their point of view, refused to go into courts. When the change of government came in 1896, the matter stood as it had stood for three or four years before.

But, no sooner was there a change of government than the Noble Bros., being prominent supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite, exerted their own political leverage; and, knowing one of these gentlemen personally as I do, I saw him here session in and session out, and it was notorious what his business was. He was endeavouring to have the government take up this alleged claim and deal with it on its merits. I am glad to say for the credit of the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Sir Louis Davies, that from 1896 that gentleman resisted the payment of this claim. I do not know whether he offered them a fiat to go into the courts, I assume probably he did; had he followed the action of his predecessor in office he certainly would have done that. But there is one thing certain, and that is that Sir Louis Davies never agreed—because there was never any vote in the estimates for such a purpose—to compromise with these people in any shape or manner, so far at least as the records of the House showed by a vote of money. There was the action, first, of Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper offering them a fiat for them to go into court, and their refusal to do so. Then here is the palpable fact that for five years Sir Louis Davies would not recede from the position of the former minister and would not pay these people one dollar; at least the evidence that is open and above board as to no

money grant being voted in the House would show conclusively that he agreed with the action of his predecessor in office, and did nothing in that regard. Now, I find on the 22nd of August, 1901, the then minister, Sir Louis Davies, appointed Mr. Justice Lount, one of the judges of the Superior Court in the province of Ontario, under a commission to inquire into this matter; and I will be bound to say that there never was before, and I doubt if there ever will be again, a document issued from any government in this country within the terms and under the circumstances that this one was issued. Let me read for the benefit of the committee the instructions of the Order in Council to the commissioner:

By the said commission and Order in Council the following matters are submitted to me for my opinion and finding:—

(a) Whether in my opinion on the facts proved before me the conviction, seizure and confiscation mentioned in the said Order in Council were justifiable or not; and if I find such conviction, seizure and confiscation were justifiable;

(b) Then, whether there were any and what extenuating circumstances in connection with violations by Messrs. J. & C. Noble and their fishermen of the fishery laws and regulations, and

(c) Whether in equity and good conscience, having regard to all the circumstances proved the government of Canada, should pay to the said Messrs. J. & C. Noble, any damages by reason of such conviction, seizure and consequent disposal of their tugs, boats, gear and nets, and the reason why in my opinion the government of Canada should pay any, and

(d) If I find that damage should be paid by the government of Canada in equity and good conscience on account of the conviction, seizure and subsequent disposal of such tugs, boats, gear and nets, what amount of damages and the reasons why in my opinion the government of Canada should pay the amount determined; with further authority to me to recommend to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to what disposition of all questions of costs in connection with this commission and the proceedings had and taken thereunder to me shall seem proper.

The learned judge goes on to make his findings, and he says:—

In my opinion on the facts proved before me, the conviction, seizure and confiscation mentioned in said Order in Council were justifiable for the following reasons:

I need not read the reasons in detail which he sets out. Then he goes on to say:

Under a strict interpretation of the said S.S. 3, it was the duty of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to cause to be seized and confiscated all the materials, implements or appliances used in violation of the Act.

Further on he says:

I have therefore now to determine whether or not there were any and what extenuating circumstances on the facts proved before me which should be taken into consideration in connection with the violations by the said Nobles and their fishermen of the fishery laws and regulations, and whether in equity and good conscience, having regard to all the circumstances proved, the government should pay to the said Nobles any damages by reason of such conviction, seizure and subsequent disposal of their tugs, boats, gear and nets.

Now, it will be seen the commissioner found that the seizure and action were justified by reason of their violations of the Act, and that all that had been done in the premises was justifiable. Then he next puts the question, hedged in by these words that the minister had inserted to let the Nobles fall easily, 'in equity and in conscience as to what amount of damages should be paid, if any.' Now, the minister, in a case that he had refused to take up for five years, had refused to pay any damages on all the facts and evidence which was before him, because there had been a prior inquiry before Judge Johnston as commissioner, and if there was any decision to be given the then minister had all this evidence and could come to a conclusion as easily as the judge. The case was pressed strongly by the law firm with which a member of this House is connected. And here again we see that principle that is coming to the front more and more every day in this House, and is coming to be a by word and a reproach in this House, namely, the steering of cases in every department of the government by men who are members of this House, or by their partners. Why, these hon. gentlemen made the welkin ring when they were in opposition on this very question. It was notorious that for years they denounced the action of the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy in holding a brief in the St. Catharines Milling Company, although Mr. McCarthy stated time and again that he did not participate in any of the fees that came to his office through that case.

Well, Sir, the case apparently was put in good trim, a partner of an hon. member of this House is retained on behalf of the Nobles; and then, so as to make their fall easy with these words 'in equity and good conscience,' the learned judge goes into the disposition of the case. The minister this afternoon laid the papers on the Table containing the evidence; there are 800 or 900 pages which it is difficult to wade through. I have glanced over it, and I find that page after page of that evidence proves every allegation that could be made against these men. The counsel for the government, Mr. Lindsay, was acting, I think, with commendable vigour in resisting the claim on behalf of the department—and I have no fault to find from what I have seen of the evidence in that regard—and Mr. Lindsay was told by the counsel of the Noble Bros. that he need not call any more witnesses to prove that they had supplied illegal nets to half-breeds who had participated in the fish that were taken out of these nets, and the evidence was so preponderating that these men did systematically defy the law for years, that it was admitted there was no necessity for calling some eighteen of

those witnesses who were standing there in court to prove that the Noble Bros., had been supplying them with these illegal fishing nets. More than that, it was shown in evidence by their own bookkeeper when the books were produced, that year in and year out they had fish caught illegally in their storehouse for sale; they made no bones about it, and one of their witnesses makes even this strong allegation, that as soon as the fishery inspector came there to make a seizure, one of the Nobles suggested to his assistant the propriety of 'fixing' Mr. Elliott the fishery inspector, evidently supposing that for a monetary consideration the inspector could be fixed, and there would be no prosecution. You can find in different parts of the evidence this fact, that when the inspector came there they bundled a large quantity, one witness states over a ton, of these illegal nets, trap nets, pound nets and seine nets into boxes, and then when the inspector came to look through their storehouse, of course nothing was to be found.

Now, I have this to say, that I am going to enter my protest, although it will not have any weight with the committee, I assume, and as far as the whole case is to be discussed it is most unsatisfactory because the hon. gentleman who is now at the head of the department had nothing to do with it beyond simply finding it when he came into office. I may say that throughout the country and particularly on the shores of Georgian Bay it will be a most startling thing when it is known that these Noble Brothers are to get $18,563 for systematically breaking the law, for telling the Fisheries Department that they did not care what power or influence they had, that they were prepared to bring influence to bear. When the Conservative party were in power they were being buttressed up by strong Conservative friends and when the change of government came I know not what they have done since then. In view of the strong language I have read from 'Hansard,' uttered by the hon. member for East Grey, I would be bound to say that the statements made by him on that occasion will be amply borne out. Here was this officer of the law doing his duty fearlessly, as I know. More than once when I was a supporter of the old government in parliament from 1891 to 1896, I had time and again to appeal to Sir Hibbert Tupper for what? Because, the men doing exactly what these men were doing, fishing with illegal nets, had their nets and boats seized, and it was proper that they should be seized. If a man wanted to take the chance there was the law set for him, and if he was found fishing illegally he had to suffer the consequences. I can recall instance after instance where fishermen who had their all invested in an equipment consisting of boats and nets, had the mortification of seeing their property burned up on the shore right under their very eyes in an endeavour to stop this illegal fishing. These men can now look back knowing what they had to suffer by reason of having contravened the law. While these Noble Brothers who were the greatest poachers and the greatest wrongdoers, the men who had been spoiling the whole fishing business on the lakes, are to be rewarded by the government with this princely grant of $18,563, of which I believe some $3,000 is to go as law costs to a firm of which a member of this House is a partner. I can only say that I enter my protest against voting this money.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I fear we will find a great deal of difficulty in enforcing the fishery regulations. I have a statement furnished me by the department in regard to this matter, and I will place it before the committee:

> In 1894, the fishing tugs, boats and gear of the Messrs. J. & C. Noble, of Killarney, were seized by the fishery overseer for the district under instructions from the department, for having been used for fishing purposes without having first obtained a license therefor as required by law, and the Messrs. Noble were, during the year, refused licenses and their tugs, boats and gear confiscated. These were eventually returned in bond in time for the fishing season of 1895.

Even during the time of the previous government, there was quite a difference of opinion as to the punishment which should be inflicted upon these people for the violation of the law that had occurred. After having these tugs, gear and boats under seizure for a long time, they were eventually returned:

> Meanwhile strong representations were made that the offence committed was mrely a technical one under the circumstances, and that the punishment received by the Nobles was far in excess of that demanded by the irregularity committed by them.
>
> The correspondence continued from 1894 to the fall of 1901, during which time two commissions were granted to inquire into the claim of the Messrs. Noble for damages, neither of which ever reached a conclusion, the counsel for the Messrs. Noble being unable to accept the terms of reference to the commissioners, and the commissioners' ruling on strictly legal grounds.
>
> In 1901 the government consented to refer the matter for a final decision to a commissioner in the person of the Hon. Justice Lount, one of the judges of the High Court of Justice of the province of Ontario, and in the terms of reference to the commissioner the element of good conscience and equity was admitted, as well as that of strict law.

I may say to my hon. friend and to the committee that we all remember that there was a great difference of opinion in regard to this question. It is true that the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Char-

les Hibbert Tupper) took a very extreme view, but his successor, the Hon. Mr. Costigan, took a different view to a very considerable extent, and the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) did not see his way clear——

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister whether the return of the property was made while Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was minister, or while Hon. Mr. Costigan was minister? I am not sure myself.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would not like to be certain about that, but it was under the administration of either one or other of these ministers and during the time of the former government. Sir Louis Davies did not see his way clear to granting any redress except in the way of a further departmental investigation, which did not seem at all satisfactory. My hon. friend has laid some stress upon the government of the day in granting this commission, but I may say that I think all governments as well as parliament are susceptible to public opinion, and I believe there was a strong opinion not only in the locality, but throughout many portions of the province of Ontario, that these people had been harshly treated. One of the brothers, it is known, died in poverty as a result of this punishment, and there was a strong public opinion that the matter should be referred for judicial action. Sir Louis Davies resisted the applications that were made from time to time, and although I was not a member of the government at that time and do not remember the exact circumstances, I have no doubt that he gave way to public opinion and granted a hearing in this matter. The result was a finding by the commissioner awarding the Messrs. Noble as damages, sustained under the circumstances proved before him, the sum of $15,563, with a further sum for legal and other expenses in connection with the last commission of $3,000. I looked into this matter a few days ago and I wish to say that this is a very small portion of the cost to which these people have been put during all these years while the matter was in dispute. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) referred to the counsel in this case being a partner of an hon. member of this House. Perhaps that is hardly fair, because, I understand that from 1894 onward and during the whole progress of this case the same firm have been counsel and solicitors for the Nobles. So that, in that case it cannot be charged that there was any favouritsm, or any favour shown to a member of this House, or to the firm of which he is a partner, nor has there been any political favour shown him.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The member at that time was on the Tory side.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, but that was during the time of the Tory government.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The hon. gentleman is now on the Grit side.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The solicitor was on the Tory side, I am sorry to say. I mention that incidentally, because a wrong impression may be taken from the remarks of the hon. member for East Simcoe. Perhaps it is not intended to suggest that any extra influence has been brought to bear by the present member who happens to be a partner in that firm. The two late lamented members of the firm perhaps would have as much if not more political influence under both governments than the younger member of the firm. However that may be, I think this commission was appointed simply on account of the strong public opinion existing, and the feeling that injustice had been done.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In view of the decision in this matter, I presume the minister is prepared to pay every fisherman in the Dominion who had his property confiscated for illegal work. I have a large number of gentlemen whose loss was proportionably as great as the Nobles, but they never squealed and took their medicine like men, I presume the minister will pay their claims.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In view of the frequent violations of the regulations, the department has dealt fairly leniently with all parties. The department generally stands by its officers in carrying out their duties. I may say that it would cost us very little if we could compromise on the same percentage as this, with almost all the violaters of the Act.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). What was the original claim?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I think it was something over $100,000.

Mr. BENNETT. If the case was one of such extreme severity, how was it that it took five years before an inquiry was granted?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. An inquiry and some mitigation had been granted under the Conservative government, and a minister does not like to reopen a question that has been decided by his predecessor. I believe it was due to the strong public opinion that existed that a judicial inquiry should be held.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to be a rather remarkable thing that a reference should have been made in these terms, when in other departments of government

it has been impossible to get fiats granted for the enforcement of claims purely on legal grounds. Three years ago twenty-four claims were presented to the Postmaster General in which the people only asked a legal enforcement of their rights, but a fiat has not yet been granted, while this claim has been referred to a special commissioner with the proviso that he is to report not only the legal rights of the parties, but also as to whether, apart from legal considerations, they have a fair claim against the government. This commissioner has found that these gentlemen pleaded guilty to the offence; that the seizure of their boats was justified in law, but notwithstanding the minister proposes to pay them $18,000 on account of certain considerations. If that favour be granted to these men, it is remarkable that twenty-four other Canadians who have claims against the government in respect to post office contracts are not allowed to enforce their legal claims in the courts of the country, simply because some minister refuses to report favourably on the granting of a fiat. Can the Minister of Marine explain why one practice prevails in his department and a practice of so remarkably a different character prevails in the department of the Postmaster General ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not think I can explain the ways of the law. The members of the legal profession are very peculiar sometimes and if the Postmaster General were present he no doubt would be able to give his reasons. However, this was a departmental matter, and it could have been dealt with by the department at the time of the offence by inflicting a much smaller penalty. Personally, I always have been willing, both in the management of public affairs and my own private affairs, that a fair hearing should be given to both sides of case, with the view of arriving at a fair settlement. Speaking for myself, and not belonging to the legal profession, unless it is a question of policy on which the government and parliament takes a stand, I am inclined to think that I would be always in favour of referring these matters to a proper tribunal for hearing rather than have them stand before the department for a long period, resulting in costs both to the country and to the parties themselves.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the matters to which I have referred are just as much of a departmental character as this. The Postmaster General saw fit to cancel contracts entered into for the carriage of mails, and the persons whose contracts are cancelled are advised by counsel that the Postmaster General had no right to do so. They applied for a petition of right to assert their claims, but years have passed and they have not received a single word of satisfaction. The Noble Brothers were offered six years ago a fiat in the Court of Exchequer which they did not want because they knew they could not succeed, but these other men have been vainly trying to obtain that for three years past. After having refused a fiat these gentlemen were allowed to have their claims investigated by a special commissioner, not upon the question of legal liability but on grounds infinitely more favourable to them.

I have not had an opportunity of reading the report of the commissioner very fully. I understand that the recommendation he makes to the government is that this claim should be paid to these men, because an officer of the government acted wilfully and in bad faith, and misled the deputy minister of Marine and Fisheries at that time as to the real facts of the case, and he has no doubt that if the real facts had been communicated to the department at that time the forfeiture would not have been enforced. Well, I do not know whether or not any claim could have been made against the government in the Court of Exchequer on that ground. I should think not. I have not considered the question, but I should think that the claim, so far as there could be a legal claim, would be against the officer himself, and that the government would not be responsible for a wilfully wrong act done by this man against these people. I suppose the Crown in that case is not legally liable, even on the report of this commissioner; and it is only as a matter of grace and favour that this vote is being put before the House at the present time. But I rose merely for the purpose of contrasting the consideration granted to these men with the utter lack of consideration granted to the men of whom I have spoken, who have been for three years asking for the right to file a petition in the Exchequer Court for the purpose of obtaining only their rights, and for no favour or grace of any kind whatever.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was there any reason why there should have been a special commissioner in this case, or why it should not have been tried in the Exchequer Court? I understand that a fiat had been offered to these gentlemen for a number of years. If they had a legal claim, I cannot see why it was not referred to the judge of the Exchequer Court, and it looks as if they were afraid to go before him, and wanted a special commissioner who might be more favourable to them. Is there any reason why it should not have gone to the Exchequer Court ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. So far as I have been able to form an opinion, I do not think they would have had much chance of succeeding purely on legal grounds, and I think it was a wise act on the part of the government, if the matter was to be considered at all, to refer it to a judge of the High Court to take evidence; and he has found that the

department were not in possession of all the knowledge they should have had, or perhaps their decision would have been different. I think it is rather commendable than otherwise that the matter was taken away from here and referred to a judge who was altogether independent.

Mr. BENNETT. It is simply like kicking a dead cat to discuss the matter now, because the minister is not at all responsible for what has been done, and I suppose the government are bound by the finding of the judge. But I can only say that if the last Minister of Marine and Fisheries were standing here and trying to get this vote through, it would certainly be a matter of wonderment why this claim, if it was a fair and honest claim, was allowed to stand for five years without any action being taken in regard to it. It was not because the claim was not pressed, because the Nobles were haunting the corridors for weeks endeavouring to get this claim through.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the Minister of Justice considered whether the report of the commissioner discloses any legal liability on the part of the Crown?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have not looked into the matter very fully. According to the report, the whole proceedings were the result of a conspiracy started by this man Elliott. The learned judge finds that the fishery overseer deliberately plotted to bring about the ruin of the Nobles in accordance with threats which he had previously made to outside parties, and he goes on to say :

In my opinion, if the facts as they have been made to appear before me in the sworn testimony of many of the witnesses, and in the exhibts filed, had been present to the mind of the minister, such severe treatment would not have been dealt out to the Nobles. The seizure would have been abandoned.

Then he goes on to say:

The said overseer Elliott acted in bad faith, with malice and with a desire to injure and destroy the business of the said Nobles. He wilfully made false and misleading reports to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

He further goes on:

I find that the evidence given before me by the said Elliott was not given with candour or truth, and I distributed it when in conflict with the evidence of reputable witnesses.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Might I ask, is that officer Elliott still in the service of the government ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not know.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I think he is, and I wish to state that he is just as reputable as any judge who took evidence concerning him.

Hon. Mr. SUTHERLAND (Oxford).

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Then I find it stated that they pleaded guilty, and a witness who was examined before the commissioner, a man named Long, said that they pleaded guilty on an undertaking being practically given to them by a solicitor of the government at the time, that the result of a plea of guilty would be a favourable report to the Minister of Marine at Ottawa, and that this would restore them to their former standing. It seems to me, under all the circumstances, that there was something sufficiently peculiar in the whole case to justify the action of the department in referring it to the commissioner.

Mr. BENNETT. I have not gone into the evidence fully, but it will be borne out by the report that there was one conviction got against these people. Let me ask the Minister of Justice how he reconciles these facts, that there was a sweeping condemnation of the witness Elliott by the inspector, and that there was leave and license for the solicitor of the Noble Brothers to say what he liked to this man. Time and again it appears that after the witness gave his evidence frankly and candidly—and I searched all through the evidence in vain to see where the commissioners remonstrated with him for not telling the truth—Mr. Osler charged him with having stated a series of deliberate lies. The commission did not seem to have any air or dignity about it at all events. If the commissioners had the evidence of such a gross conspiracy against the unfortunate Noble Brothers, how is it that Sir Louis Davies could not find a tittle of proof to establish such a conspiracy in spite of all the efforts of so able a counsel as Mr. Osler. Take all the evidence before Judge Johnson and Mr. Wilmot, before whom Mr. Osler appeared on behalf of the Noble Brothers, and it is quite clear that Mr. Osler failed to make any proof that would justify Sir Louis Davies in concluding that there was anything savouring of conspiracy. This fact stands out strongly, that with all this evidence before him, Sir Louis Davies refrained during five years from naming any other inquiry. In every section of the country where the Noble Brothers are known, it will be agreed that it was not a question of merit or justice, but rather a question of political pull.

To pay the estate of the late Captain W. H. Smith, R.N.R., for travelling expenses incurred by him on government business while holding the position of chairman of the Board of Examiners of Masters and Mates, and Inquiries into Wrecks, between January, 1893, and December, 1900, Captain Smith having failed to render his accounts for such expenses each year, $3,691.69.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that Captain Smith was engaged holding inquiries and was not paid his travelling expenses and I think they ought to be paid.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We made a very careful investigation. The officer of the department at Halifax, Mr. Tremaine, looked into the matter, and gave his affidavit that Captain Smith never collected his travelling expenses and that the amount was legally due.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 12.20 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 6, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 160) to incorporate the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Union Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Ingram.

SALARIES OF THE FRENCH TRANSLATORS OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. L. N. CHAMPAGNE (Wright) moved that the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of this House during the present session, be now concurred in. He said: The report speaks for itself. It recommends:

1. That the salary, viz., $1,200, now paid to Mr. Wilfrid Larose for his services as Chief Translator of the Debates be increased to $2,000 per annum, it being understood that the said chief translator shall, as heretofore, be responsible for the management of the office and the making of the index to the French edition of the Debates.

2. That the present salary of $1,000 paid to each member of the staff of translators of the Debates, be increased to $1,500 per annum.

3. That the above mentioned increases date from the beginning of the present session.

As chairman of the Debates Committee, a few words of explanation from myself may be required in support of the action which has been taken by the committee. These employees have been petitioning the committee for a couple of years for an increase of salary. They came before the committee last year and put their claims before us. The question was fully discussed, but it was thought advisable at that time to postpone the matter. They came before the committee again this year urging that they were entitled to an increase of salary, that the salary which was allowed them was not in proportion to the salaries given to other officers of this House, and that for all the reasons set forth in their petition, they were entitled to an increase. After having fully considered the matter, the members of the committee unanimously came to the conclusion that they were entitled to some increase. The translators asked for an increase of $1,000, which would mean a salary of $2,000 a year. The committee granted them an increase of $500, which would mean a salary of $1,500 a year; this decision was unanimously arrived at by the committee, and we now come before the House and the government asking that the necessary appropriation be made. I need not remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that unless exceptional reasons of a serious character can be shown to the contrary, the report of the committee ought to be adopted. I think that rule has been laid down before the House and accepted on many occasions. This committee have thought fit to recommend to the House and to the government an increase in the salary of these employees. If the government wish to take control of these employees, well and good, I for one as chairman of the committee would not have the slightest objection; but so long as they remain under the control of the Debates Committee the suggestions of that committee with respect to their position ought be endorsed by the House and the government. I may perhaps be permitted to remind the House of the expression of opinion which was given on the subject as far back as 1884, by members of the House and members of the government, who stated at that time that these translators were deserving of more salary than they were getting. I might quote Mr. Coursol, Sir Hector Langevin and the Hon. Edward Blake, who expressed the opinion that these gentlemen were not sufficiently rewarded for their services. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will take steps to carry the recommendation of the committee into effect. We may be told that it is rather late in the session. But I may say that in 1900 we came before the House with a report recommending that the remuneration of these translators be increased by $250 on account of the unusual length of that session. It was not then considered too late in the session to take action. The report was adopted by the House on July 17, and prorogation took place the next day. I have no doubt, that if the government desire to be fair towards these gentlemen they will take the necessary means, either by inserting an item in the supplementary estimates or otherwise, to give them the increase to which we think they are entitled.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Mr. Speaker, this question of the indemnity

which is allowed to the translators is not a new one, because I remember very well that for the last ten or twelve years, or since I have been a member of the Debates Committee, this same question has been brought to our attention. Though the committee felt they would be justified in recommending an increase of salary to these gentlemen at a time, I may say, when the work performed by some of them was not satisfactory, the committee did not take action on account of a certain element that then was on the Board of Translators, and on account of the dissatisfaction which they had created by the work they were performing. The whole board, I may say, has since been reorganized. We have now men who are perfectly qualified to do the work, who do the work and do it well. The fact of the matter is that for two or three years we have had a translation that is remarkably good and very acceptable to hon. members. The committee, having looked into the matter, have thought that now was the time to do justice to these gentlemen. What are they recommending? The committee are recommending that these gentlemen should be paid on an average the sum of $1,500, which is not beyond the maximum salary of a second class clerk. I believe that this House will be generous enough to pay these men, who are all men of high standing in literature, at least a salary equivalent to that of a second class clerk employed by the government or by this House. I believe, Sir, that though this may appear to be a pretty stiff increase, the committee has thought proper to fix at once such an indemnity to be given to these gentlemen as that they would not come back next year or the year after for a further increase. We want to settle the question for once and for all, and I think we have done so. I hope that the government and the House will approve of the work of the committee and adopt the report which is now placed before them.

Mr. FLINT. May I ask the hon. member for Wright (Mr. Champagne) if this is the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. CHAMPAGNE. Yes.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I can corroborate the statement made by the hon. chairman of the Debates Committee (Mr. Champagne) that it was the unanimous opinion of the committee, in view of the quality of the work that is now being done by these gentlemen, that an increase should be made in their remuneration. Those who are competent to speak upon the subject say that the work is being better done now than ever before, and more promptly as well, and in view of what has been said by the hon. gentlemen who have just spoken and of the opinion that has prevailed for many years on the part of the committee that these gentlemen are not paid an adequate remuneration for the work they perform, I think it would be very reasonable to make the increase which the committee have asked the House to make. I hope hon. gentlemen will see their way clear to support this report recommending an increase in the remuneration of these gentlemen.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which is more in the hands of the House than it is in the hands of the government. The House has thought proper, and with good reason, to keep in its own hands everything in connection with the reporting of the debates of the House. The reporting is not done under the supervision of the government; it is done directly under the supervision of the House through a committee which is appointed every year for that purpose. The government have no wish to offer any opposition to this recommendation, but the government will be bound to consider carefully the report of the House and give it the proper authority. I may say, personally for myself, as a member of this House, that the present committee which has undertaken for a number of years back to supervise the debates of the House, has done it in a manner that has reflected great credit upon itself. The translation of the debates some years ago was very inadequate, but the committee has adopted a new system altogether, by introducing the competitive system into the appointments. Appointments are not made now for political reasons. They are just made upon merit. Whenever a vacancy occurs applicants are called upon by the committee to pass an examination, and the most successful competitor gets the reward.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. This has done a great deal to improve the translation of the debates. I remember that some years ago it was an annual complaint on the part of the French members that they could not get their reports, and that when they came they were not only late but they came in a very imperfect manner. This year I have not heard a single word of complaint and not only have I not heard any complaint, but there could not be a word of complaint, because, from my own personal knowledge of the translation, it is very well done. I do not think that it could be better done in the short space of time which the staff has to do it in. They are keeping to the point and they are now doing the work in time. They are never behind. For all these considerations, for my part, I would be very glad to favour the adoption of the report. I may say, however, that I am afraid we could not give for this session the desired increase. We are, as we hope, within a few days of prorogation, the estimates are all prepared and

in the hands of the printer to be introduced here at a very early date and it would be extremely awkward and perhaps would retard the blessed day of prorogation if we were to reopen them for this question. With this suggestion and with these observations, I have no objection that the report should be adopted.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 161) respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by letters patent.—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 162) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.

Mr. BOYD. I would like the hon. gentleman to give us an explanation in regard to the changes.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The Bill is simply intended to bring the funds under the control of the department. We have had a good deal of trouble hitherto owing to there being a deficiency in the funds. Various demands have been made on the consolidated revenue fund to make good the accounts in connection with the working of the Act. I do not think that will occur again under the present regulations. The money will go into the consolidated revenue fund and be distributed in the ordinary way. That is the only provision that I have introduced, but there will be certain amendments, of which due notice will be given, of a more important character brought up when the Bill takes its second reading. At the present, I am merely introducing the Bill that is printed and of which notice is given.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CANADA.

Mr. T. G. RODDICK (Montreal, St. Antoine). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to ask my right hon. friend, the First Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether he has any announcement to make to the House in reference to the further consideration of Bill (No. 11) for the establishment of a medical council in Canada. It will be remembered that this Bill was withheld after passing through the committee stage with the exception of one clause, at the distinct request of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. I am very anxious if possible to proceed with the Bill now, because I understand that if it does not reach the Senate to-day or at the latest to-morrow, it will be impossible to have it become law during the present session.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am most anxious to oblige my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) and I will try to give him an opportunity of moving his Bill to-morrow, in the evening. I hope the business of the House will be such as to warrant it, and if both sides desire it of course I shall raise no objection.

THE COASTING TRADE.

House went into committee on the following resolution :—

That it is expedient to amend the law respecting the coasting trade of Canada, and to exclude a foreign-built British ship from that trade unless it has obtained a license, which the Minister of Customs may grant, upon the payment of a duty of twenty-five (25) per cent ad valorem on the fair market value of the ship.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson). This is an amendment to the law by which a foreign-built ship that is going to engage in the coasting trade of Canada shall have to make application for a license, which will be granted upon payment of 25 per cent of the value of the vessel.

Resolution reported.

GENERAL INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 142) further to amend the General Inspecton Act (the Minister of Trade and Commerce) ; read the second time ; considered in Committee ; reported ; read the third time and passed.

PACKING AND SALE OF STAPLE COMMODITIES.

Bill (No. 141) to amend the Act respecting the sale of certain staple commodities (the Minister of Trade and Commerce), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Quite a number of dealers hold stocks of this article for two or three years, and of course the twine they have on hand cannot be stamped under the provisions of this Bill. It would be well to have a saving clause so that dealers will not be penalized under this Act for selling stock which they have on hand.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That is perhaps a good suggestion.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I agree with my hon. friend

(Mr. Taylor) that dealers who are innocent of any wrong-doing should not be punished under this Act. There should be a provision so that it would not apply to the stock of twine on hand.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It does not do to draft these amendments hurriedly, and so I will defer it until the next sitting of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well.

Progress reported.

MOUNTED POLICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 147) to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894 (the Prime Minister) read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Indians, British Columbia—Medical attendance and medicines (Governor General's warrant), $12,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). This was due to an outbreak of small-pox.

North-west Mounted Police, $100,000.

Mr. WILSON. There ought to be an explanation of this additional estimate.

The PRIME MINISTER. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The appropriation last year for the North-west Mounted Police was something like $400,000 or $450,000. This is an appropriation for 500 men at $800 a year. We were not able last year to keep within the appropriation, and this was due to two causes. First, we were obliged to increase the number of stations, as we have a very much larger area than before to police. We have 86 police stations, distributed all over the territories, as compared with 83 in previous years. The largest number of stations are on the boundary between the territories and Montana and Dakota, where we have to keep a larger force on account of the increasing communications between the two sides. Then, in the Macleod district, where there are large ranches, we have a very large force, which we have not been able to decrease. There are also several Indian reserves in this district which require constant supervision. Then we had to put up a new station at the eastern boundary adjoining Manitoba, where railway construction is now going on. We have also to keep up a large number of stations north of the Saskatchewan towards the Mackenzie river. Great Slave Lake is the station furthest north, and probably we will require a new station at the mouth of the Mackenzie. We are covering the whole of the territories, which causes larger expenditure in travelling expenses, as we have to keep our men continually on the move. At Regina we have about 60 men, at some points ten men, at other five, and at the majority of stations one or two men. These men have to be kept moving all the time. If we could keep the men always at the same stations, the expenditure would be very much decreased, but in order to properly police the territories, and keep the force well disciplined, the men have to be constantly on the move. Another cause of increased expenditure is the changes in the force necessitated by the drafts on it to supply men for Africa. The force has proved the best nucleus for the different contingents that went to that country. The material of the force is not better than that obtained elsewhere, but the men have the advantage of experience, and of being accustomed to the use of horses and being able to shift for themselves under all circumstances. For the last three years we have been depleting the force on this account and taking in raw recruits, who had to be instructed, and could not give as good service as the veterans. This has obliged us to keep up a system of recruiting, and a system of moving the men about more than would otherwise have been necessary.

Department of the Interior—contingencies—printing and stationery, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The department sent its deputy to England in connection with immigration, and he found it necessary to expend $35,000 for printing and advertising. On account of the considerably larger number this year than usual of immigrants from the United States and foreign countries, we have to spend $10,000 more in various items than we did last year. It will take about $10,000 to cover the additional expenditure.

Mr. WILSON. Would the hon. Minister give the statement I asked for, showing the salaries of the immigration agents in Great Britain and Ireland, the United States, and on the continent ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The following is the list :

United States—

M. V. McInnes, agent, Detroit	$1,800
F. S. Longworth, clerk, Detroit	750
C. A. Laurier, agent, Michigan	1,200
Benj. Davies, agent, St. Paul	1,500
Miss M. Dass, clerk, St. Paul	600
Chas. Pilling, agent, St. Paul	1,200
E. T. Holmes, agent, Indiana	1,200
C. O. Swanson, agent, Eastern States	1,500
T. O. Currie, agent, Wisconsin	1,200
J. M. MacLachlan, agent, Wisconsin	900
Jos. Young, agent, Ohio	1,200
Jas. Grieve, agent, Michigan	1,500
J. S. Crawford, agent, Missouri	900
W. H. Rogers, agent, South Dakota	1,200
W. V. Bennett, agent, Nebraska	1,200
J. C. Duncan, agent, Nebraska	900

C. J. Broughton, agent, Chicago	$ 900
W. J. White, inspector, &c.	2,200
R. A. Burriss, agent, Port Arthur	1,200
Alex. Ribout, agent, Mattawa	900
Rev. M. Blais, repatriation agent	600
Rev. H. L. Vachon, repatriation agent	500
Damase Gauthier, agent, Eastern States	1,000
H. M. Williams, agent, Ohio	1,200
Great Britain and Ireland—	
W. T. R. Preston, inspector	3,000
C. F. Just, clerk, Mr. Preston's office	1,800
C. R. Devlin, agent, Ireland	3,000
H. M. Murray, agent, Scotland	2,000
G. H. Mitchell, agent, Liverpool	1,200
J. C. Hardy, clerk, Liverpool	1,000
A. F. Jury, agent, England	1,800
E. O'Kelly, agent, Ireland	1,800
W. L. Griffith, agent, Wales	1,800
Thomas Duncan, agent, Scotland	1,500
John Webster, agent, Ireland	1,200
Continent—	
T. D. de Coeli, agent, Belgium	1,200
S. Brinjolfson, agent, Iceland	1,200

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the minister would tell us on what principle he grades the salaries. He is paying men all the way from $500 to $3,000 a year, and he ought to be able to explain how he arrives at the amount in each case.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are supposed to be paid according to their capacity and ability to do the work. If salaries are raised it is because of satisfactory and efficient service, just as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson) would raise the salary of an efficient man who was working for him.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think that is a very satisfactory explanation. Mr. Devlin, for instance, is only an ordinary immigration agent in Ireland—at least, that is the statement made in this House and to the committee ; yet he is paid $3,000 a year. Yet, Mr. Preston, who has charge of the whole business over there, is only getting the same salary. The deputy minister, who is at the head of the whole department, only gets $200 a year more than Mr. Devlin, while the superintendant of immigration gets $500 less. It does seem to me there ought to be some explanation why a man who is given a small territory should be thus singled out. I recollect very well the minister's speech when this was up before the House on a former occasion, when he spoke of Mr. Devlin's great ability. But if this officer is such an able man, surely the minister ought to give him something else to do than to fill the place of immigration agent in a small territory, from which, as I am reminded by an hon. friend near me, he secures but few immigrants anyway. The expenditure on the service in Ireland was about $18,000, and, according to Mr. Devlin's own report, the immigrants he and his fellow agents secured from Ireland numbered only 953. I must say that the explanation is not at all satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman has several times asked me the same question, and I have given him about the same answer. It has not been satisfactory to him, apparently, in the past, so I can hardly say I am much disappointed that he is not wholly pleased now. I do not think the hon. gentleman can get a man of Mr. Devlin's ability and capacity to give his services——

Mr. WILSON. Will the minister excuse me if I interrupt him ? Why then does he not give Mr. Devlin a position where he can display his abilities, and earn the salary that he is giving him, instead of putting him in an out of the way place——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We put him where we think he can do the best work.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. I attended the meeting of the committee, and heard the report of the deputy minister in connection with immigration. And, as a new member of the House, I was very much pleased with the arrangements made for England, Ireland and Scotland, as explained by the deputy minister. As our effort is to settle a new country, much depends upon our immigration policy, and the way it is carried out. We find that, in some cases, immigrants make a great deal of trouble, because they are not the right kind of people for us. It is an old saying that an empty house is better than a bad tenant, and I think I would rather have our land unoccupied than to have it settled by some classes of immigrants. The work of the department, as far as I can judge, is well done. There is a great deal of work ahead for the men engaged in this service, and the future of Canada depends in no small measure on the way that work is done.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Devlin is described by the minister as a very clever man and an efficient officer. It seems a little strange to me that before the deputy minister went to England to rearrange the whole system, he gave Mr. Devlin two months' leave of absence,—the result being that when the deputy minister was in England Mr. Devlin was in Canada. If Mr. Devlin is so able a man as he is represented to be, surely it would be greatly to the advantage of the service for the deputy minister to meet him, talk matters over with him, and get his help in making arrangements for the future. Strange to say, the officials of this government are very anxious to have the whole Atlantic between Mr. Devlin and themselves.

Geological Survey—To provide for the salary of a geologist to accompany the International Boundary Survey from July 1, 1901, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are surveying the boundary line between the province of British Columbia and

the United States. This necessitates the sending out of an expensively equipped party. We save a good deal of money by geological examination at the same time. We send a geologist along with the boundary survey party, instead of later on sending a geologist with a party of his own. I have secured the services of a very competent man, Mr. Daly, who is a Canadian by birth, but has been connected with Harvard University.

Mr. WILSON. Has he been employed since the 1st July, 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He has been employed since last season. He was paid out of the Geological Survey vote last year.

Mr. WILSON. I have known Dr. Daly for a long time—in fact, I think he was born in our town. He has taken a very high position at college, and is a worthy man, and I have no doubt he will make a most efficient officer. I am delighted to think that our young Canadians are employed in the high places in our own government departments.

Government of the North-west Territories—additional amount required for registrars, $1,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Please explain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount of work in the registry office in the North-west Territories is increasing very rapidly, owing to the improvement in settlement and the general increase in the number of transfers, and the registration of patents. An inspection was made by an officer of the department some time ago, and it was found the work was falling behind, and we had to employ some temporary assistance. Although we shall have to increase the staff considerably, it does not involve any additional burden upon the exchequer, because there are increased profits, and in proportion as the work increases the profits increase.

Additional grant for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c., for the half year from January 1 to June 30, 1902, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That $50,000 is a subsidy to the North-west Territories. Hon. gentlemen will remember that we had quite a lengthy debate in Committee of Supply during this session upon the subject of the financial requirements of the North-west Territories. I think the sense of the committee generally on both sides of the House was that something further should be done than had theretofore been contemplated by the government. The information furnished us is to the effect that the North-west government, perhaps unwisely, have to a considerable extent anticipated their revenue for the present six months, and that they will be seriously embarrassed in carrying on their business if they do not get some relief for the first six months of this year. The money voted in the main estimates as a subsidy for the North-west Territories only becomes available on the 1st of July. But their fiscal year corresponds with the calendar year, and therefore the increase in the subsidies which we are voting them will not take effect practically until the middle of this year, and will not be available for the whole of this year. We have thought it well to make it effective for the whole of the calendar year by voting one-half the amount in the supplementary estimates for the current fiscal year, which will apply to the six months between the 1st of January and the 1st of July.

Mr. WILSON. Do you hand this money over to the North-west government ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, just the same as a subsidy, and they deal with it themselves.

Dominion Lands—chargeable to capital—further amount required for surveys, $80,000.

Mr. BOYD. There is a question or two I wish to discuss with the minister, and they can come under this head I think. I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to pay over certain moneys to the provincial government of Manitoba, certain accrued interests, and if it will be necessary to introduce legislation in order to do that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not in a position to say positively. I know it has been decided to pay the money over, and I think the Department of Justice is considering whether legislation is required. I can see the Minister of Justice and give an answer this afternoon.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I understand a deputation waited on the minister when he was in Winnipeg, and he promised to pay this interest ; but I think he also told them that legislation would be necessary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is quite true ; I remember saying on different occasions that legislation might be necessary, and my recollection is that the question was referred to the Department of Justice.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think I can satisfy my hon. friend about this. The matter is in the hands of the Department of Justice at this moment. I understand their opinion is that it is simply a matter of book-keeping ; it is not money of this country, it is money that belongs to the province of Manitoba.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). That means that no legislation is required ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no final report, but that is my impression now. At all events, the matter has not been forgotten, we are dealing with it.

Mr. BOYD. There is another question in regard to the sale of school lands that took place some time ago in Manitoba. I would like to know if the minister could tell me how many of those sales he has cancelled ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is not a question which I can answer now. But there is no difficulty about ascertaining the number of sales cancelled, the names and the parcels of land referred to, and I can give the information tomorrow.

Mr. BOYD. There is a certain sale I wish to discuss with the minister, that is the sale of the North-west quarter of section 11, 8-14 west. Has the minister any information regarding that particular sale to show whether a man named Thornbury gets that land ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I could not answer a question like that without looking at the records. I can tell the hon. gentleman this afternoon.

Mr. BOYD. We will drop that for the present. Then there is another question regarding the interest on the sales of school lands, which interest was lowered from 6 per cent to 5 per cent. Now, as we understand it in Manitoba, and as the Premier has said, the money, or the land either for that matter, does not belong to this government, they are merely acting as trustees. Well, those lands have been sold in the past, and on the last sale that took place it was advertised that the interest should be 6 per cent. By an Act passed last session that interest was lowered to 5 per cent. The Minister of the Interior, in his speech last session, said that the interest on Dominion lands should be lowered to 5 per cent. Well, the school lands are not looked upon as Dominion lands, and when the minister made that statement in the House last session it was not understood that it was to affect the sale of school lands. The effect of that arrangement is to take $25,000 a year out of the funds of the province of Manitoba ; and the effect on the last sale has been that the men who bought those lands expecting to have to pay 6 per cent find that, by the generosity of this government, they only have to pay 5 per cent. I think that the government of Manitoba and those of the people who are not benefited feel that they are losing to that extent. If those people who bought the land were aware that this was to take effect and that they were to be affected benefically by it they certainly had information that enabled them to pay higher prices for the land than others who were under the impression, that, according to the advertisement, the rate of interest was going to be 6 per cent.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is a question whether or not the Act which was passed last session applies to school lands as well as to Dominion lands. I supposed it would be applied to all lands sold by the government. In the matter of school lands we are trustees of the fund, we administer it and we are bound to pay the interest over to the provincial government. Of course, if the interest is at the rate of 5 per cent instead of 6 per cent, the provincial government will lose that much, but the settlers will gain that much. I do not think it would be conducive to any good result if one class of lands were sold at 5 per cent, and another class at 6 per cent. I think the rate ought to be equal generally. My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) knows that the rate of interest is not like the laws of the Medes and Persians; it is not eternal, it is largely the result of the conditions of the country, and as the country improves and progresses the rate of interest decreases. I am very glad to say that that is the condition in Manitoba to-day. There is no intention of injuring anybody, no intention of doing any wrong to the government of the province of Manitoba, but my hon. friend, I think, will agree that lands ought to be sold to settlers on the most favourable conditions. I would be surprised to hear him ask us to restore the old rate of 6 per cent. I should think that he would rather have the lands sold at 5 per cent, and if possible at 4 per cent. I am quite sure that it was never the intention of the legislature, that, when it created the trust in respect to these lands in 1872, the rate of interest should remain for ever at 6 per cent. It was intended that the rate of interest should move with the times. The rate of interest is now placed at 5 per cent and I hope that the time will come in Manitoba when we shall be able to sell land, not at 5 per cent, but at 4 per cent and at 3 per cent even. I hope the condition of the country will warrant such a result and that as the country advances and progresses that it will become possible. But, as to the rate at present, there can be no discrimination between school lands and lands sold for settlers. There would be great discontent if two men went to a land agent to buy land and one man bought a pre-emption at 5 per cent while his neighbour bought school lands at 6 per cent. Such a discrimination would lead to discontent and it would not be in the public interest.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has admitted that the Dominion government are only acting as trustees for the Manitoba government so far as school lands are concerned. In that case I think it would have been only proper and fair to have consulted

the provincial authorities as to the reduction in the rate of interest when they were acting as trustees. The Dominion government have reduced the rate of interest without consulting the local authorities in Manitoba. These school lands do not belong to the Dominion government, they are simply acting as trustees and I think it would only have been proper to have consulted the local legislature as to the reduction in the rate of interest. From one point of view what the right hon. gentleman says may be correct. If it is the settler who derives the benefit there would not be very much objection, but that is a disputed point, because, at any sales of school lands, speculators have been the purchasers and they have derived the benefit. If we were assured that the settlers would derive the benefit of the reduction in the rate of interest we would not object, but these speculators have purchased the lands and they have derived the benefit. We would not object so much to the reduction of interest in the interest of the settler, but so far as making the reduction was concerned, I think it was not fair to include sales that had already taken place because the purchasers bought under certain terms knowing that they would have to pay 6 per cent. We object to an Act of parliament being made to apply to past sales and we also say that the provincial authorities should have been consulted before any reduction in the rate of interest was made as this reduction entails a loss of $25,000 per annum to the province.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The statement was made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche), and it certainly has been made in criticising this transaction in other places, that the beneficiaries of the change in the rate of interest were the speculators who purchased the land. There is absolutely no foundation for that statement. I have at this moment figures in my possession which prove that practically all the land that was affected, almost all with the most trifling exceptions, was purchased by actual settlers, men who live either on the adjoining land or in the neighborhood of such land, so that the reduction in the rate of interest has enured, practically, almost without exception, to the benefit of actual farmers and settlers in the neighbourhood. I need only say one word as to the question of what the obligation of the government is. I have always taken the position that the province ought to benefit as largely as possible by this fund. I have always taken a strong position in that respect. I very cordially favour the province deriving the largest possible benefit from the fund. In regard to the money we were discussing a moment ago, that is the interest accruing on the deferred payments, I very cordially favour that accruing to the province to the greatest possible extent. But, it must be remembered that this government have been charged with a duty in connection with the management of this fund. The province is not responsible in any way. We are responsible for the rate of interest charged against the people who purchase the land, and for my part, I think, in view of the general reduction in the rate of interest all over the country, a reduction from 6 to 5 per cent, it would have been quite indefensible, it would have been taking a position quite impossible to satisfactorily explain or defend, if we had still required persons who are owing us in connection with these sales, to have paid 6 per cent. I am quite satisfied, speaking as the head of the department, that the result simply would have been that there would have been an interminable correspondence with persons who had purchased that land making claims for refunds on the ground that they had not been fairly treated, with the result that somebody ultimately would have had to have given way. I felt that the question should be considered. I think the change will prove a benefit to the provincial government in the long run. I believe the reduction will produce more money because the principal money will be larger by reason of increased sales and this will more than counterbalance any reduction in the rate of interest. Whether that is so or not, I think my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) will agree with me that the action of the government in reducing the rate of interest from 6 to 5 per cent has been worth a great deal of money to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories in view of the general effect it has had in the reduction of interest, because, as the hon. gentleman knows, the amount payable in interest by the people of the west is a very heavy charge.

Allowance to L. E. Fontaine for injuries sustained in the discharge of his duty $1,654.75.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This man was accidentally shot through his tent by one of the hands in connection with a party and we have allowed him his pay for the portion of the season when he was unable to perform his duty on account of being disabled.

To provide for a gratuity to the widow and family of the late Nathan White, accidentally killed by a government employee when on duty in 1892, $750.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is a case that was brought before me four or five times and I finally came to the conclusion that it ought to be dealt with—the case of a man who was shot by an officer of the geological survey. He was sent out by the department to make collections, and he hired Nathan White to convey him from place to place, and when the officer was getting out of the rig his pistol went off and White was instantly killed. The matter was brought before me

a number of times and perhaps I did not understand it as fully as I should. However, it was insisted upon and I became convinced that this amount would not be too much.

Mr. TAYLOR. Under the circumstances the amount is quite too small for the loss of a husband and father.

Relief of destitute settlers in Saskatchewan, $5,000.

Mr. WILSON. Please explain this.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A flood occurred a year ago at Isle of the Cross in the northern portion of the territory. One of our inspectors whom we sent there reported that owing to the flood the settlers had been driven from their homes, their crops destroyed, and they were in the greatest possible distress. To save them from starvation our officer made an arrangement with the Hudson Bay Company to give them such provisions as were absolutely necessary. We have not got the bill but we expect that it will be about this amount.

Mr. WILSON. What kind of settlers were they ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Half-breeds.

Mr. WILSON. I do not think that any one can object to the vote under the circumstances.

Relief of destitute miners, Dease and Liard rivers, $4,364.23.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This is the balance which we think is properly due to the Hudson Bay Company. The company claimed a good deal more and I referred their claim to Mr. Stevenson, inspector of Dominion lands, who is a good accountant, and to the deputy minister, and they reported that this sum should pay the balance due. The company was not satisfied and they have taken the matter to court.

Mr. WILSON. How much was paid ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They claimed $10,000 more, but I could not admit it in the face of the report of my officers. If they prove it in court of course we will have to pay it.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to know from the minister what quantity of swamp lands has been examined by his officers ; the number of acres that are due the provincial government, and the number of acres that have been handed over already ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will get that information in the morning.

Excise, $7,000.

Mr. BOYD. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to the importance of doing something with reference to the weighing of grain coming from the threshing machine. This is a matter which is of much greater importance than the department seems to think, and I just wish to refer to a case which occurred in court on account of this. This clipping is from the 'North-west Farmer.'

At Nepawa the other day, John H. Howard sued T. Poole and John Ducklow, for his threshing bill. Both of them set up the usual defence that the grain was not measured in accordance with the Dominion statutes, and therefore they could get from under their obligation to pay for the work. This defence of course blocked the court from dealing with the case on its merits, and the plaintiff was nonsuited.

As I have mentioned to the House before, it is altogether impossible to deal with these threshing machines and measure the grain according to the standard prescribed by the department. You could scarcely put enough men with bushel measures around one of these threshing machines, which put out from 2,000 to 3,000 bushels in a day, to measure the grain. These machines are provided with automatic measuring appliances, and I think the government should instruct their officers to use these before the next crop is threshed, so that this injustice may be removed. It does not matter what bargain a man may make with the owner of a threshing machine, all he has to do is to fall back on the plea that the grain was not weighed according to the Dominion statutes, and refuse to pay. Here are two men who avoided payment in this way, although they understood perfectly the system and the bargain that was made with them. It is a great injustice, and it will be a great hindrance to the country if we have to go back to the primitive style of handling grain by means of the ordinary bushel measure.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Some years ago one of our inspectors was instructed to inspect one of these weighing machines, and it was found to be so imperfect that he would not certify to its results ; but recently I have received information that within a short time a proper scale will be perfected, for attachment to weighing machines, and will be ready for use next season. Some weeks ago a manufacturer of these weighing machines was in the department, and from the way he spoke, and from information which we have received from our own officers in Winnipeg, we are in a position to state that within a few months, or before next session opens, that difficulty will be remedied.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). The last time I had a conversation with the hon. minister

he mentioned that an officer of his in Winnipeg was coming to Ottawa with a new machine. Has he arrived yet ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Not yet. We expect him within the next week or two. He says that the weighing machine, to the best of his belief, is perfect, and will be ready to be attached to threshing machines within a few months.

Militia—annual drill and musketry, including clothing and stores ; further amount required $200,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is the usual vote for drill for the balance of the current year. It is the custom to divide the vote into two parts—$275,000 in the main estimates and $125,000 in the supplementaries. Then, there is a supplementary vote for clothing and a supplementary vote for stores. This year I have put the three votes together in order to afford a little more elasticity, so that if a smaller amount happens to be used for annual drill, a larger amount will be available for clothing and stores, as we are endeavouring to increase our supplies of clothing and stores in order to establish a reserve. Now that we have a large store building completed in Ottawa, it is very desirable that we should have a larger reserve than we have. This vote of $200,000 is less than the amounts voted for similar purposes last year.

Mr. WILSON. Can the hon. minister state what portion of this is for clothing and what portion for drill ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. $125,000 is the usual amount for drill, and about $75,000 is for clothing and stores, but I do not wish it to be understood that all of the vote for annual drill will be used. If not, the balance may be used for clothing and stores.

Militia—salaries and wages ; further amount required, $14,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This sum is required on account of the increased wages paid. Most of the men who have been getting $1 a day now get $1.25 or $1.50. We could not retain them without increasing their pay.

Mr. WILSON. What is their business ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Taking care of the stores, rifle ranges, drill halls, &c., all over the country. During the current year we have appointed a man at London to take care of the rifle range, a man at Brockville to take care of the drill hall, a man at St. John to take care of the rifle range, a man at Springhill to take care of the armoury, and a man at Kentville to take care of the armoury.

Mr. WILSON. Do you have men employed by the year to take care of armouries ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes.

Mr. WILSON. You do not pay officers for that ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Some retired officers have been given places of that kind, but officers in the active militia are not supposed to do work of that kind. It is generally given to a sergeant or some man who has served a long time in the militia.

Mr. WILSON. This is just taking care of the rifles.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Rifles, armouries, rifle ranges and stores.

Mr. WILSON. I thought that in our district we gave them to the captain of the company.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The old system in the country districts was to give each captain $40 for taking care of the arms, and he found a place to keep them and paid a man for cleaning them. But this is a different thing. Where there is a central armoury, a man has to be employed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it the intention to hold the camps in June this year ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I am not quite sure that all the camps will be held then. The cavalry and field artillery will be drilled this year to their full strength in June, and of course the drill in the cities will go on as before, and a considerable portion of this money will go for this purpose.

Military properties, including $25,000 for walls at Quebec—further amount required, $50,309.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The estimate I have here for the fortification walls at Quebec is $23,111, and other expenditures at Kingston, $1,650. The expenditure at Charlottetown for fitting up the garrison artillery building is $546. Repairs to the port of Annapolis, N.S., $234. Toronto annex to drill hall, $300. Alterations of drill hall, $300. Fitting up field hospital, battery corps and artillery, $200. Winnipeg, urgent plumbing, $200. Montreal drill hall, $2,000. Fitting up armoury, $2,000. To complete rifle range, $9,000. Ottawa rifle range, $2,000.

Contingencies—further amount required, $4,500.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is simply to reimburse

the department for the amount paid over to the troops in connection with the Valleyfield riots. Proceedings were taken to collect that money from the town, but in the meantime the men had to be paid and were paid out of contingencies. There was no other way of paying them.

Mr. WILSON. From whom are you trying to collect the money ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. From the town.

Mr. WILSON. Pretty hard on the town.

Royal Military College—further amount required, $10,580.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is for the installation of an electric light plant which will result in a saving of $1,346. The present annual cost of lighting the college is $2,400. The light is purchased from the town. When this light is installed, the annual cost will be $1,054, considerably less than half the present cost.

Mr. WILSON. Did you try to make an arrangement with the town ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, and could not succeed.

Dominion Arsenal—further amount required, $31,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is to cover the cost of repairs to batteries returned from South Africa, and of repairs to other artillery and other expenses. It includes also the cost of manufacturing one million rounds of gallery practice cartridges, $5,000, and the installation of an electric light at Quebec cartridge factory, $4,750. It was thought advisable that during alteration and repairs an independent plant should be installed.

Defence of Esquimalt—further amount required, $4,867.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is in accord with the arrangement made with the imperial government.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it not agreed that Canada should pay a fixed sum and was not that amount asked in the last estimate ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There was some question as to whether this amount should be paid by us or not. We took the view that it should not, but after negotiations and correspondence with the War Office it was decided that we should pay this amount. This really covers the amount for two years. Two thousand four hundred dollars is the amount. There is no question of our liability to pay it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was not the understanding for a fixed amount, and did not the minister ask last year for a fixed sum ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. In addition to that there was the maintenance of works, &c., which we thought was included in the amount assured by us, but it appeared on further investigation that the cost of maintenance was not included, and this is an estimate to cover that.

Medals, $8,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What class of medals ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. This is for the colonial auxiliary force long service medal and the long service decoration now being distributed.

Allowance of family of Major Hurdman during his services in South Africa, $779.64.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Under the law by which the $2,000,000 were granted for the contingents in South Africa, there was a provision to pay the wives of the officers serving there half pay. Major Hurdman's wife, unfortunately, died shortly before that, and the family did not get the benefit. Under the law, the Justice Department has informed me, we could not pay the amount. It seems only fair that this should be paid.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

Militia—chargeable to income—towards the expenses of the contingent of Canadian militia attending the Coronation of His Majesty, $30,000.

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The total estimated expense of this contingent is $80,000. We are asking for $30,000 to be expended in the current year ending 1st July next, and, in the supplementary estimates for next year, which are to be brought down in a day or two, there will be an item for $50,000. The estimate is made up in this way: A contract has been made with the Allans to convey the contingent from Quebec to Liverpool and back, at $50 each for the men and $120 each for the officers. There will be 580 men and 22 officers. The transportation across the ocean will cost, therefore, in round numbers, $30,000. Railway transportation to Quebec, the point at which the force will be mobilized, together with subsistence in transit, is expected to cost $15,000. Pay for 45 days is estimated at $17,000. As for clothing, of course the ordinary militia clothing will be used, but, in some cases we shall need to make alterations and also to issue new clothing. The cost of this is estimated at $10,000. Contingencies will take about $8,000. These items make a total of $80,000. I may say that the Jubilee

Contingent cost $30,000. It was made up of something over 200 officers and men. In this case, there will be a little over 600 officers and men.

Mr. SPROULE. How is the contingent to be composed ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The contingent has not been made up yet, but I think I can give pretty full information on that point. In the first place, there will be 300 mounted men and 280 infantry. The mounted body will be made up of 25 men from the North-west Mounted Police, 25 from Strathcona's Horse, and the balance from the cavalry, mounted rifles and field artillery. The infantry will be made up from the different branches of infantry and the garrison artillery, the infantry being composed of guards, fusiliers, highlanders and rifles. In addition to this we shall endeavour to have every branch of the service represented. There will be a representation of the bearer companies, the field hospital corps, the engineers and the new branch of the service, the army service corps, which has recently been organized.

Mr. SPROULE. What proportion of these men will be drawn from each province, and how will they be taken ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. They will be taken from each unit. The average number from the infantry is exactly one and three-quarters from each regiment. This will mean, of course, that the larger regiments will send two men each and the smaller regiments one man each. The squadrons of cavalry will get, I think, four men each, because the number of mounted men is larger in proportion than the number of infantry.

Mr. SPROULE. Who will select the men?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The men will be selected by the district officer commanding in each district.

Mr. BELL. What officers are sent ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. There will be one lieutenant-colonel, two majors, one adjutant and also three officers for each 100 men, that is, eighteen besides the four I have mentioned, or twenty-two officers in all.

Mr. SPROULE. Where will the contingent mobilize, and how long before sailing?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The date of sailing is the 7th of June, by steamship 'Parisian,' from Quebec. The force wil be mobilized at Quebec about the 29th or 30th of May.

Mr. TAYLOR. What pay are the officers and men to receive ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The regular pay of the militia.

Mr. BELL. How do you provide horses for the mounted men ?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. The War Office provides all the horses, 300, together with the artillery, guns and everything. The Militia Department provides clothing, equipment and pay.

Department of Justice—contingencies—sundries, $500.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This $500 under the head of sundries is to provide for the travelling expenses incurred by the Minister of Justice and the deputy minister who were both in England last summer in connection with the conference about the Privy Council.

Department of Customs—contingencies—to pay H. L. Wood, customs officer, for extra work on trade and navigation tables for fiscal year ended June 30, 1900, consequent on the re-arrangement of the customs statistical service (228 hours, at 50 cents) notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $114.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. William Paterson). This is in addition to the salaries of officers who were doing extra work last year in preparing the annual report and the statistical report, and this name was accidentally omitted.

Supreme Court of Canada—allowances to ad hoc judges, $800.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Do I understand that this is going to be paid ? I do not see how it can be paid unless my hon. friend goes on with the Bill which provides for the appointment of assistant judges of the Supreme Court of Canada. I call attention to the fact that there is a pressing necessity that this Bill should be passed this session. There are several cases, I understand, on the list of the Supreme Court in which two of the judges are not competent to sit. They are cases in which the government is interested and upon which these gentlemen passed when they were ministers of the Crown. I would quote a case which is a precedent in these matters. Sir Alexander Lacoste, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals for Quebec, was appointed administrator of that province at a time when the late Lieutanant-Governor, Sir Adolphe Chapleau, was absent. An Order in Council came before him upon which were based contracts between parties and the government. When these contracts were before the courts, or some of them, and suits were taken upon them, Chief Justice Lacoste refused to sit, simply because, when he was administrator, he had signed an Order in Council upon which the contracts were based. It seems to me this is a precedent for cases of this kind in which the administrator had nothing to do but to sign his name as a ministerial act. When questions come up before the Supreme Court involving the validity or invalidity of con-

tracts, or damages upon contracts, which were before the administration when certain gentlemen sat in the council who are now judges of the Supreme Court, these gentlemen should not sit, and I understand they are loath to sit, that they do not want to sit. On the other hand, these are important cases, and it will be delaying the business of the court if they cannot sit. As I said, I think it is very pressing that this Bill should be proceeded with. I quite understand the difficulty, and probably it is not quite proper that the Governor in Council should appoint substitutes or judges ad hoc. But I suggest that that difficulty could be got over in the province of Quebec, for instance, if the judgments under review were judgments that came from the Court of King's Bench, that the Chief Justice of the Superior Court should have the appointing power. If on the other hand, it was a case that came from the Superior Court sitting in review, then the appointing power should be the Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench. I believe the Minister of Justice appreciates the difficulty, and sees that judges of the Supreme Court and who are likely to be called upon to sit on these cases, should not sit, and that some provision should be made for their being replaced.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I quite appreciate the force of all that has been said by my learned friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain). I think it is extremely desirable that we should make provision for the difficulties that he has suggested. No doubt there may be some question arising as to whether some of the members of the Supreme Court should sit in cases before them. My hon. friend will bear in mind that this is a matter which is personal to the judges themselves; it would be for the judge to say whether, under the circumstances, he felt that he ought not to sit in the case. Far from having made up my mind not to press the Bill, on the contrary, the present intention is to press the Bill through during this session. In that view, of course, it is necessary to put this item in the estimates.

Further amount required for judges travelling allowances in Manitoba, $500.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I believe there is a vacancy at present on the bench of Manitoba caused by the elevation of Judge Prendergast to the Supreme Court bench of the North-west Territories. I think about six weeks ago the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRiviere) asked the Minister of Justice if it was the intention of the government to fill that position, and the minister replied that it was the intention to fill that position forthwith. I would ask if the vacancy has been filled, and if not, is it the intention to have it filled at once?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, it is the intention to fill it in the immediate future.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Forthwith?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Practically. I want to wait until the session is over to be able to give the matter a little more consideration.

Further amount required for miscellaneous expenditure including North-west Territories, $6,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The expenditure from the vote of this year has been unusually large during the year owing principally to the following charges:

King vs. Frogg—Keewatin case—$2,894.76; King vs. Wabey, the Indian case which was tried over here in Hull, $1,166.25. The extradition case of Rosebluff and Pariseau, $1,247.04.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was a good year for the lawyers.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. And a bad year for murderers. Increase in cost of maintenance of prisoners in the North-west Territories $2,500, and increase in witness and jury fees, $4,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is a great deal more than $6,000. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how he paid this amount with that amount of money?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The $6,000 simply implements the amount we had already at our disposal. Of course the $6,000 is only part of the amount that we spent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand that. I understand that the $6,000 has been spent already.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There has been a great deal more than $6,000 spent. This $6,000 is merely to implement the amount we have already at our disposal. The $6,000 we are now getting has not been spent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand that perfectly. The hon. minister had a grant for this purpose last year and he has over spent it by $6,000.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. I will have exceeded it at the end of the year by $6,000. We have to provide, in addition to the amount I have mentioned, for trials that have already taken place and we have to make provision for witness and jury fees in the North-west Territories which have been incurred to the extent of $4,000. These accounts have not yet been disposed of. Then, there is the maintenance of prisoners, $2,500. These are additional amounts to those which I have mentioned already.

Additional amount required for witness and jury fees (Governor General's warrant, $12,000), $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. In this case you have obtained money under Governor General's warrants.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Of the amount that is required, there will be taken $13,000 to cover the cost of the disbursements in the case of O'Brien, and there will be for law books, $1,500. Hon. gentlemen will remember having heard of this O'Brien case as one in which O'Brien was convicted of deliberately murdering three men on the trail between the frontier and Dawson city. He had built for himself a shack on the side of the road and he lay in wait for people passing up and down and in this way he succeeded in disposing of three men. The men disappeared in the month of December, 1900, and their bodies were not found until the spring of 1901. It took a very considerable time to get together the evidence necessary to bring the crime home and as a result the expenditures made by the officials were very great. For instance, there was paid in connection with the case for witness and jury fees, $13,233, stenographers fees, $284, and cost of the execution, $586. In addition to that the North-west mounted police were obliged to spend something like $22,000 on the case so that the case will cost the government something in the vicinity of $40,000. But, I think the money was well spent, because it goes to demonstrate the fact that within the limits of Canada, wherever a man may happen to be, life and property are safe and that murderers are invariably tracked and discovered.

Law books, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Do we supply a law library for the North-west Territories ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Not for the North-west Territories. We did until this year. So far as the North-west Territories are concerned, the library at Regina was turned over by a statute passed during this session to the Law Association of the North-west Territories proper. So far as the Yukon is concerned we supply law books for the purposes of the judges.

Mr. SPROULE. How much did we vote for a library there already ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman at present.

To provide for the salary of George W. Dawson, inspector of penitentiaries, from 6th to 30th June, 1902, both inclusive, at $2,600 per annum, $180.55.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you require this item in here. Does he not get a regular salary ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. He gets a regular salary but he was appointed on the 6th June, 1901.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It must be 1901. This is a mistake in the item.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. His year of service will end on the 6th June, 1902. This is to pay for the broken period.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the hon. Minister of Justice say when Mr. Dawson was appointed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. On the 6th June, 1901.

Mr. TAYLOR. And this is a sum which was not paid him for the first part of the month ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The statute says that :

The salary of the second inspector hereby provided for shall be for the first year of his service, $2,600, and thereafter such sum as parliament appropriates for the purpose.

We have to provide for the broken period of the year intervening between the next fiscal year and the end of the year of his appointment.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are his duties ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. His duties are to assist in looking after the penitentiaries throughout the Dominion of Canada generally with Mr. Stewart.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was not one inspector quite sufficient, or was this to provide a fillip for Mr. Dawson ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I do not think it was intended to provide a fillip for Mr. Dawson. From the year 1895 up to last year the inspector of penitentiaries had been so busily engaged here that it was not possible for him to visit the penitentiaries throughout the country. There has been no inspection for four or five years in the penitentiary in New Westminster. It is extremely desirable that the inspector should inspect ; that is to say, that they should visit the penitentiaries throughout the country.

Mr. SPROULE. I presume this is in addition to his travelling allowance ? Could the hon. gentleman tell me what his travelling allowance amounts to for the year ? There is an arrangement, I presume, for travelling allowance ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. There is an arrangement for travelling allowance, but as to the amount which he has disbursed I cannot say. I have other estimates to come down for next year and I will then be prepared to tell my hon. friend what he has disbursed.

To pay the following persons for expenses connected with the Lussier arbitration : E. R. Cameron, $110 ; Miss H. E. Stewart, $5, $115.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What arbitration was that ? I never heard of it.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This farmer lives in the vicinity of St. Vincent de Paul, and owing to a sewer which was constructed by us, his cattle were injured and killed and other damage done and he claimed $4,000. A petition of right was issued, but we thought the speediest way of disposing of the matter was to appoint an officer of the court, and Mr. Cameron, the Registrar of the Supreme Court, after making inquiry, found that Mr. Lussier was entitled to $1,922, which included witness fees, costs, damages and everything.

To pay J. E. Farewell, K.C., balance of costs as solicitor for Judge Dartnell, upon North Ontario recount, $36.91.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How did this come in ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This is in connection with the recount that took place in North Ontario in 1896. A recount was asked for before Judge Dartnell and an injunction was applied for in the High Court asking that he should not proceed with the recount. Judge Dartnell pleaded that he was acting as an officer of the House of Commons and that he could not be restrained by an injunction, which contention was upheld by Judge Robertson. The costs amounted to $66.37, and $29.46 were taxed against Judge Dartnell's side. Judge Dartnell holds that he was not obliged to pay his lawyer, because he was brought into court as an officer of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. My recollection is that there was some dispute as to which judge the recount should be before.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it not a bad precedent to allow a judge cost for anything of this kind ? He has no right to appear by counsel.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I think it is admitted that in all proceedings of this sort an inferior judge would be entitled to counsel. I know that is the case so far as magistrates are concerned.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is the first time that I have ever heard of it in this House.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Let us hope it will be the last.

Mr. SPROULE. Judging by the history of the transaction, it would be well that it should be the last time, because this was a sort of political job throughout. The impression on the public is that it was a little smart Aleck trick for the purpose of holding a seat in this House.

Trent canal—To dredge shoals in Trent and Otonabee rivers, $3,500.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this dredging done by contract or by the government ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are doing it with our own dredge.

Contribution towards building of road between Lindsay and Fenelon Falls, $1,500.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On what principle are you making this contribution ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The old road was flooded by the construction of the canal, and a new road has to be built above the water level, on the line of the old road. That is the recommendation of our engineers and the member representing that county was strongly of opinion that the work was necessary.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On this item I drew the minister's attention to the Poonamalee causeway in the township of Elmsley, which is in a similar position. The principle under which the government makes these contributions is that if any government work causes a portion of a road to be overflowed, which would not be overflowed otherwise, the government makes good that portion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have come to an understanding with the municipalities in such cases as the hon. gentleman mentions, and in other cases in which the raising of the water of the canal has rendered some bridges too short or unfit for use, we make a compromise with the municipalities and agree to bear a part of the cost.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A petition was presented by the municipalities in the township of Elmsley asking for assistance for the repair of a highway which was in existence before the Rideau canal was built. They ask, and I think very fairly, that the government should grant assistance for the repair of the highway to the extent of the damage done by the government. I understand that the officers of the government have inquired into the matter and I want to know what the government intend to do.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the papers, but I will get the information later.

Mr. KEMP. Is it the intention of the government to complete the Trent canal so as to connect the Georgian bay with Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have already under contract the stretch between Lake Simcoe and Balsam lake, but we have not at present concluded that we will carry the work beyond that.

Mr. KEMP. Can the minister say what it will cost to complete the canal through ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Our engineers estimate that it

will cost about $6,500,000 to complete it from end to end. We have expended in round numbers about $3,500,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That gives what depth of water ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Six feet.

Mr. KEMP. Is it the policy of the government to complete the work through from the Georgian bay to Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have determined to complete the canal between Lake Simcoe and Balsam lake. The rest is practically completed or under contract. When all that is completed we will have one more contract to enter into and only one, that is, the contract for the hydraulic lift which we propose to place in that section. Beyond that we have not come to any conclusion.

Mr. KEMP. It will cost $3,000,000 to complete that portion of the work.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. About that.

Mr. KEMP. And the hon. gentleman is not prepared to say whether the government will go on and complete the canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would not like to say one way or the other.

Mr. SPROULE. The work, if incomplete, must be of little value. It seems to me that it is too large an undertaking on which to go on spending money blindly, without deciding whether it is intended to finish it or not.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. To what extent we will continue the work towards completion is a point not definitely passed on by the government, and it is quite impossible for me to make any precise statement on the subject. The northern division, the section from Lake Simcoe to Peterborough, will be the first to be completed. We are now working towards completion of the lock between Lake Simcoe and Lake Balsam, and I am in hopes that a moderate expenditure will give us clear navigation from Peterborough to Lake Balsam. The estimated cost of the whole section from Balsam Lake to Lake Simcoe is one million and a half dollars, and the engineer estimates that it will cost from Lake Simcoe to Georgian Bay $1,450,000 if the canal is extended.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I hope there is no question about that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think probably there will not, but I cannot give a definite statement on my own responsibility.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister is asking $300,000 to be expended this year. Will he apply any of that vote, if an Order in Council is passed, to pay Corry & Laverdure the $126,000 due them.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If this amount is due them, they will be paid, but I cannot say whether it will be out of the appropriation for the current year or for 1902-3.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). How much is appropriated for this year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $300,000 is all the revote for the year to come.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). There is only $300,000 to be spent on the work the coming year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In other words only $300,000 is to be spent for the coming year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is all.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Will the minister please give us some explanation ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I would be glad to furnish all possible information, but I can only state the fact that we do not expect in the coming year to spend more than $300,000. We would have made provision for large expenditure had we finished the hydraulic lift which we are going to place on that section and which is going to cost $350,000.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That is the one at Kirkfield.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that will be provided for another year.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems extraordinary for the government to say they are going on with that work, a work which they themselves admit will cost a total of $6,500,000 when finished, of which only about $3,500,000 has been spent, and yet that they are not able to tell us whether they intend to finish the work or not. A work so gigantic as this, one would suppose, might be taken into consideration by the government with a view to reaching some businesslike conclusion with regard to it before coming to the House to ask for more money. If they are not going to finish it they should let us know, if they are going to finish it they should be able to speak definitely of their intentions and of how they purpose to carry them out.

Mr. GERMAN. In my opinion the money spent on this work is absolutely thrown away whether the canal is finished or not.

This is a legacy from the great Conservative party, and was started by them for the purpose apparently of enabling them to control the Midland constituencies, and it has controlled them ever since. The lift locks now under construction, which will cost about one million dollars each, were begun by the late government. Contracts, I believe were let by the late government for the construction of these locks. Any person who will go up and see these locks will get the impression that they are great baronial castles that are being built up there in the wilderness. The canal appears to me absolutely useless for a route for navigation or transportation. There will be only five feet of water on the mitre sill, and the boats that will carry through there the products of the west, if they ever do, will draw five feet of water and carry 5,000 bushels of wheat. It would take forty or fifty such boats to carry one cargo of a large upper lake steamer.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Why does the hon. gentleman stop at fifty ? He might as well make himself absolutely ridiculous and say seventy.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not intend to make myself ridiculous, but I say it will take forty such boats to carry the cargo of one upper lake freighter. And if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, Victoria) will consider the matter for a moment he will see that I am correct. An upper lake freighter carries 200,000 bushels of wheat. The canal barges which will use this canal will not carry more than 5,000 bushels.

Mr. BENNETT. Nonsense.

Mr. GERMAN. All the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has to do is to make the calculation. The locks on this Trent Valley canal system have a length of 130 feet, and a width of 33 feet, and they admit vessels with a draught of five feet. A calculation will show that the capacity of these barges will not exceed five or six thousand bushels, and the average will be five thousand. So, it will take forty such barges to carry the cargo of an upper lake freighter. If any one suggests that a canal with no greater capacity than that will be a benefit to the country, it will be hard for me to avoid doubting his sincerity. This canal should never have been begun, and I think the quicker the government stop spending money on it the better it will be for the country at large.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. German) shall promptly have his few incoherent remarks reported in the Peterborough newspapers, for, at a single blow he has knocked his friend Hon. James Stratton to pieces. Does not the hon. gentleman know that Mr. Stratton's stock in trade in Ontario politics has been nothing but this Trent navigation system, plus a campaign fund ? The hon. gentleman is talking the ordinary Ontario politics from his point of view. He has lived for years on the Welland canal and has seen, intermittently, an ordinary sized schooner drag its weary course through the canal. We, of course, do not wish to say anything about that canal, but when the hon. gentleman sees a rival to the Welland canal starting up, we hear from him as we have heard. It is not necessary for me to say anything in favour of the Trent Valley canal. It is an accepted fact and it is to be completed. The Minister of Railways and Canals has been over the route and has approved of it. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) should have been more kind to his friend the Hon. James Stratton at this intense time in his history, and should not have given him this blow below the belt.

Mr. GERMAN. Hon. James Stratton is quite well able to take care of himself regardless of any canal question. So far as the Welland canal is concerned, we have not the slightest jealousy—

Mr. KEMP. This will be a competitor, will it not ?

Mr. GERMAN. A competitor ? The ordinary mule is not the competitor of the race horse, and I think that furnishes about a fair comparison between this route and the Welland canal. The Welland canal admits boats carrying 70,000 or 80,000 bushels of grain, and it is rather amusing to find hon. gentlemen comparing with this the Trent Valley canal which will take vessels carrying not more than 6,000 bushels. I do not think any one need be at all alarmed at the competition of this route with the Welland canal.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Welland canal is such a wonderful navigation route why is the government spending half a million dollars more in trying to blast the rocks from Port Colborne harbour so that an ordinary vessel can get in there ? The House must remember that the Trent Valley system is not a series of locks like the Welland canal, but a magnificient chain of lakes and rivers where there is free navigation. But the hon. gentleman has completely upset Mr. Stratton's stock in trade, and his remarks shall be duly reported in the Peterborough newspapers.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I am surprised that the hon. member for Welland should make such an exhibition of himself. He is generally well informed on matters respecting this country, but the reference to any other navigation route than the ditch near which he lives seems to arouse his ill feeling. We do not wish to interfere with this ditch of his, we who have a magnificent chain of lakes, Lake Couchiching, Lake Simcoe, Balsam lake, Sturgeon lake and all the other great chain leading down to the

Bay of Quinte. The hon. gentleman indulges in the comparison of a horse and a mule. Why, I understand that they employ boys to drag the several schooners and canoes that pass up and down through the Welland canal. Ours is not a canal, but a chain of lakes which vessels can navigate with a full head of steam. But in the ditch of which the hon. gentleman speaks, a rate of two and a half or three miles an hour is all they are allowed to go, for fear of washing in sand and filling up the ditch. The hon. gentleman speaks of the lift locks at Peterborough and Kirkfield, and says that this government was only carrying out the work of the Liberal Conservative party. It is well known that this route was designed as a great military route. But, unfortunately, people in power, even representing the Conservative party, listened to the carping opposition of some of the old Liberals who have already been relegated to oblivion. But the carpings of these people have had the effect of causing some who should know better to believe that this is not a great work.

Mr. COWAN. How deep is the canal ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Deep enough to drown a man standing on the head of the little member for South Essex (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. COWAN. How tall do you want the other fellow to be ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). The Minister of Railways and Canals, some years ago was prejudiced against this canal. But, with the energy which characterizes him in nearly everything he does, he took a trip over the route, and from that day to this he has been trying to get his disgruntled supporters to favour the early completion of this work. I do not intend to take up time by discussing it in a general way. But, the hon. member for Welland talks about only barges going on this route. Why, vessels carrying 25,000 bushels of grain can pass through it. The hon. gentleman can shake his head, but there is nothing in it, as was said once of an Irish politician. The hon. gentleman lives within sight of the city of Buffalo, which has been made what it is because it is the entrance to a canal which allowed the passage of vessels with a draught of not more than three feet six inches, and with locks only twelve feet in width. The great cities of Albany, Lockport, Rochester, Oswego and others have been built up by that canal, which, even with the recent five enlargements, admits vessels of only four and a half feet draught. And it has been of such value to the people of New York city and New York state that they are willing to pay $30,000,000 to maintain it and improve it. This is the little ditch that has built up the great city of New York and has given the people in the western States competition in freight rates against the railways that has been of such incalculable benefit to them. We have not opposed the hon. gentleman's (Mr. German's) canal. My policy is to build up all the transportation routes, and I only ask the same consideration for the Trent canal system that we are giving to that fad of my good friend the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte), the French river route, or to the old Welland canal route. We want the construction to go on; and if these gentlemen are serious in their opposition all I can say is that we will take them in hand and educate them, and, if need be, we will show up some of the weak points in their position. We want to develop all the transportation routes for there is room for all of them, and need for all of them, and for none more than for the grand Trent Valley system. I am sorry for the Minister of Railways and Canals, when we see so much being spent for docks and wharfs along the St. Lawrence river and for docks and wharfs in the maritime provinces, that the people along the Trent canal route must be delayed year after year in the completion of this work. I hope the hon. minister, with his characteristic energy, will turn down the disgruntled kickers in his party and push this work through to completion. I am sorry that there are even any signs of lack of energy in pressing forward this work.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not intend to discuss whether this is a proper public work or not; it seems a little too late in the day to enter on that question. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) thought to make a point against the Conservative party by finding fault with this work, although it is endorsed and approved by the government of which he is a supporter. He said that it was during the Conservative regime that this work was commenced. I desire to draw attention to the fact that the Trent navigation work was commenced as far back as the year 1837, shortly after the completion of the Welland canal, as it was first designed. I think that after we have been going on for sixty-five years it is too late in the day to charge the responsibility for that work to either one political party or the other. I presume that there is no man alive to-day who was in power at that time and personally responsible for that work. I merely mention this fact, because the hon. gentleman seemed to have no other point in his speech than to make a reflection upon the Conservative party.

Mr. KEMP. As the canal system seems to be under review, I would like to inquire from the minister if it is the intention of the government to start another canal or series of canals between Lake Nippissing and the Georgian Bay ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not heard anything of the kind. No action has been taken by council towards the construction of a canal in any direction whatever.

Mr. CLARKE. Can the minister tell us when the work on this Trent Valley canal was commenced, and when we may hope it will be wound up ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am safe in saying it was commenced at least fifteen years ago. Construction has been continued in the way of enlargement and extension.

Mr. CLARKE. When is it to be finished down to Lake Ontario ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The question of the lower end has really not yet been considered. There are strong reasons why it is desirable to finish the upper part at an early date. There is not the same urgency in regard to the lower end. There is a strong probability of a considerable trade taking place on the canal already built, which will bring a great deal of traffic to Peterborough. I understand that there are several gentlemen who are looking forward to establishing industries at Peterborough in consequence of this canal.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I presume the minister refers to the cereal works at Peterborough. I know that the promoters are very anxious that this canal should be extended, and I can assure the minister that while this canal will assist the proprietors of the cereal works, there are hundreds of other business institutions along that line the minister is not acquainted with, but who are just as anxious to have that canal opened up. We have along the route of that canal, and tributary thereto, a population much greater than that of the city of Montreal. Some hon. gentlemen make a great noise in this House over the city of Montreal, and demand a heavy expenditure of money for the development of that place. We do not object to that, we back up a judicious expenditure for Montreal, but at the same time we ask for some consideration for the route along these waters on the Trent Valley canal.

Mr. KEMP. The minister said he knew nothing in regard to the building of a canal connecting the Georgian Bay with Lake Nippissing. I presume that if such a work was contemplated it would naturally come under the Department of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I fancy so. If there is going to be a canal constructed between Lake Nippissing and the Georgian Bay, in my judgment that work would devolve upon the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. WARD. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention of the government to make any further survey to ascertain the practicability of a route by way of Port Hope ? I urged that matter upon the government last session. I do not intend to discuss it now, but I would like to know if any further report of an engineer will be obtained by the department ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the government decides that the time has arrived to take up the construction of that canal from Peterborough south, no doubt very extended surveys will require to be made. I do not think we are yet sufficiently supplied with data to enable us to say anything on that question.

Mr. WARD. Do I understand that the surveys will include a route by Port Hope ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I should think so.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). I would direct the minister's attention to the extravagance of this firm of contractors on the Trent canal. I do not know the details of the matter so far as the minister is concerned, but I understand that the minister has endeavoured to keep down these extras. But I can tell the minister that I have been upon that work from time to time, and I can assure him that there was no time that I did not see five times as many men loafing as I saw working. I cannot understand how men having a contract, and hoping to finish it and make both ends meet, could carry on the work as those contractors seem to be doing at Peterborough. I know whereof I speak. I see the minister has endeavoured to do his best to keep these men up to the mark, and I congratulate him on what he has done. I hope that for the future he will keep a tight hand on them and see that they do their work.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell us how much of this canal is navigable now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell at the moment. The deputy will procure the information for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). That canal is navigable from the head of Lake Couchiching to Beaverton on the first section. Then it is navigable from Kirkfield west of Balsam Lake continuously down to Lakefield, with six feet of water on the sill all the way, a distance of sixty to eighty miles. Then it is navigable from Peterborough down to Feely's Falls near Campbellford. All the way from Peterborough to Lakefield is finished, and that section will be ready as soon as the lift lock is built. Then there will be complete navigation from Feely's Falls right up to Balsam Lake; and when the work of that lift lock is completed there will be a continuous navigation from within a few miles of the Georgian Bay right down to within a few miles of the Bay of Quinté, with exception of about ten miles at each end. It will be a canal able to carry three times the quantity of

grain that the Erie canal was ever capable of carrying.

Mr. BENNETT. I would be sorry to let some remarks go unchallenged regarding the size and capacity of this canal. Let me say to the hon. gentlemen who have not been there, that to-day there are steamboats plying during the summer months that are licensed to carry four hundred passengers. As to the statement of the hon. member from Welland (Mr. German) concerning the size of the vessels, I am prepared to say that, with that depth of water, flat bottomed ordinary barges would be capable of carrying at least 20,000 bushels of grain.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). Twenty-five thousand bushels.

Mr. BENNETT. And if my hon. friend thinks over the matter he will agree with me in what I say. I know of boats with a length of 260 feet and a depth of 12 feet carrying 60,000 bushels, and beyond 60,000 bushels, and if you have a boat 135 feet long with a depth of 6 feet of carrying capacity, it is plain that you will have a capacity for carriage of 20,000 bushels. Then, in addition to that, I may say, referring to the cereal factory in the town of Peterborough, that they propose at the outset to consume 15,000 bushels of grain per day and the factory is being constructed with a consuming capacity of 30,000 bushels per day, and one of the considerations that impelled the gentlemen interested in the concern to locate there, was the fact that they would have water communication from Midland and the elevators there for the purpose of bringing their grain down to Peterborough, and also of getting their grain from along the route of the canal. It means an immense advantage to the counties of York and Simcoe that during the summer months they will be enabled to have competition with the only railway that passes through that part of the country by being able to ship their grain down through these lakes and rivers to Lake Ontario. Two or three years ago an elevator of 1,250,000 bushels capacity was erected in the town of Midland by some American gentlemen who came there in preference to locating at the city of Buffalo. I know that one of the great objects of the owners of that concern in coming to Midland was the fact that they anticipated there would be a consummation of this project in due course of time, and that they would be in a position to ship out their grain either by rail or water. If hon. gentlemen would some time during the coming summer go down over these lakes and rivers in that part of the country, they would come back with vastly different feelings than those which some hon. gentlemen have given expression to in this House.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). In support of what the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has said, I would mention the fact that when the Canadian Pacific Railway were building their railway bridge at Sault Ste. Marie, the Peterborough Bridge Works Company tendered for the contract. They had to take into consideration the question of freight on their material from Peterborough to Sault Ste. Marie. The extra freight which they would have been charged for hauling their material to Sault Ste. Marie, that is, the amount by which the freight from Peterborough to Sault Ste. Marie exceeded the rate from Belgium to Sault Ste. Marie, would have been an enormous profit on their contract. It would have represented all the profit they would expect to get on their work. The freight rates from Belgium to Sault Ste. Marie were so much lower than the freight rates from Peterborough to Sault Ste. Marie, that the Peterborough Company lost the contract. If this canal had been opened it would have been an easy matter to have had that work done in our own country rather than have foreigners tendering for it and driving our people out of business. I simply mention this as one instance. Besides the town of Peterborough along the line of the canal, there are Ashburnham, Bobcaygeon, Fenelon Falls, Lindsay, Barrie, Orillia, and the villages of Beaverton, Campbellford, Frankford, and other towns and villages along these rivers and lakes where industries are springing up. The freight rates will be kept down by the competition between the canal and the railway companies. We know that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, having been over this route, appreciates its importance, and I am only sorry that hon. gentlemen who are not in sympathy with the carrying on of this work are not alive to their interests. They have railway passes. Why do they not take a trip over the route, so that they may see for themselves the immense advantages that would accrue to the country from the construction of this work.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that there are 60 or 70 miles of this canal now navigable. What tonnage has passed through it ? Has any record been kept of the tonnage ?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria). This is largely upon the lake sections. There is a navigable course from the head of Pigeon Lake down to Buckhorn and Chemong lakes, a distance of 50 miles.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will turn up the statistics in the report of the department, he will find all the information that we have.

Carillon and Grenville canals—to rebuild guide pier, $23,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is that work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a revote. We have not been able to secure the construction of this pier during 1901-1902, and we have therefore only expended $7,000 of that vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the work being done by contract?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who are the contractors?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are a Toronto firm. I cannot remember their names.

Mr. SPROULE. I see several places in these estimates, and I think it is a defect in them, where an item is stated as a revote, while in other places it is not so stated, and we are left in the dark as to how much is a revote and as to how much is an original vote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is omitted in some cases, but where it is omitted I inform the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it should be stated in all cases in the estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So it should. Where it is only partly a revote, it should be stated what portion is a revote and what portion is an original vote. I am trying to have that done.

Quebec canals—surveys for establishing boundaries, $1,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What does that mean?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It has been recommended by the officers of the department and by the chief engineer that we should have a small appropriation so that where disputes occur as to boundaries between our property and adjoining property we can make a survey. When these disputes come up we have no money that we can use for the purpose of providing for surveys.

Culbute canal—damages by flooding, $250.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to provide for damages by flooding in the town of Bryson, caused by the construction of a dam.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That dam has been down for a number of years. How can it have been caused by the construction of a dam?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not mean that the dam is down? There was an attempt made to blow it up which made some break in it, but the dam is still there. It must have been sufficient to have occasioned this flooding. We had the matter inquired into and there was an arrangement between the town of Bryson and ourselves to settle for $250.

Mr. SPROULE. Here is another item of the same kind. There was a vote of $265 last year and there is a vote of $250 this year. We have no information as to whether that vote of last year was spent and this is a new item or whether there was only a small portion of the vote spent last year and this is a revote of the balance.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is entirely a new item. The account will show that we spent nearly the whole amount that was expropriated last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the last claim for damages?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are quite a few still outstanding.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you adjust them by arbitration?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have our valuator, and he reports his recommendation and some have not yet accepted what we considered to be fair, but possibly they will do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister tell us how much we have paid for damages in this matter and what claims are still outstanding?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will have such a statement prepared.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What final estimates have not yet been completed on the Soulanges canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Those of Ryan and Macdonnell; Andrew Onderdonk and the Canadian Electric Company. The final estimates of the others have been prepared.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In connection with these railway items, I asked the minister the other day whether the building of the railway from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour had been let by public tender and contract, and the minister said it had. I see by the papers brought down in the other House that only 21 miles of this railway had been let by tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Eleven and one-half miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And that the contract for the rest of the road was given to the party who obtained the contract for the 11½ miles by a mere extension of their original contract. The minister led me to believe that the whole contract was let by public tender to the next lowest tenderer;

the lowest tenderer not being able to carry out the work. I protest against such a manner of letting contracts. Where there are 40 miles of road to be built the law requires, and the Order in Council requires that all work should be let by tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Tenders were first asked for 11½ miles which was a distinct section of the line and the least expensive and the handiest to construct. After the work was in progress, and it became necessary in the opinion of those who were most anxious to see the work carried forward—members of parliament and members of the government—that the work should be proceeded with, an offer was made to the contractor to continue the other 31½ miles at the same price for that class of work. Some dispute between the engineer and the contractor arose which led to delay and although the prices were actually settled, I am not sure that the contract has been yet finally executed by the contractor. A number of tenders were received for the work when it was first offered, and it was thoroughly advertised in all the newspapers from the 15th of November to the 23rd of December. The prices were the schedule prices, as usual under such circumstances. When we were being hurried to get the work proceeded with we proposed to the contractor who is a very respectable man, and who had secured the first contract after open competition at prices that were fair and reasonable ; we offered to him to continue the work because for the further reason we did not wish to have two men operating together one at one end of the line and the other at the other end, and our proposition was accepted. The work will be continued by the same contractor who had the first part of the road.

The CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, not carried for a while yet. You have a habit of crying ' carried ' when a member is on his feet. I had cause to draw your attention to it before, but I hope I will not again. The minister states the contract was let for 11½ miles, and on the pressure of members of parliament in that section of the country and others, it became a necessity to push the work forward and the 31½ miles was given to the contractor at the schedule prices which he obtained by competition for the other 11½ miles of the road. Was that contract offered to him with the consent of the council at the time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You got an Order in Council authorizing you to make the offer to him. Were there any payments made to him on the 31½ miles before the contract was entered into ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there were no payments made on other than the first 11½ miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well, all I can do is to protest against it. Here is a contract for the construction of 31½ miles of railroad given to a person who has not tendered for it, and without any open competition at all ; and the only excuse the minister has is that the man had constructed another section of the road, and that it was done at the urgent request of the members of parliament representing that section of the country. What is the use of having an Act of parliament which says all such works shall be let by contract ? What is the use of the Order in Council if the minister can override it ? We cannot do anything but protest against such extraordinary conduct as that of the minister.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is not much use of my hon. friend talking about extraordinary conduct. He does not deceive anybody, because he must recollect that it has been a very customary and usual thing. It was so under his own administration, and if he desires to be furnished with instances of it, I will supply them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would be delighted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman may assume that what he did is not a justification, and I quite admit that it is not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to see the hon. gentleman give a justification in a particular case ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No doubt it would not be sufficient for me to show that the same thing has frequently occurred, and properly and naturally so. We invited offers from these tenderers, and the prices at which the contracts were awarded were fair and reasonable prices, as anybody will know who has had experience in business of that kind ; and the contractor was a very responsible man who had done a large amount of work, and upon whom one could rely as able to carry on the work in accordance with the contract. When the prices were fixed by competition on a small section, we could not do a wiser thing than continue the contract in the hands of a safe and responsible man for any further mileage we had to construct ; and that is what we did after the matter had been considered in council.

Mr. BENNETT. We heard of so many extraordinary acts on the part of this government that one is hardly surprised at anything that occurs ; but this act overtops everything else.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The last is always the worst.

Mr. BENNETT. But one shudders to think of what the next may be. What are the facts? The minister wished to have constructed a certain line of railway in Prince Edward Island. Tenders were asked for 11½ miles in the open market. No one can find fault with that. The work was proceeded with. The 11½ miles were constructed, not for a lump amount, but on what is known as schedule prices, that is, so much for this part, and so much for that part. Then, the minister deliberately goes and gives the same man a contract for 31½ miles of the same road, without asking for a tender or inviting any kind of public competition. I am not going to say that there was any collusion between the minister and these contractors; but a strong inference can be drawn from this fact, that the minister knew that there was more profit to be derived from the construction of 40 miles than there was from the construction of 11 miles. The minister might have said to the contractor: 'To construct the 11 miles will entail the removal of a considerable plant to the scene of operations, and I will tell you what I will do: You tender a little higher figure for 11½ miles, and I will give you the contract for the 31½ miles afterwards.' I do not know that that happened; but the minister has placed himself in such a position that this state of affairs can fairly be inferred. But the minister did worse. Had he entered into this contract, and then gone to his colleagues and said: 'I have made this contract and we have to stand by it,' it would have been a bad enough transaction on his part. But the minister is not alone to blame, because every colleague of his assented to the deal. He says he went in the open council with it, and every one of the ministers said: 'That proposition is a proper one, and we approve of it.' Contrast the position of the Minister of Railways with that of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General on coming into office, found that his predecessor had said to the men who had contracts for carrying the mails: 'You got the contract in the open market for carrying the mail for $120 a year, you being the lowest tenderer; and as you have invested in the equipment necessary to carry the mail, I will renew your contract at the same figure.' The Postmaster General cancelled all such contracts. That is a matter of record. He said to the contractors: 'You had a contract for three years only; and when your contract expired, the minister who preceded me in office had no right to renew it, and for that reason I cancel it.' There was scores of such cases. But here the Minister of Railways and Canals lets a contract for 11½ miles of railway, and then on his own authority, backed up afterwards by the council, gives a contract to the same man without any tender or competition for 31½ miles more. There is not a tittle of evidence before this committee to show that the other 31½ miles could not have been more cheaply constructed. On the schedule prices the work would cost as much proportionately for the 31½ miles as the 11½ miles did, while the means of access, the materials, the supplies and opportunities to engage in the work were all much more advantageous to the contractor. If there had to be blasting on the first 11½ miles, I suppose the minister did not in his first schedule provide for allowing so much for granite, so much for limestone, and so forth. It may be that on the first 11½ miles the contractor would meet with granite, whereas on the other part he would find shale or hardpan, the excavation of which would not be nearly so expensive. The Minister of Railways and Canals is certainly carrying things with a high hand. But, I do not blame him altogether for asserting himself. He has hard work to keep the job in his department. This afternoon he was asked whether the French river navigation system was to be under his control or not, and right along side him was the Minister of Public Works, and he made the statement emphatically that if anything were done it would be done by himself. Evidently the hon. minister intends to assert himself. All I can say is that if he can get his colleagues in the council to back him up in deals of this kind, he will be asserting his position, and asserting it pretty emphatically. I am surprised that there is not an hon. member on the other side who will stand up and protest against this high-handed proceeding, but so long as the present government remain in office, I suppose the country will have to grin and bear it. I can tell the hon. minister, however, that such transactions as this will not stand the light of public discussion, and when properly ventilated, they will be visited on the heads of the present government as they ought to be.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. I do not often take up the time of the House and certainly would not rise to defend anything which I knew to be wrong or a waste of public money. I happen to be in a position to know all about this road and the ground it covers, and I think I am a much better authority on the subject than the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House. The first 11½ miles were let to the lowest tenderer, and the gentleman who got the contract, Mr. Kitchen, is a very efficient contractor who belongs to New Brunswick. Those 11½ miles were let at the very best rate, being the lowest of six tenders and it must be evident that the contractor, who did the work, would be better equipped to continue it and complete the balance of the road than anybody else. It is not extraordinary therefore that he should have been given a contract for the balance without any tenders being called for. As a general rule, it is no doubt better to call for tenders, but there are exceptions, and the government has to be guided by the

conditions which prevail, and certainly in this case the contractor, having taken the first 11½ miles at a lower rate than anybody else offered to do the work for, and having done the work efficiently and being equipped on the ground with all the appliances to continue it, it seems to me that it was a wise policy to give him an extension of his contract at the same rates. For the balance of the 31 miles the conditions are about the same. If anything, I should say that they are more difficult, because the country is a wilder and a rougher one to traverse and will require more excavations than did the other portion of the line. For my part, I am thoroughly convinced that the arrangement was a very good one, and I certainly would not find any fault with the Minister of Railways for having acted as he did.

Mr. SPROULE. The defence made by the hon. gentleman for West Queen's (Mr. Farquharson) may be a very good one from his standpoint, if he knows all the conditions and surroundings. But what we object to is the adoption of an unsound principle, and one which is contrary to that adopted as one of the planks of the Reform platform. The Reform party adopted as one of its planks that no public money should be expended on public works except after calling for tenders and giving the contract to the lowest tenderer, and the Minister of Railways has acted in open violation of that principle. Evidently a small contract was given to this contractor in order to afford some apology for extending that contract and giving him a larger one. The hon. member says that the cuttings are heavier in the second portion perhaps than in the first. Well, that is a reason why the contract could be taken at a cheaper rate. If the haulings are shorter and the cuttings heavier, the work could be done for less money, and if tenders have been called, in all probability it would have cost less. But the great thing against which we protest is that the principle set down in the Reform platform, as one of those on which hon. gentlemen opposite would act, if returned to power, has been deliberately violated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister's statement does not agree with the return brought down in the Senate. He says that before this party began the work, the minister obtained the consent of his colleagues to the contract. If I remember rightly in the return brought down to the Senate, the department did not know at all that there were any such contracts entered into, and that the work had been commenced and in progress a number of months before the consent of the hon. minister's colleagues was obtained. The statement of Mr. Scott in the Senate was that the work had been in progress some time before the Order in Council was obtained authorising the contract.

Mr. FARQUHARSON.

Mr. HACKETT. I had a question on the Order paper the last few days in connection with the letting of this contract, but the minister was apparently unable to give me the information required, and the question was postponed from day to day. We are evidently now, however, getting some of the information I desired. It appears that there was no contract for the construction of this railway from Southport to Murray Harbour. There was simply a contract for 11½ miles of the work, and the balance of the work was given to the same contractor at the same schedule rate. I think that that is entirely wrong. This contract was simply for the grading of a railway, and there are numbers of contractors down there who would have been glad to have had the opportunity of bidding for the grading of this road. But the minister was evidently determined to give it to his friend Mr. Kitchen. As far as the 11½ miles are concerned, Mr. Kitchen was the lowest tenderer and entitled to the contract, but that does not warrant the minister giving him without competition the construction of the other 31½ miles to Murray harbour, and I cannot approve of that. This kind of thing leads to corruption, extravagance and waste of public money. The hon. member for West Queen's has spoken about the difficulty in the grading and the construction of this railway, but he knows as well as I that the first 11½ miles cost twice as much per mile for the grading as will the other 31½. He knows that the first section goes through the most uneven part of the country, where there are more hills and more grading and levelling to be done. Yet the minister has allowed this man for the 31½ miles, the work on which will only cost one-half of what the 11½ miles cost, the same schedule rates as he paid on the first contract. We know why all this has been done. We know that this friend of the minister, about election time, had printed blanks circulated throughout the riding of East Queen's offering work to men who would go in and promise to vote for Mr. McKinnon. Those blanks were produced in court and are now on record, and it is not to be wondered at that Mr. Kitchen, after doing all this to obtain support for the government, should have been allowed the privilege of building this further section of railway without any competition. What more is Mr. Kitchen doing? Is he only grading or is he grading and ballasting the track and building stations and doing everything to complete the railway in that part of the country?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have arranged that he shall do the track laying and the ballasting.

I have not seen all the answers or statements made in the other Chamber with regard to this matter, but I know whereof I speak when I say that the extension of

this contract was made by Order in Council long before a blow was struck on the additional thirty and a half miles. I defend the extension of that contract on the ground of public interest, and I invite hon. gentlemen opposite to take the very first opportunity—it may not be available at this moment, but it will come—of entering upon the most thorough investigation of the whole proceeding. What are tenders asked for ? In order that we may make sure that the country is not paying an unreasonable price for the work that is being done. And what kind of people do you wish to tender ? People who are competent to carry out the work they undertake, people who have means, people who are responsible and can stand behind the undertakings they make. We had tenders for eleven and a half miles which was all we expected to build at that time. These tenders showed us just what competition would do as to the cost of the work. Our engineers were satisfied that the prices were reasonable. And hon. gentlemen opposite can look at them and see whether they are reasonable or not. We found that we had a competent and responsible contractor, and he was willing to take the work at the same prices for similar classes of work as those covered by his tender. Therefore, in the public interest, we did what has been done in the department over and over again, we extended this contract. I do not carry the details of these matters in my mind, but I will bring a statement of some extensions that have been made from time to time by our own and other governments, for such extensions have been made by all governments under conditions which are practically the same as these. It is a very legitimate mode of doing business for the lowest tenderers are often people who are not capable of carrying out the work, and who give the department more trouble than the saving of expense is worth. They get a contract from the government and think they are going to make a great deal of money whether they have had experience or not. But it is always better, if possible, to get a safe man. If you are paying only a reasonable price for the work and have responsible men who are capable of carrying out your contract, it is far better to extend their contracts than to call in others of whose capacity you have no knowledge.

Mr. BENNETT. If the extension had been for seventy-five miles instead of thirty-one miles, would the hon. minister have given the contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was no suggestion of an extension——

Mr. BENNETT. But, if it had amounted to seventy-five miles, would the hon. gentleman have acted in the same way ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can hardly be expected to say, offhand, exactly what would have been done if the circumstances had been entirely different.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I think we shall have to ask the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) to read his colleague a great moral lecture upon the duty of giving out contracts by tender only. We know how the Postmaster General has sacrificed himself in the carrying out of his principle in this respect, a principle which has been so much neglected by hon. gentlemen opposite. I expect the Postmaster General to read his colleague a severe lecture.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not rise to defend the Minister of Railways and Canals, but I like to see a discussion carried on with fairness. To my mind as a business man, the Minister of Railways and Canals gave his contract for the extension of the work in a businesslike way. He did exactly what the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did in the construction of their line. The contractors who tendered for work on that road were given contracts right along as long as their work was satisfactory. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not appear to be in harmony. One of them said that the work on this eleven and a half miles was much more difficult than the remainder, while another said that the other part was more hilly and required more excavation. The question is simply, was the second contract let for more than the work was worth ? The Minister of Railways and Canals was the judge. He knew he had got the lowest tenderer for the eleven and a half miles, and that a good contractor could not do the rest of the work for less than the price at which he gave it. So, in a businesslike way, he extended the contract for the additional mileage he required at the same schedule of prices. I do not think the country has suffered, but the opposition in this matter are trying to make a mountain out of a molehill. Before the giving of this contract labour and everything else had advanced in price, and the chances are that the minister got the best of the bargain.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Railways and Canals is certainly to be congratulated on the fact that at least he has found one dutiful and docile supporter. The member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) wants no more tenders asked for by the Railway Department. If the minister says it is right, the hon. member for Pontiac accepts in silent awe. This is going to be a case of hero worship with the hon. gentleman from this time out. Let any minister bring up what he chooses and the hon. member for Pontiac is ready to say that it is all right because the minister says so. But the hon. minister did not find so docile a supporter in the hon. member for West Queen's (Mr.

Farquharson). That hon. gentleman says it may have been right or it may not. I think that hon. gentleman is aggrieved—and this throws light on the story—because the contractor did not come from Prince Edward Island, but from New Brunswick.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He came from a good place.

Mr. BENNETT. He certainly came from a good place to get a contract in that department. I wonder if 'my friend Pugsley' did not intervene on this contractor's behalf? Perhaps he did. Perhaps the Prince Edward Island contractor did not secure the services of 'my friend Pugsley.' But the blissfulness of the hon. member for Pontiac is beautiful to see. If the minister gives a contract for five miles of railway, evidently he can continue it for fifty miles without further tenders, and be sure of the support of the hon. member for Pontiac. All he wishes is that the minister shall say it is right. No doubt, he will say it is right, then he is prepared to support it. Once again I have to congratulate the Minister of Railways and Canals. He has asserted his position. He came down with the Drummond County Railway deal, all signed, sealed and delivered, and threw it at his supporters and said : There it is, take it. And they did take it. He came down with the Yukon deal and threw it at his supporters without ever consulting them, although it was only a day or two before the meeting of parliament, and they said : We will take that too. Now the minister comes down with a proposition and says, I want you to understand that I am going to let railway contracts on this principle. I shall let a contract for a few miles, and if I see the prices are right, I will extend that railway indefinitely; and I shall expect you to do as you have done before, one after another, getting up like the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Murray) and saying amen to the proposition.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to inform the hon. gentleman that I am not a slavish supporter of this or of any government. I think he is stretching his imagination when he says that I approve of everything the minister does, and am satisfied to let him go on and let contracts. I said nothing of the kind. I say that in this case I think the minister was justified. I do not approve of the principle. The hon. member, I think, has tried to misconstrue my statements.

Mr. HACKETT. Has the minister settled on the location of the southern terminus of this railway, whether it will be at Murray River Bridge or Murray Harbour ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not come to a final settlement with regard to that. Perhaps it would be necessary for me to go down there myself and look over the ground with some of my officers.

Mr. BENNETT.

Salaries, engineers, draftsmen, extra clerks and messengers, $26,140.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an increase over last year of $350. We have given an increase to Mr. E. V. Johnson, the inspecting engineer, of $200, and $100 to the assistant engineer, and $50 to Mr. A. H. McKee.

Prince Edward Island Railway, $275,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not understand the minister to say what was the approximate cost per mile of the eleven and a half miles that were constructed under the original contract.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not the information, but I can get it in the office.

Mr. BENNETT. Has that eleven and a half miles been paid for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is not completed yet.

Mr. SPROULE. The other day I asked about the schedule prices paid in that contract, and the minister did not give us any information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will get the information and furnish it.

Mr. BELL. I see from the government return up to the end of 1901 that the cost of working the Prince Edward Island Railroad increased by over $40,000 over the preceding year. Does the minister expect any such increase this year ? If so, he is not appropriating nearly enough money to carry on that road. If his working expenses are increased by $40,000 this year he will need over $300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have had to add something to the operating charges. I have had from all the members representing the island a demand urging to give them two trains a day during the winter season as well as in the summer, on that portion of the line that is not so served. We cannot put on two trains without considerably augmenting the cost of operation. Many things in the way of improvements are required, which I hope to be able to take up during the year. So I could not hold out any promise of reduction in the balance against us for the current year. Our business is growing nicely, I understand it is better than in former years. But we have these urgent demands upon us, and reasonable demands too, with which I would be glad to comply.

Mr. BELL. In that case the hon. minister is making no provision for such an increased service, because he is merely taking this year $14,000 more than the working expenses last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Is it likely that any trains will be operated on the branch we have been discussing ? Will it be completed by the end of the fiscal year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Mr. BELL. He has not anticipated that there will be any outlay in that direction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The bridge will not be completed for probably a year and a half.

Mr. BELL. I observe the hon. minister had increased earnings of $19,000 and increased operating expenses of $40,000 which would be more than twice the amount of the increased earnings, so that, if he anticipates any increased business and he has no more revenue, it means that for every dollar he gets of revenue it will cost him $2 of expenditure and he is making no provision for such an event.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There were certain improvements on the road which had to be made, and if I had had a capital expenditure the cost would not have appeared in the working expenses at all. I feel like treating the Island road with a reasonable degree of liberality. The people there are situated very differently from us on the mainland and I think they have a strong claim to consideration. If I have any discretion to exercise I think I should exercise that discretion in a general way toward the Island railway.

Mr. HACKETT. I am pleased to hear this statement from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and I trust in doing that he will put on a second train west of Summerside. We, who live west of Summerside, believe that this is the best paying part of the road. It is true there may not be as many passengers as on other portions of the road but there is more freight and more traffic of that kind and I urge upon the hon. minister as strongly as possible the necessity of giving us this second train and I trust that he will see his way clear to comply with our wishes in this respect. We have two trains during the summer months and we are only deprived of this second train about four months in the year. I believe that if we had this second train in that part of the country it would not increase expenses but it would largely add to the revenue. I am not surprised at the increase in the working expenses for 1900. There is a very good reason for that. The hon. minister knows all about it. I need not repeat anything in that connection, but it will not occur again for some time to come. He will have two or three years at all events during which time he will not have as great a number of men working on the railway as he had in 1900. I trust the hon. minister will see his way clear to put on a second train.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will have to trust to 'Hansard' for what the hon. gentleman has said because the talking that is going on about me renders it impossible for me to hear him.

Canals—repairs and operating expenses, $668,-634.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. minister kindly give the details of the increase of $52,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The increase of $52,000 is due to the following items ; staff and repairs, $9,988. There is an item for lighting the canal and for furnishing electric power for the canal which makes up—

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Which canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The Cornwall canal. We are lighting it with electric light and the gates are being worked with electric power.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like to ask the hon. minister just here, although we have left the railway estimates a question. I see a rumour to the effect that Mr. Russell who is the head superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway is about to be retired and the report is that Mr. Tiffin is to take his place and that a Mr. Ross is to take Mr. Tiffin's place. Is there any truth in these rumours.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. None whatever. There is no truth in them. No such action has been taken and at this moment no such action is contemplated.

Additional to pay persons employed permanently in the public service and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for and in connection with passing vessels through the canals of the government of Canada from mid-night on Saturday to mid-night on Sunday, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $18,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How is that increase of $3,000 to workmen for working over hours accounted for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The opening of the Soulanges canal itself would make up a good deal of difference and I am not sure but that it would absorb the whole $3,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Soulanges canal alone ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think it would take a very large portion of the $3,000.

Intercolonial Railway—Improved ferry service, Strait of Canso, $247,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We want the fullest explanation of that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a balance required to

complete the ferry and the approaches on both sides. The expenditure upon that work altogether including the cost of the steamer, the approaches, the hydraulic lifts, the subaqueous excavation, will amount to $610,000.

Mr. BELL. What did the steamer cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Two hundred and fifty-four thousand dollars.

Mr. BELL. Is the work that was done for her in Halifax included in the $610,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was some painting and cleaning done on her there during the winter.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Was the steamer found serviceable for the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Very; we have favourable accounts of her.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why was she sent to Halifax ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. She was battered about by storms in crossing the Atlantic, and some of her machinery was injured. While they gave her ample coal for some days beyond an ordinary passage, yet she encountered such rough weather and not being able to make very good time at sea, she exhausted her coal near Newfoundland and was towed in there. When she came to Mulgrave we thought that it would be better that she should be taken to Halifax and be looked over. She is now upon the route and doing all that we expected of her.

Mr. BELL. How many cars does she carry at a time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. She has three tracks on her deck, and is about 270 feet long. We expect her to take a full train.

Mr. BELL. Engine and all ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not expected the engine would go over.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where was delivery taken ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We took delivery on the other side. She sailed in September or the last of August and she arrived on the last of September or early in October. We were not ready for her, as we did not have the approaches finished, but at all events we thought she would not be in shape to go to work right away. We had not any precedent for this system of hydraulic lifting, and the officers had to do a certain amount of original work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What time was she put on commission on the ferry ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 25th of April.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There has been no experience of this boat in the ice so far.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not know that we have had experience of the ice, but we have not any doubt as to her efficiency in the ice. She has been built by a firm who have built a number of vessels of various kinds for the Russian Government, and who are thoroughly familiar with what is required.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it intended to transport a whole train across the Strait—all the passenger cars, baggage cars, and everything ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. She will take a whole passenger train easily.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there any estimate in the department of what the cost of a bridge there would be ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. I have talked to some of our engineers on the subject, but there has been no careful estimate made of what a bridge would cost. I have heard it stated by gentlemen who profess to know, that it would cost five or six millions, but the opinion of some of the engineers in my department is that it would cost more than that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Outside of this boat there has been an expenditure of $350,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $350,000 or $360,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister make a statement as to what has been done with that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have done a large amount of bridge construction in the form of approaches on either side. This has been largely experimental work, some of which we have had to take up again. These superstructures alone have cost us $86,000. On dredging, we have spent $93,000. On electrical work, engineering, and so forth, we have spent $22,500.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you a search light on the boat ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we shall have—we have alwys had—a search light on our ferry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has there been any difficulty with the structures on either side by reason of ice during the past winter ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think not any serious trouble; but there has been some slight displacement at Point Tupper. That is where we are likely to have trouble if we are going to have any.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the work done partly or without tender?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The labour work was done by ourselves; but we invited tenders for all the materials and supplies of every kind.

Intercolonial Railway—to provide additional tools and machinery, $40,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In this there is a revote of $47,000. Last year when we took the vote in the main estimates, we are in hopes that this work would be done during the year; but every manufacturer has been overrun with work, and has been slow in delivery.

Intercolonial Railway—rolling stock, $70,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to pay for four shunting engines that have been made at the Kingston Locomotive Works. The price of these engines is $17,500 each.

Intercolonial Railway—improvement at Mulgrave, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The appropriation for the current year of $13,000 was not quite sufficient, and we require this to supplement it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are the additional tools and machinery to supply the place of those which are already worn out, or are they in addition to those which have been used in the past?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for larger and heavier machines to handle the larger and heavier engines, and I do not know of any other items in the estimate that has any connection with this.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Before the Intercolonial Railway items are through I would like to call the attention of the hon. minister to the local railway service between Lévis and the valley of the Metapedia. I have received a number of petitions from residents in the counties of Bonaventure and Rimouski, complaining about the railway running time in that district. I understand that a time table is being prepared for the spring and summer service, and I would like to ask the hon. minister if possible to comply with the wishes of the people in those localities. What the people complain of more particularly is the local service. There is only one local train per day eastward, which leaves Point Lévis at 8.15 a.m., and arrives in Campbellton at 8.45 p.m., taking 12 hours to cover 303 miles, and going west the train leaves Campbellton at 10.15 p.m., and reaches Lévis at 10.45 the following morning, taking over 12 hours to cover the same distance. Then there is a train going west which leaves Campbellton at 6 o'clock in the morning, and arrives at St. Flavie at 4 p.m. in the afternoon, taking 10 hours to cover 105 miles. The local service from Metapedia to Lévis westward is altogether at night. The train leaves Campbellton at 10.45 p.m., and goes over a large area at night, arriving at the different stations at 11 p.m., 12 a.m., 3 a.m., and 4 a.m., thus compelling the people to wait until very late at night or get up at early hours in the morning in order to catch the local train. What they want is that one train should leave Point Lévis at 7 a.m. for Campbellton and that the train which leaves Campbellton at 10.45 a.m. should leave at 7 a.m., and reach Point Lévis in the evening. I have presented a number of petitions asking for this change in the service and my colleague from Rimouski has also presented a number of petitions to the same effect, and I am sure that the hon. minister will meet the wishes of the people in that locality.

Sault Ste. Marie canal—Towards deepening and widening the entrance, $20,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is being expended during this year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will it require to complete the whole entrance to a 21-foot depth of navigation?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The estimated cost is $420,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the whole of it be finished this season?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, we have not even let the contract for the upper, and the lower entrance work will not be completed this current year. We are now dealing with the supplementaries for the year we are in up to next year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. minister to his surveys on the Georgian canal and to show him how entirely useless they are. The hon. gentleman must remember that in the debate in the House it was contemplated that this would be an extension of the same system of waterways which are at present in force from Lake Superior down, which is a 20-foot navigation. But the surveys are all got out and the quantities and estimates and everything else on the basis of a 14-foot navigation. We have got that in the Welland canal, and there is no use of building a new canal with a 14-foot depth of navigation. The surveys, estimates and plans ought to have been taken out on the basis of a 20-foot navigation. If the minister

has the information in his department, perhaps the engineers, on the surveys they have made, will be able to make an estimate of the cost of the 20-foot navigation, and he ought to be ready next session to supplement his report, which is entirely useless, by giving this information.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Is the hon. gentleman under the impression that we are making a survey of the Georgian Bay route for canal purposes? We are not doing that. I quite agree that the project ought to be on a 20-foot basis, and we are not making any survey at all. We did one year ask parliament to give us a small grant, not exceeding $10,000, to enable us to survey a portion of the canal, but we did not take the thing up as a project at all, and have not had any extensive surveys made. I am given to understand that the company have prepared plans and estimates on the basis of a 20-foot navigation to show what the whole enterprise would cost, but that information has not been furnished the government.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. minister will look at his own report, he will see that Mr. H. F. McLeod, civil engineer, and Mr. Kerr made a survey in 1900, of all the locks required on the whole length of the canal from the Georgian bay down, and gave the estimated cost, based on a depth of a 14-foot navigation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think that that has been abandoned for some time. We came to the conclusion that it would be idle for the company to undertake the construction of a canal with a 14-foot navigation. It must be a 20-foot or not at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is the first report we have had from the hon. minister, and it is the report of this year on surveys made in 1900 and 1901.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Railways and canals—chargeable to capital—Lachine canal—Towards electrical installation, $25,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We desire to make use of electricity on the canal, and are installing a plant for the purpose. The object is to light the canal, work the gates and bridges, &c. The contract is in the hands of the Canadian Electrical Company, by whom it was secured under tender. Messrs. Ahearn & Soper are the contractors for putting up the poles and wire cables, and Messrs. Grant & Co. for the work that is being done to power house. We propose to erect a power house and produce the current for ourselves.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total will be $90,000. We had an appropriation of $30,000 in the estimates of last year, and the probable expenditure up to the 30th June, 1902, is $50,753. We require this $25,000, therefore, to carry on the work till the end of the year. We have a round sum of $35,000 in the estimates for the year to come. In that is included the estimate for the power house, and out of that sum will be taken whatever amount is required to cover the $90,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I understand the minister, then, he will have this sum of $25,000, which, with sums already voted, will make $55,000, and he is taking $45,000 in the estimates next year. That will make $100,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the $45,000 for this year includes the continuation of the work on the walls for next year, also some dredging and a pontoon gate.

Farran's Point canal—Enlargement, $26,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount will be necessary in order to finish that work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The expenditure for the current year, ending 30th June next, will exceed the appropriation by this amount, and so we require this to meet these obligations.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount have you in the estimates for next year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have $10,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will that finish the work?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, so I am advised.

North Channel—Forming, $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended on the north channel and does this finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are to get next year, under the estimates, $56,000. That, I understand, will finish the work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be the total cost when finished?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Something short of $1,200,000.

Galops Rapids—Deepening and widening, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I propose to make a reduction in this item. When we were discussing this matter the other day, I said we were not asking any sum for continuing the work, but

that there was $25,000, or very close to it, which we owed on account of work done before the 1st of July of the current year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not the current year, but the year before.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before the 1st of July, the fiscal year in which we are now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, the current fiscal year commences on the 1st of July. Then I say we were providing for an amount which would be sufficient to pay for the work done prior to the 1st of July of the current fiscal year. Now, I do not see that there is anything due in respect of work that was done before the 1st of July. That has not been properly estimated upon, and I have not the figures to enable me to state accurately what the amount due on work would be done prior to the commencement of the fiscal year that we are now in. Therefore, I do not propose to ask the committee to vote anything in respect to that. If we find there is anything, and I do not think there is much, we will have to ask parliament to provide for it later. But now, all I ask for is a sufficient amount to pay the drawbacks, which are between $24,000 and $25,000. I ask for one-half of this present vote, and leave the appropriation standing at $25,000. The drawback previous to the 1st of July, in the current year——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, there was no vote for the Galops Rapids last year at all. Then this work must have been done before last year; and the amount is for work, you say, done during the current year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I stated the very reverse. I am saying that all I am asking for is a vote which will enable me to pay what was retained by drawback for work prior to the 1st of July, in the current year, or to be more explicit, the first day of July, 1901. Not one farthing am I asking for to be paid in respect of any work subsequent to the 1st of July, 1901.

Mr. SPROULE. Why have an expenditure without an appropriation? Because it must be clear that you went on and continued the work for which you had no appropriation, about a year ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not.

Mr. SPROULE. Somebody must have done it. Surely it was done under the instructions of the engineer.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I want to be understood explicitly by the committee. I stated at the last meeting of the committee when this item was referred to, that the contractor was notified that we were not going to continue the work.

Mr. SPROULE. About what date?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was notified before the 1st of July, 1901; and he had no authority whatever, expressed or implied, for continuing the work after that date.

Mr. SPROULE. Why should the hon. gentleman now ask for a sum to pay him if he had no authority?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I must be lacking in the faculty of explaining myself if the hon. gentleman has not understood me. I say that I am not asking for anything more than sufficient to pay the drawback that was due and retained in the department, as is usual in all contracts, for work prior to the 1st of July, 1901.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand what the hon. minister says perfectly well. Does he mean to say that the work did in 1901 amounted to $300,000? It was a daily contract, so much per day, and there could be no drawback in paying for anything before 1901, and there was a drawback for work done to the extent of $500,000 in 1902.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the hon. gentleman knows that drawbacks are always deducted in forming estimates, and it is only when special application is made that any portion of the drawback is released.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the minister will please tell us what is the amount of the contract, what is the amount of the drawback that is due on the contract, and how far does it extend back?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The drawback is 10 per cent on over $200,000, on all the work that was done from 1897 to 1901. Ten per cent on that has been retained and is in our hands. I do not think I can make it clearer than that. I state distinctly to the committee that I have no intention of paying one dollar for work done after the 1st of July.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the minister must see that he is exceeding his vote of 1901 by the extent of the drawback. He expended on the Galops Rapids a certain amount of money, which is exceeded by the drawback to the extent, as he says, of $25,000. What does he want the other $25,000 for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman cannot properly draw an inference of that kind. I ask the hon. gentleman why he says that the appropriation was exceeded, otherwise there would be no drawback retained.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think it is perfectly clear, and the minister ought to see it at a glance. There was an amount

voted for the Galops canal in 1900, in the year previous, and in the year previous to that. Then the amount he says has been expended on the 1st of July, 1901.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What amount ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The $10,000 you paid him, plus the drawback for which you are asking an amount now. Was not the total amount voted paid to the Gilbert Company ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. Of the $100,000 appropriation for 1901, the amount expended was about $90,000. Now, we would have been able, if the application had been made to us before that appropriation lapsed, to pay $10,000 out of that appropriation on account of the drawback. But it was not asked for and was not paid; and the appropriation therefore for the difference between what was paid and the amount of the drawback, has lapsed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Then the total amount that has lapsed is $10,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, on that year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Don't you pay the drawback for the year previous, when he is hired by the day ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do sometimes. Sometimes the contractor comes in and makes an application, and we go to council and get authority to pay the drawback to the contractor. If he does not ask for it, he does not get it. In this case he has not asked for it, and therefore he did not get it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of the drawback that is due them for the three years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Between $24,000 and $25,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What are you asking the other $25,000 for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I say I am not. I am striking $25,000 out of the vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are striking out $25,000 and only going to apply the drawback which is due the contractor to the first of July, 1901?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I can assure my hon. friend that I have repeated that fifteen or twenty times.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not hear what the hon. gentleman said when he was striking out the $25,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That was the first thing I mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Flint) :

Hon. Mr. HAGGART.

Resolved that a sum not exceeding $25,000 be granted to His Majesty for deepening and widening the Galops Rapids.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it usual for a contractor to allow a drawback of 10 per cent to remain for a year without applying for it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recall individual instances, but I know where there have been large accumulations of drawbacks and we have very often to get the necessary authority to pay them. At certain times a contractor will allow his drawback to remain a good deal longer than he will at other times. There is no rule about it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I understand, this is a contract by the day. His dredges are hired?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only in part.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Only in part, I know, but the amount that is paid in on his contract is a small proportion of the total payment for the use of his dredges. And you are deducting an amount equal to 10 per cent of the whole, which you have now continued to keep for over three years without the contractor making application for the payment of the 10 per cent. It is most extraordinary.

Motion agreed to.

Soulanges canal—Construction and equipment, $100,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is that for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to enable us to clear up for the year what has been done in respect to the work on this canal.

Mr. SPROULE. This is contract work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Rapide Plat canal, enlargement, $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount to be expended for next year, and what is the total amount required to finish the work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount we have asked for next year will finish it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The amount you have now in the estimates for next year will finish the whole expenditure in connection with the Rapide Plat canal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, that is the estimate of the engineer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Well that is about the end of the St. Lawrence canal system. What is the amount the hon. minister estimates will be required to finish the whole of the St. Lawrence works from the head of the Galops Rapids down to Montreal ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I thought I had that statement here in my room, but I believe it is over at my office. I will have it for the supplementaries for next year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like the hon. minister to make a general statement too in reference to the Welland canal and the whole system of navigation and what will be required to finish it up and have it ready when the supplementaries are under discussion.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I intend to do that.

The gathering information and otherwise with reference to a railway commission, $1,400.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to cover what we have paid for gathering information in respect to a railway commission.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the railway commission in regard to freight rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had a commission of inquiry from one end of the country to the other. The commissioner took evidence and inquired into freight rates and such troubles as were arising in respect to railways.

Mr. SPROULE. Was the gentleman appointed on this railway commission a railway expert, or what qualifications had he for doing that work ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had very superior qualifications, as far as I could judge. I inquired to ascertain where I could get a man who had been a student of economic questions, who had studied railway questions and inter-state laws regulating railways, and I found such a man in the person of Prof. McLean.

Mr. SPROULE. What experience had he in connection with railways ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had never operated a railway. He had never been in the employ of a railway company, but he had studied railway questions generally and he is a professor in Lafayette College, Arkansas. Any one who has taken the trouble to read the report prepared by him, I think, cannot fail to be pleased with the manner in which he has discharged the duties imposed upon him.

Mr. SPROULE. He is a professor of what branch ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Political economy and other economic questions.

Mr. SPROULE. I would hardly think that a teaching professor would have such an intimate knowledge of railway traffic and traffic arrangements between railway companies as would make him an expert in that line. He might, from the literary standpoint, and as a professor of political economy, be able to write a fine report, but I can hardly think that would make him an expert, or make him more suitable for this work than a business man who had been connected with railways.

Welland canal, to complete west docking at Port Dalhousie, $11,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for work done under the contract of Mr. John Riley. The amount appropriated last year, we thought, would suffice for the work this year, but it has not sufficed. The contractor has gone on and continued the work, as we were glad to have him do, and we want $11,000 to pay what he is likely to earn in the current year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount required to finish that dock?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The amount expended up to date is $19,000. This work will be finished during the current year, and $11,000 will finish it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is there anything in for next year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This finishes it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Strengthening of wall at head of locks, $5,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that old canal used by vessels ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes. There are some factories there. We have to keep it open.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is only useful for supplying water power to the factories. What rental is the minister getting for that water power ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. New leases are granted upon very much better terms for the country than the old ones. I have endeavoured to secure for the benefit of the public not an excessive but a reasonable rate.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much per horse power ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not less than $2 and as high as $6 annually.

To complete drainage at Port Colborne, $5,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have to do this work in consequence of the remonstrances of the board of health.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why is the government expected to do the drainage.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If we obstruct the natural drainage by our canal I presume we would be bound to provide drainage.

Mr. COCHRANE. The water in the canal would not be any higher than the level of the lake, and so you cannot obstruct the drainage.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I cannot understand how it is possible that you can obstruct the drainage by building the canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not want the surface drainage to go into the canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It could not go anywhere else than into the canal. I cannot understand for the life of me the principle upon which the government does this work. It is unexplainable I suppose. Go on to the next item.

Lachine canal—To complete work of paving Mill street, $1,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why do you pave Mill street.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This finishes it and we will hand it over to the city, which will relieve us from any further responsibility.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But on what principle do you pave Mill street.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It belongs to us and nobody else could do it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a long strip on government property and it is used for traffic.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And because a street in Montreal is alongside government property you are called upon to pave it.

To rebuild waste weir, $6,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I suppose this is about ten times the amount you ever collected in rent from the parties you supply the water to.

Mr. COCHRANE. What policy has the government adopted in reference to this. Why should the public be called upon to contribute to building weirs for gentlemen who have manufacturing establishments on the canal. I should think that if we furnish them with water they should build their own weirs. I am not disposed to grumble about doing anything for the benefit of the public as a whole, but as the representative of a rural constituency I do not feel called upon to vote public money to accommodate gentlemen in Montreal or anywhere else. You not only keep up the weirs but you build bridges across the weirs for them. Why should we do this work for private individuals ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. These weirs have been there for a great many years and they require to be rebuilt and there is no alternative.

Mr. COCHRANE. I do not accept that as an explanation at all. I do not think it is a common sense explanation that because a grievance has existed for years past even under the administration I supported, it should be continued. If we find that this is not a paying investment we should stop it. If it is a losing game for us let those who get the benefit of the weirs keep them up. What is the revenue derived from keeping up these weirs ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot say from memory nor can the chief engineer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister, in order to protect the canal and keep it from breaking away, should see that the weirs are properly built and put in proper order; and after that any repairs upon them should be charged to the individual who is using the water.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Is there any revenue at all derived from these weirs ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell how much revenue we get from them. These water powers are subject to rental—not as much, I am sorry to say, as they ought to be, or as much as we are getting under the new leases; but they are all subject to rental.

Mr. ROSAMOND. It seems to me that if these weirs are maintained by the government for the benefit of the mills, the government ought to derive at least enough revenue from the mills to keep them in repair. These mill-owners are given an advantage over their competitors if they have these weirs maintained for them at the public expense. It is no argument to say that the same thing has been done by previous governments.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am not bringing that forward as an argument at all, although I can say with absolute truthfulness that we are repairing the weirs just as they have always been repaired, and I think it would be rather hard on the lessees of these water privileges, after the lapse of all these years during which they have used them on the same conditions, never having been asked to contribute a farthing towards their repair, if we should now ask them to repair them. How could we compel them to do it ? We have given them leases which do not contain any covenant to compel them to keep up the weirs.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is no clause which compels you to keep them up.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If we did not keep them up, the canal would be hurt more than these people, and we cannot allow anything to occur that would impair the safety of the canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister says that hitherto there has been no contribution by the parties who own the water powers towards the maintenance of these weirs—that they have always been maintained by the government.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So I am told by the chief engineer.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would like the minister, before the next supplementary estimates are brought, to inquire and ascertain whether that is strictly correct or not, because, if my memory serves me rightly, I obliged some of them, when the weirs got out or order, to pay, at any rate, half the cost of putting them in order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have already stated that what I am saying I am saying on the authority of the chief engineer, that we are pursuing exactly the same course that has obtained hitherto; and I can well understand that unless there is a covenant in these leases——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is a covenant for repairs, to be paid by the lessee.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That I will have to look into, because I am advised that there is not.

Mr. ROSAMOND. The minister will see that every mill-owner in the country using a water power is obliged to keep up his water power at his own expense; and therefore it is, I think, unjust that the mill-owners along the canals should have these weirs kept up for them at the public expense, and without contributing any revenue whatever to the country. I do not think that should be allowed to continue. I would be glad if the minister would bring down some information later on as to what revenue is derived from these weirs.

Culbute canal—To pay damages by flooding, $1,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is another thousand dollars.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I shall be glad to read to the committee the names of the claimants and the amounts which have been reported upon and which we are prepared to pay as full settlement: A. Sabine, $75; Y. Lamarche, $30; L. Lacroix, sr., $40; G. Gervais, $10; T. Kearney, $55; F. Wright, $20; Rev. T. V. L. Morque, $75; E. Wousseau, $15; T. Kearney, $55; M. McVeigh, $160; D. Gervais, $25; M. Griffin, $50; T. Lacroix, $30; W. Lett, $20; L. Lacroix, jr., $30; A. Caswell, $40; legal and other expenses, $270; making $1,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you take a release from them to the effect that if at any time the Culbute canal is raised up to its former height, they will claim no more damages?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not settled these yet; but I should think that would be proper.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We put the dam down, and I thought we had paid everybody who had any claim when the dam was at its full height. But now that it is down, there are more claims.

Intercolonial Railway—Operation and maintenance, $1,000,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the amount voted last year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $4,500,000, and this is to supplement it up to the 1st of July next, which will make it the same as last year.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps the minister could give us some information as to what the deficit is on the working expenses of the road this year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I made the statement the other day that down to the 31st of March there was a deficit of $136,000, as compared with a deficit of $500,000 and $600,000 during the corresponding period of preceding years. I expect that this deficit will be extinguished and that there will be a credit on the other side.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This would only be available for about six weeks expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, and most of it must have been spent.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not paid last months yet. There are three months not paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are we to understand that the employees have not been paid for three months?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We pay the working men monthly. On the 10th of May the men are paid for April, so that we have April, May and June still to pay, which makes three months.

Cornwall canal, repairs and working expense, $18,150.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How do you exceed the estimate for repairs and working expense by $8,000 in one year on a canal that was only finished a couple of years ago.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for the lighting of the canal by electricity, which comes under the general item of repairs and working expenses.

Mr. PRINGLE. While dealing with this matter, I would like to refer to a subject which pertains to it, and that is the superannuation of a man named Shields. I desire to express my appreciation of the efforts of the Minister of Railways and Canals to see that justice was done Mr. Shields. I received a communication a short time ago to the effect that the treasury board had granted him his superannuation from the date of that letter, but I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to this fact, that on the 12th April, 1897, Mr. Shields was notified that his services would no longer be required. A period of five years has elapsed since then, but he is entitled to the superannuation from the 12th April, 1897, and is therefore entitled to the arrears from that date to the present. I do not think that the government are treating Mr. Shields at all fairly in simply allowing his superannuation from the present day. He should have the arrears for that period of five years, and I would ask the hon. minister to take that matter into his consideration. I have received a letter from Mr. Shields—who unfortunately is very ill, and I do not know when he may get better—complaining about these arrears and asking that this should be made right. Now that the government have looked into the matter and found that there was unquestionably a mistake in depriving him of his superannuation allowance, I think that they ought to grant him his superannuation from the date his services were dispensed with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The question of arrears did not present itself to my mind, and I have not passed upon it. I was under the impression that it would be satisfactory to Mr. Shields and his friends if the superannuation were allowed. The treasury board have not the power to make any allowance in respect of arrears. If, on consideration, it seems proper, in view of the representations made to us, to allow the arrears, we will have to ask parliament for an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. PRINGLE. That is one of the reasons I have brought the matter up—that it may require a vote of the House in order to give the arrears. I have a letter from Mr. Shields which I shall be glad to show the minister. While Mr. Shields appreciates the course taken by the government in granting his superannuation, he is very solicitious about the arrears. I can say that the man requires them, for he has quite a family and is in ill health. He has been unable to do any work since his dismissal owing to an unfortunate accident which occurred while in the discharge of his duties.

Railways and Canals—Collection of revenue—general—Additional amount to persons employed in the public service and remuneration to any other persons for services rendered for and in connection with passing vessels through the canals of the government of Canada from midnight on Saturdays to midnight on Sundays, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is made necessary by new work and increases on all canals. The amount will be required before the close of the fiscal year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This seems a large amount for one canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is for all the canals.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. minister has increased the vote in the main estimates from $15,000 to $19,000 for the canals generally, and this amount could not be needed for the Soulanges canal alone.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not confined to that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The minister told us that the increase from $15,000 to $19,000 was due to the increase of work by reason of the Soulanges canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there is naturally an increase on all the canals, the Galops, Farran's Point and all.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why should there be additional work to what there was before?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not just recall what increases took place. But my hon. friend knows that on account of the increased wages and one thing or other, the expense of labour on our canals is growing.

Mr. TAYLOR. Have the wages of the men been increased?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In some instances.

Mr. TAYLOR. The increases must be very rare. I do not know of any case on the Rideau canal.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not recall upon what particular canals they are.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is this proviso 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' here?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I suppose that, perhaps, there are men employed, who, not having passed the examination, could not be paid without this proviso.

Mr. TAYLOR. But men do not have to pass an examination to work on the canals.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some of them have to, I believe.

Post Office Department—To promote Henry Knauf to a second-class clerkship, July, 1901, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the explanation of this ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Henry Knauf is a German. He was appointed to the service in 1877. His present salary is $1,000 a year. He is at the maximum of his class having been there from the 1st of July, 1888. He is a third-class clerk, and has not passed the qualifying civil service examination. He is an expert in the Scandinavian languages, German and Italian, and is used in the translation of dead letters.

Post Office Department—Salaries—to pay E. J. Cummings, a junior second-class clerk in the Branch Dead Letter Office at Vancouver, provisional allowance from March 1 to June 30, 1902, at $180 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $60.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is a proportion of a provisional allowance, the officer being transferred to Victoria.

Post Office Department—Salaries contingencies —To pay E. L. Foley, a temporary writer of the Branch Dead Letter Office at Winnipeg, provisional allowance from January 1 to June 30, 1902, at $120 per annum, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $60.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the same kind of case as the other. The officer is in Winnipeg.

To increase the salary of D. Sagala, a temporary packer from $420 to $600, from July 1, 1901, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $180.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is the case of a man who has been in the service since 1890, and who, for six or seven years got no increase. He brought his case to my attention the other day, and I have given him an increase of $30 a year for the six years when he was without any increase.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) is repenting of his sins.

Post Office—To increase the salary of Mr. W. W. McLeod, post office inspector at Winnipeg, from $2,400 to $2,600, from March 1, 1902, $66.67.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This officer became intitled to his increase after ten years' service on the 1st March of this year, and this gives him an increase at the rate of $200 from the 1st March, to the 1st July.

To reinstate Mr. Joseph N. A. Gingras, formerly a 2nd class railway mail clerk in the Quebec district, at his former salary of $720, from July 1, 1901, and to restore him to his former status under the Superannuation Act of 1870 and its amendments, on payment of the deductions from salary prescribed thereby, his service to be considered as continuous, and to pay him a mileage allowance of $250.72 for the year ended June 30, 1902, making a total of $979.72, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service or Superannuation Acts to the contrary, $970.72.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Mr. Gingras was a railway mail clerk, and was accused of having purposely delayed the transmission of newspapers and having prevented them from reaching their destination. The case seemed to be made out and he was dismissed. But, after an appeal and a re-inquiry, the conclusion we reached was that the treatment he had received was rather harsh. He explained the charge away, and I have had him reinstated. This is to make up his back pay while he was in a state of suspension or dismissal.

To complete payments for post office service to June 30, 1902, $133,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Last year I was away, and the officers of the department did not take a supplementary estimate for enough to carry us through.

Mr. CLARKE. What will be the total deficit for this year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Something under $200,000.

Mr. EARLE. Before we leave the post office estimates I would like to call to the attention of the Postmaster General a defect in the mail service between Dawson and Victoria, B.C. I have just received today from the Wholesale Grocers' Exchange, Victoria, a letter which reads as follows :—

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is all over now, it is all arranged. It arose on account of our not being able to make an agreement with the White Pass Railway. That railway underwent a change, and we have a contract signed within the last week by them and instructions have gone forward.

Mr. EARLE. If the mails are made up for Vancouver as formerly some delay will occur. What the people there suggest is that the mail from Skagway and Dawson for Victoria be made up at Dawson for Victoria, so that a steamer when calling at Vancouver may bring the mails with her.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will endeavour to do that and to see that every steamer passing between Canada and the Yukon shall take the mails, whether the steamer be American or Canadian. I have not succeeded wholly with the Americans, but I have made an arrangement that we shall have at least one service a week both ways by one of the American ships that take their own mails.

Mr. EARLE. I do not think the Postmaster General quite catches the point. The difficulty seems to be that the mails from the Yukon are made up for Vancouver, all the mails are distributed there, so that a steamer coming from Skagway for Victoria calls at Vancouver and delivers the mail there, remains half an hour or so and comes on to Victoria. Then the regular steamer, if she has left previous to that time, does not get to Victoria with the mail until the following night. So it puts us twenty-four hours behind Vancouver in receiving our mail.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We are now ready to go on with the items of the Minister of Agriculture; but as he is not present and may come in later, in the meantime, it might meet the convenience of the House to discuss the Bill respecting labour troubles. The premier promised that if possible he would allow an opportunity to discuss it on the second reading. I do not know whether any hon. gentleman desires to discuss it at this late hour; but if any one desires to do so, I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why take up the time when it is not the intention of the government to press the labour Bill?

Mr. EARLE. There are very few representatives of labour in the House to-night, I mean of the prominent representatives.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think a great deal of good will come from a discussion. We do not wish to pass it through until it is fully discussed.

Mr. CLARKE. I thought it was already sufficiently discussed, because the government have relegated it to the next session.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not think many members have had sufficient time to study it.

Mr. CLARKE. When was the announcement made that an opportunity would be given for further discussion?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. On the first reading. The government was asked if an opportunity would be given for a second reading, and the premier said if possible.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would suggest to the Postmaster General, who is leading the House now, that if no other business is ready, we should take up the Bill of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Roddick), who is very anxious to have it passed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would not be advisable to take it up without notice.

Board of Civil Service Examiners, $200.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought it was announced that that item would be dropped.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why hold civil service examinations now when thousands of people have passed and there are no places for them?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was ever so.

Mr. GERMAN. Civil service examinations have been advertised in the papers for May and November. There are a large number of young men in the country who desire to pass the civil service examination --promotion examinations, it is true, but even civil service examinations without promotion. I think it is wisdom on the part of this government and on the part of every government to adopt the principle that no person should be placed in the civil service without having passed an examination. I am free to admit that on the recommendation of party friends gentlemen are placed in positions in the civil service who have not passed an examination; but I think the government would do well to adopt the principle that no person could be appointed to the service who had not pasesd the examination. That would be an encouragement to young men to educate themselves for positions in the service, irrespective of their party leanings. We have plenty of young men who would be glad to take positions in the service and who would qualify themselves therefor and make suitable employees, irrespective of their politics; but the trouble is that they are set aside by party interest. I think that is wrong. I am free to say that if there were two gentlemen equally competent, one being a Liberal and the other a Conservative, so far as I am concerned, I would probably be inclined to recommend the Liberal. I suppose that is natural. But I would like to impress on the government the idea that it would be wise to make it a necessary qualification for all employees that they should have passed the civil service examination.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman ought to have taken the government to task a night or two ago when they passed an item here practically doing away with the Civil Service Act altogether.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the history of the last two years ought to be enough to disabuse the hon. gentleman of the impression that young men get into the service by reason of having passed the civil service examinations. Under the Conservative government no person could get into the service unless he had passed the civil service examination. But since this government has come into power that rule is more honoured in the breach than in the observance. The fact is, that there is scarcely an item in the estimates nowadays which does not contain the proviso 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the con-

trary,' showing that the appointment was made in open violation of that Act.

Charges of management—additional amount required for printing and engraving Dominion notes, $25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Was there a new contract entered into with this firm for the printing and engraving of Dominion notes ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it a private contract, or was it by tender, or how was it let ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was a renewal of the old contract made with the American Bank Note Company. There is only one other company that could tender; that is the Burland Company, and for reasons which I am sure will be satisfactory it was not deemed advisable to invite that firm to tender.

Mr. SPROULE. Why ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I suppose the hon. gentleman is aware of the litigation pending between the government and the old contractors.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is the government's fault.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is the fault of the old government, my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) means. If he is at all familiar with the case I am sure he will not press the question, but if he desires to press for the information I will give it to him.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an expenditure involving $25,000.

Mr. CLARKE. It is a great deal more than that.

Mr. SPROULE. I mean this estimate under consideration. That is a very respectable sum. It would be natural that we would anticipate when the government were expending that large amount of money that they would endeavour to expend it in an economical way, and to do that it would be fair to let the contract after open competition.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I agree with my hon. friend, but there are only two companies on this continent—I speak subject to correction, as I am not aware of more than two companies—that do this business. There is the American Bank Note Company, that recently established here, and there is the British American Bank Note Company, which for many years had the contract. In 1897 the contract was removed from the old company and transferred to the present contractors. It was then discovered that the old company had been guilty of a breach of contract. There is no question about that. The contract required them to supply a steel engraved stamp to the Inland Revenue Department, but instead of doing so they mixed up lithographed stamps to a very large amount, and this deception was practised without the knowledge of the Department of Inland Revenue. Neither the minister nor any of his officials was aware that the stamps delivered were mere lithographs instead of being steel engraved, and for many years they continued to pay for these stamps as if they were according to contract. After the discovery was made the matter was brought into court, and the Exchequer Court has given judgment against the contractors for $100,000. The matter is now in the Supreme Court, and in view of that kind of treatment received by the Dominion of Canada the present government are not prepared to invite these former contractors to tender for the performance of such work.

Mr. CLARKE. What is the total amount involved in the contract every year ? What is the amount paid the American Bank Note Company for work done under their contract ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It is a varying sum. It is so much an item, so much for printing postage stamps, so much for printing postal notes, Inland Revenue stamps, bank bills, &c. It is a schedule contract.

Mr. CLARKE. It amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually though ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not think so much as that.

Mr. CLARKE. How much ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give my hon. friend the figures.

Mr. CLARKE. The contract is for five years and has been renewed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. There are many establishments in Canada which, if an opportunity had been given to put in tenders for this work, would have done so. It seems to me to be a departure from the professions which the hon. gentleman made and which his party made many years ago that great amounts of public work should be given out without public competition. It is not at all creditable to the Dominion of Canada that work of such a nature should be done by a firm which is practically a foreign firm and that a very large portion of this work—the finer portions of the work—should be done in the United States.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not correct.

Mr. CLARKE. It was correct when the contract was first made and we have no evidence that it is not correct now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman states on his own knowledge that it is not

correct, of course, I will have to withdraw that statement. Does he state that none of the work of this contract in engraving is done in the United States ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not see the work done, but I believe that none is performed except in Ottawa. When the contract was taken in the first instance, until the company got into working order, a very limited portion of the work was allowed to be done in the United States, the engraving of the die and the steel rolls, but I have seen in regard to work for my department part of that work done, and I see no reason why the same should not be done in the case of bank notes. My hon. friend talks of this company engraving bank notes as if it were simply a matter of printing posters for ordinary purposes. It is a very responsible position, and many of the banks of Canada at all events show their appreciation of the standing of this company by employing them to do their work. My hon. friend talks about the company as if they were here to-day and away to-morrow. They have invested large sums of money in permanent plant in the city of Ottawa, they have erected a handsome building and they own this property in freehold. At one time this company did a great deal of engraving in New York for the Canadian banks, which work has now been transferred to Canada, and this company here is doing a great deal of bank note engraving for the banks of Canada which was formerly done in the city of New York.

Mr. CLARKE. It is an unjustifiable thing to renew a contract of this kind without ascertaining whether or not there are other firms doing similar work in Canada.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The hon. gentleman's predecessors for a generation renewed the contract with the British American Bank Note Company without a tender.

Mr. CLARKE. And the only apology that the hon. gentleman has to make is that for twenty years his predecessors in office did what he is doing now.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, we have a very much better contract.

Mr. CLARKE. What was the difference?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. $165,000.

Mr. CLARKE. Then this contract made with the new company meant a great deal where there was a difference between the two companies of $165,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL . For five years.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman was expending $165,000 of his own money I think he would not renew a contract without endeavouring to ascertain whether the work could be done by other firms for a less amount. When the contract was offered to the American Bank Note Company, I know a firm in Toronto which sent its representative down here to make inquiries in respect to the work, a firm that was doing the highest class of engraving that can possibly be done, and a Canadian firm, and I think before the contract for this work which will involve $1,000,000 of an expenditure was renewed, an opportunity should have been given to Canadian firms to undertake the work and do it in this country. If the government had then found that the work could not be done as well as it is being done now, or that it could not have been done for less money than is being paid now, the government might have been justified in renewing the contract, but in the absence of that the government cannot justify its action in renewing for five years without tender a contract made five years ago involving such a vast expenditure of public money. On no business principle can the government justify its action in renewing for five years without tender, a contract which involves such a vast expenditure of public money. When the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock) was in opposition he did not hesitate to condemn loudly, and properly in my judgment, anything of that kind if it was perpetrated by his political opponents.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am glad to learn of a change of heart in the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke). We have got a most profitable contract—

Mr. CLARKE. For the firm.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We have a most profitable contract for the Dominion of Canada, a contract which saves thousands of dollars a year as compared with the contract price paid by the late government. When the present government made this contract by which we got cheaper and better work none were louder in denouncing us because we did not continue with the old contractor without renewal than this hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes. I sat in this House and heard it. The hon. George E. Foster denounced us because we had passed over the British American Bank Note Company which had forfeited any claim to the consideration of the government, and my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has the coolness to stand up here and to tell us to go back to the old system of for twenty years renewing a contract at improvident prices. If the hon. Minister of Finance were present he would be able to give evidence to show that the terms of this renewal are fair and reasonable. The company about which my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) speaks so flippantly is a very solvent

company, highly respectable company, and it is doing the most confidential work in Canada for those who desire it. The banks in Canada know their own business, and if they think this company is sufficiently responsible, sufficiently reliable, and sufficiently trustworthy to be given this very delicate work of engraving bank notes, we think so to. There might be other companies that would in time grow up to the situation, but it is not every even well equipped engraving house to-day that could commence manufacturing bank bills and stamps at once. In the old country the government continues for years and years with the same contractor because of the confidential relations which exist between the two.

Mr. HOLMES. I had the opportunity—as my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) might have had the opportunity if he wished to avail himself of it—of visiting the bank note establishment the other day. If the hon. gentleman would visit that office he would find that all the work is done in Canada, the steel engraving and the printing of the bank notes, by Canadians, with the exception of possibly the manager, the assistant manager, and two of the employees, who are Americans. Otherwise all the work is done by Canadian labour. In addition to doing the work for the Dominion government and apparently doing it satisfactorily, this concern is doing work for nearly all the banks in the Dominion at the present time. I am surprised at the statement made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) in view of the fact that he is a practical printer and knows as well as any man in the House that there are only two establishments in Canada that do work of that kind. You might ask for tenders all you like, but you would only receive tenders from the two establishments that are in Ottawa. I believe that the government has given a good reason why it was not advisable for them to ask for tenders from the old firm.

Mr. CLARKE. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holmes) for telling me how I should act and where I should go to obtain information. But, in talking the way he does he is simply beating the air. I say that in a matter involving this very large expenditure extending over a period of five years, the government should have called for tenders as the hon. gentleman would do himself if he were contracting to have such work done for him. How does he, or how does the minister know that Canadian firms would not put themselves in a position to do this work just as satisfactorily as the American firm if the Canadian firms were given the opportunity? How does he know that if tenders had been asked for Canadian firms would not have put themselves in a position to provide plant to do this work? Is it a business proposition that in a contract involving nearly a $1,000,000 the government should renew the contract to the same firm without ascertaining whether any responsible and reliable Canadian firms could do the work? Common business principles would have dictated the ordinary method of calling for tenders in such a case. I am surprised that a man like the hon. member (Mr. Holmes) should justify such action on the part of the government. I am prepared to say that if reasonable notice had been given and tenders asked for, more than two Canadian firms would have put in tenders for this contract.

Mr. HOLMES. I am not surprised to hear that the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Clarke) knows it all. No doubt, the valuable information that he has given to the House at different times has convinced the people of the country that he knows it all. However, there are certain things which even gentlemen in the city of Toronto can learn, but they require humility in order to learn it, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) who assumes a very patriotic air now is not consistent in the theory he is putting forth. I did not intend to give him information, I simply wanted to convey the idea that the information is available to any member of the House who wants to learn. Of course there are some people who are too big to seek information, and who simply make recriminations in this House for political effect, and for what they can gain by appealing to public sentiment and to things of that kind. Some of us may be sincere in the advocacy of certain principles, and some of us may be talking to the gallery as certain people from Toronto do occasionally. So far as this not being a business proposition is concerned, I assert that the government did what was perfectly right and that the people of Canada will endorse their action in renewing the contract to that firm. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) talks about beating the air, I can tell him that no body beats the air more than he does when he speaks of calling for tenders, because he knows perfectly well that there are only two firms in all Canada who would entertain a proposition involving this very large expenditure. But the trouble with our friends on the other side of the House is, that this business government was able to make a contract in this manner which saved the country $150,000 in five years, and were able to renew it on equally good terms.

Mr. HACKETT. Why should not this government give a Canadian company employing Canadians an opportunity to tender for this work.

Mr. HOLMES. This company employs Canadians.

Mr. HACKETT. Why should not the contract be given to a company having its interests in Canada, in preference to an American firm? The hon. gentleman,

speaking from a patriotic standpoint, says that we saved $150,000 in five years on this contract. But how inconsistent are hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Railways said the other day that he had given a contract to a Canadian company to provide steel rails at $8 a ton more than they could be purchased for outside, in order to encourage Canadian industry. What did that cost the people of this country ? $175,000 a year. And yet these hon. gentlemen say that we are not patriotic, because we would not save $30,000 a year on this bank note business, by giving the contract to an American company. If these hon. gentlemen are going to be patriotic in one way, let them be patriotic in another. If they are going to spend $175,000 a year for the purpose of producing steel rails in Canada, why not spend $30,000 a year for the purpose of producing these Dominion notes in Canada ? If the minister or his followers cannot produce any better argument than that, they are out of the race.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the hon. gentleman answer me a question ? Who is manufacturing steel rails in Canada ?

Mr. HACKETT. Clergue.

Mr. HOLMES. Well, Clergue is an American citizen who has come into Canada and is developing the industries of Canada. The American Bank Note Company have also come into Canada and are developing our industries in the same way.

Mr. HACKETT. The argument of the hon. gentleman is that Canadians are no good, and we have to depend on Americans to come in and develop our resources.

Mr. HOLMES. The argument is as good in one case as in the other.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. gentleman does not seem to realize yet the very grave injustice that is being done to Canadians, especially to Canadians in the engraving business, by the course pursued by the government. I have not made any charge that the work being done at present is not well done. I did not raise that question at all. I raised the question whether it was a good business proceeding, one that would commend itself to the approval of any business man in Canada, that a contract involving $700,000 or $800,000 or $1,000,000 should have been entered into by this government, a renewal contract too, without their asking for competitive tenders. There is not a gentleman on that side of the House who, if his own money were at stake, would not seek by public competition to get the work done lower than it is done now. But no Canadian firm has been given any opportunity to put in a tender. I do not profess to know as much as my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Holmes) of the number of firms in Canada which are competent to do this work; but I repeat that if an opportunity had been given to Canadian firms to compete for this work, more than two tenders would have been put in. I noticed that when this matter was up in the House in 1897, a letter was read from Mr. George R. Barber, of Georgetown. He said that he and his associates would have put in a tender, if an opportunity had been given them. I do not know whether the hon. member for West Huron can give me any information about printing of this character. On certain classes of printing I will not take any information from him, though he may speak upon other classes. But I know that there are firms in Toronto and Montreal which, if opportunities had been given them, would have been only too glad to have put in bids for this work, and would have done just as good work and given just as good satisfaction as this American firm is doing; and I know no good reason why Canadian firms should not have been given that opportunity. If a proposition of this character had been submitted to hon. gentlemen opposite for their approval when they were on this side of the House, they would have been loud in their denunciation of it. It is not a business proposition nor one that ought to be supported by the members of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. The statement has been made several times to-night that there was a very large saving effected by this contract over the previous contract. If that is so, the minister can surely tells us what the old contract amounted to and what the present contract amounts to ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot state the amount of the annual expenditure under each.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister get the information and give it to us at some later stage ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Certainly.

Additional amount required for clerical assistance in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, $1,150.

Mr. SPROULE. In the course of a discussion which took place in this House some time ago, a number of the members recommended the redemption of many of the notes which are in circulation. There is an opinion prevalent throughout the country that many of these old notes are not only very unclean, but tend to disseminate disease; and I am inclined to believe that there is some truth in that opinion. In fact, it is believed that small-pox has been transmitted by means of Dominion notes or bank notes sent through the mails. If that is the case, it seems to me a matter of importance that these old notes should be redeemed and replaced by new ones. Has the minister made any arrangement for that purpose, and if so to what extent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The difficulty lies, not with the government, but

with the public, who have the remedy in their own hands. The government issue notes with a view to providing the public with clean notes, and if the public will ask the banks for clean notes, they will be entitled to get them. The government is not a bank of issue, but all the banks are supplied with clean bills.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there anything in the Bank Act that requires the banks to supply the public with clean notes ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No, there is not.

Mr. SPROULE. Then it would be optional with the banks whether they would do it or not ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. They will always do it, if asked.

Mr. KEMP. It seems to me that from a sanitary standpoint the time has come when the government should consider this matter seriously. I have consulted one or two medical gentlemen on the subject, and they are of opinion that the $1 and $2 Dominion notes are most effective disseminators of disease. The $5 and $10 bills of the chartered banks are not quite so objectionable from a sanitary standpoint as the bills issued by the government, and it seems to me that the government should take some steps to see that the old bills are called in and cleaner bills issued in their place. The danger is one that does not exist to the same extent in European countries, where silver and gold are used more extensively as it does in this country and in the United States, where bills are the common currency.

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman must surely understand that $1 and $2 bills are in very much more general circulation than $5 bills. Bills of $1 and $2 are very much more in circulation than those of $5. They are used continually and pass practically as change, whereas $5 bills are not used so often, and consequently are not so much defaced. As has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, something should be done to enforce the calling in of those defaced and dilapidated bills. We have too many of them in this country. Besides it depreciates our bills in the United States. It is difficult enough to get our Canadian bills taken at par in the United States, and much more difficult when they are defaced and dilapidated. I do not know what remedy we could apply. As stated by the hon. the Postmaster General, the remedy is in the hands of the banks and the people who use the bills. If the people would return those worn-out bills and ask for gold instead, to which they are entitled, that possibly might bring about a change. It is a matter, in any case, which should receive the consideration of the government, and I hope the government will bring about a change, so that we will not have so many defaced bills in circulation as at present.

High Commissioner's Office—Further amount required for contingencies, rent, &c., $7,800.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this for additional buildings ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Either that item or another includes a sum for rental of the High Commissioner's house. I cannot say whether it is in this item or not, but I think it is. The time will come when we may have a commissioner who may not have the means to treat the country as liberally as does our present High Commissioner, and we may have to pay rent. There is no immediate prospect of that amount being used, but it might be less invidious to provide for it in case we should have to make a similar provision when a new incumbent is in the office. I hope that for many years to come our present High Commissioner will continue in that position, and so long as he does this item will not be required. When Sir Charles Tupper was High Commissioner, we purchased a residence and paid the sum of £10,000 for the leasehold, and also had certain expenses in connection therewith.

Mr. SPROULE. But this is to complete expenditure which may take place between now and the 30th June.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There has been an enlargement of the premises. We have now a much larger portion of the building on Victoria street. The department of immigration is on one side of the building on the same flat as the High Commissioner's office, and the premises have been extended in the rear as well. There is a larger staff in the High Commissioner's office and a larger proportion of the building rented.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that additional room necessary for Mr. Preston's office ? I understand that he is not using the same office as before.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Last year he had it there. I do not offer those explanations as authoritative, but I am familiar with the conditions there and I know that there have been changes, and I think that these account for the increase.

House of Commons—additional amount required for stationery, $2,500.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this is in connection with our annual supply?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Yes, under the control of the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. We had some supplies last year, in which there were a lot of nick-nacks which were of no use. Of course, some of the stationery was valuable, but some of the things supplied were merely an expenditure of public money to very little purpose.

Additional amount for publishing the debates, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That seems a very large amount to require at the end of the year.

Mr. GERMAN. That item could be considerably reduced if hon. gentlemen opposite would not talk so much.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cause of this very large amount for one year ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am not in a position to give the explanation, and the chairman of the Debates Committee is not present. If the hon. gentleman wishes we will let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Legislation—library—To provide statutory increases for two messengers, Albert Beaudry and Thomas Lynton at $30 each, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $60.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is the provision 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' necessary here ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information. The Library Committee, which is a joint committee, has made this recommendation.

Legislation — general— printing — Additional amount required, $35,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this to pay for contracts outside, or is it to meet expenses of the Printing Bureau ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. As this is for legislative printing, I take it that it would be for the Bureau.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there any minister present who can tell us whether we get much printing done outside of the Bureau ? We see the statement made in the press that that is the case. If we knew the facts, we should be better able to estimate whether the Bureau is as valuable as we anticipated that it would be.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. For my own department, I have had only one item of printing done outside of the Bureau. That was a money order book, and it was done outside for the double reason of economy, and because the Printing Bureau had not the facilities and desired us to get it done elsewhere. I believe that some departmental reports, in cases of urgency, have been printed outside. The Secretary of State, who is in charge of the Printing Bureau, reports that the demand has outrun the facilities of the Printing Bureau and the premises should be enlarged. The King's Printer himself is compelled to request that some of the printing be done outside.

Mr. COCHRANE. I see it stated in the press—it may not be correct, but I think it must be nearly correct or no editor would publish it—that $75,000 was paid for printing to one newspaper company alone. It seems hardly economical to get our printing done outside when we have a Printing Bureau equipped and running, and all it needs is enlargement.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It would take a lot of money to enlarge it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, $75,000 is quite a sum of money to ordinary mortals.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But after you pay for the enlargement, the printing costs money even if it is done in the Bureau. I understand the printing now required exceeds the capacity of the Bureau.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, enlarge the Bureau.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That is not so easily done.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is as easy to do that as to spend these enormous sums in getting printing done outside.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. No doubt it will come to that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then, it would be better if it came to it when the government have the money to spend. We all know that the pendulum will swing the other way and by and by, they will have less money.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. But this is a government of economy, you know, and we do not wish to spend so much.

Mr. COCHRANE. But, if the minister would explain more, and talk less it would save time. And I hope the hon. gentleman will accept that in as good a spirit as it is given. My contention is that it would be far better to spend the money in enlarging the Printing Bureau now that the revenue is buoyant, rather than spend the money on printing outside and still have the Bureau incomplete when the revenues are lower. It would be better to spend the money in this way than in the—would it be unparliamentary, Mr. Chairman, to say in the foolish way, in which much of it is now spent ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I guess we can stand that.

Mr. COCHRANE. Here is the fact staring us in the face that the Printing Bureau needs enlargement. When the Postmaster General sat on this side of the House he used to tell us that the public buildings here were filled from garret to cellar with officials. And now, not only are these public buildings filled, but the government is spending $18,000 in rent for other buildings, and, unless they are renting buildings that they do not need, these also are filled from garret to cellar with officials. Would it not be better to provide proper accommodation in buildings owned by the government, instead of paying rent ? And, in the same

way, would it not be better to enlarge the Printing Bureau than to pay these large sums for printing done outside ?

Mr. SPROULE. I think that, when we come to concurrence, information ought to be given as to what printing is done outside and what we pay for it annually, specifying the various lines of printing and giving the names of parties to whom the money is paid. The item we are now discussing is only one, and I suppose there are others in the main estimates for some other purposes. Also, we ought to know how many are employed in the Printing Bureau. Will the minister give this information on concurrence ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As far as possible, yes.

Mr. CLARKE. For many years past the departmental reports have never been issued at as early a date as were the reports for the year ending 30th June last. This was due to the fact that the copy was sent to the Bureau in reasonable time. Moreover, the copy was not sent in simultaneously so as to choke up the Printing Bureau, but was sent in in good time, and so the work was expeditiously turned out and the reports distributed much earlier than has been the practice for years. We have a very efficient and well equipped Bureau, but some additions will have to be made. Any one who knows anything about the Bureau will admit that the work can be done there as well and more cheaply than by giving it out to political friends of the government throughout the country. The Bureau was established for the very purpose of getting the work better done and more efficiently done, and the country is not getting the full advantage of the Bureau and of the large sums expended upon it if all the public printing is not done there. If it required a small additional expenditure to equip the Bureau even more efficiently than it is at the present time, the money would be well spent. An additional space is required for the work of the bindery, and an additional space for the press department. The expenditure of the small sum required to equip and complete these departments would enable a much larger amount of work to be done. It certainly can be done as efficiently and more economically than when it is given out. The Bureau ought to be employed to its full capacity in doing the public work.

Franchise Act—Additional amount required, $2,000.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is to pay for the municipal lists which are procured from the registrars.

Mr. TAYLOR. In connection with the printing and distribution of the blue books, I have been informed that there is a general complaint amongst the members of the Conservative press in respect to the giving out of these blue-books. Under the late government when a book was issued it was handed immediately to the members representing both political parties, at the same time. Now, the members of the Reform press are furnished with an advance copy a day or two before the Conservative press. That is the complaint made by the representatives in Ottawa of the Conservative press. The Reform reporters have the benefit of a day in advance. That is something that was never done under the late Conservative government.

The PRIME MINISTER. Speaking under correction, I do not believe that this reported abuse can be substantiated. It may be there is an odd case, but that was not the intention at all events. The order is that all newspapers should be treated alike.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope the hon. gentleman will see that the order is carried out better.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to know why it is that the 'Hansard' printed in French is so late in being distributed to the members. I only see the French 'Hansard' ten or twelve days after the speeches have been delivered, and during the recess I do not receive it for four or five months. I do not see why it should not be sent to us in a couple of weeks at least. Also in regard to the Auditor General's Report; I was down there a couple of weeks ago to see if there were any printed in French, and was told that they would not be ready for four or five months. If they are not ready for four or five months it is no use to have them at all. When we come here at the beginning of the session we cannot get a French report of any kind.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend knows that so far as the debates of the House are concerned, the government has nothing to do with them. That is a matter in regard to which he should lay his complaints before the Debates Committee, and I have no doubt the committee will look into it. With regard to the Auditor General's Report, I do not believe the fault lies with the Printing Bureau. If there is any delay in the work it must be occasioned by the translators, because I am pretty sure that as soon as the copy goes into the Bureau it is quickly disposed of.

Mr. MORIN. I have been told by the translators that as soon as the House closes a good many of them are dismissed from the service. I was told so to-day. I was told that if they were kept on a few weeks longer the French report would be printed in a couple of weeks.

Gratuities for ballot designs partially adopted, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Secretary of State informs me that when the amended Franchise Act was passed we

adopted to some extent the designs of some gentlemen who had submitted ballots. I do not think it would be correct to say that any one gentleman's ballot had been adopted, but there were a number of free designs, and the intention of the Secretary of State is to distribute this vote among the persons whose designs were used.

Trade and Commerce—Bounties on iron and steel—to meet expenditure in connection with the administration of the Act, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The administration of this Act, which was formerly in the Customs Department, is now transferred to Trade and Commerce.

Mr. SPROULE. This is to meet the cost of administration in connection with the bounties on iron and steel ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The business was formerly managed by the Department of Customs. It has been transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce and this amount is necessary to enable the minister to appoint officials to make a close inspection of the work that is going on so as to check the accounts.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know whether we can get the information in connection with this item, but I would like to know how much we are to pay this year for bounties on iron and steel. It was expected a year or two ago that the amount would run up very rapidly. That information will enable us to estimate the rate of progress that is being made in the output.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It has increased very rapidly. The amount for the current year will be very considerable, and the amount in the coming year will be very much larger. It will be far in excess of what we have yet paid. If my hon. friend desires the information I will have a statement prepared for concurrence.

Mr. TAYLOR. Or on the supplementaries.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In any case I will see that the information is furnished to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I see by to-day's paper that the Clergue syndicate has commenced to turn out steel rails. Is there any bounty on steel rails ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the bounty is paid on steel ingots and beyond that there is no bounty paid.

For expenses of reception to Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York—additional amount required to pay expenses of royal tour in September and October, 1901. (Payments out of this vote, not exceeding in all $700, may be made to any members of the Civil Service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act), $358,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the whole amount?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was an amount in the main estimates last session of $120,000. This is the balance which winds up the whole thing.

To pay for steam service between Canada and France, six round trips performed in the year 1900, prior to date of contract, $16,666.66.

Mr. SPROULE. When did this contract commence ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This contract was made several years ago with the French line. In this particular year the company were not able to make the number of trips required, and the Auditor General held that unless the whole service were performed he had no power to approve of the payment of part of the subsidy. This vote is to pay them for the number of trips they actually made.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the hon. Minister of Finance could scarcely give us much information as to the amount of trade that has been carried on as a result of our subsidizing this line, or as to whether we have been able to create a trade with France in addition to that which was hitherto carried on ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I could not tell my hon. friend.

The PRIME MINISTER. Up to the present time, I am sorry to say, I do not think it has resulted in developing very much business, but I may say that I hope we will be able to do better in the future. The expectations have not been realized that were entertained at one time.

To provide for the expenses of the Prime Minister in connection with the Coronation of His Majesty, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is only one item. Is there not another item in connection with this ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the next item.

To provide for the expenses of ministers in connection with the colonial conference in London, $12,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will that be enough ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is a very modest sum.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the right hon. Prime Minister be able to give us any information as to the line that will be followed at the conference ? Can he give the committee any information regarding it beyond what he has already given the House ?

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) knows that upon the invitation of the Imperial government, the Prime Ministers of the self governing colonies will meet in London with the view of discussing

certain subjects. We have already given our views as to the character of the discussion which will take place at the conference. I should also say that at the initiation of the Canadian government a conference is to take place between the colonies of Australia, New Zealand and Canada. It has been decided that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) and the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) shall represent the government at that conference. As to what shall be the subjects which will be debated, I may say that the conference will be held with a view of developing trade between the self governing colonies, between Australia, New Zealand and Canada, and we hope we will be able to make arrangements with that end in view. As to that, however, we are in the dark yet. Australia has just adopted a new tariff and New Zealand has a tariff somewhat similar to our own. All their revenues are raised by customs duties. I believe from what I have been told by the hon. Postmaster General and from the report which has been placed on the Table of the House by the hon. Minister of Finance, that the prospects of our being able to do a large business in Australia looks very bright. Almost everything they require to supply themselves with, Canada can supply. New Zealand cannot perhaps afford such a large field but we hope also to do something there. We are of the opinion that if any trade can be developed we will probably have to subsidize a line of steamers, and we have thought, that possibly, by subsidizing a line of steamers between Canada and Australia, taking in South Africa, a large business might be developed. We have great hopes of South Africa. When the war is over, and the time cannot be very far off now, this country will require to be supplied with almost everything, and it is our intention to push matters in that direction as far as we can. My hon. friend asked me: What is the line I will take. I do not know that I can say much more than I have already said. The line must be general. We are there simply to offer and receive suggestions. The only thing we have in view is to develop trade by two means: By trade preferences and by subsidizing lines of steamers.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the Prime Minister will adhere to his determination that he will not discuss the defences of the empire.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not changed my mind upon that subject.

Mr. COCHRANE. You do not want preferential trade, then ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I would be very glad to have it.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria). I do not know how far the Prime Minister may be able to adhere to his present opinions, because if the premiers of the other colonies begin to discuss the question of defence, perhaps that question may be forced to some extent upon the premier of Canada. That is a subject in which we are all interested. I have been studying the tariff of the Commonwealth of Australia to some extent, and in the matter of dry goods I find that in several instances it is about 10 per cent less than our own tariff. The duties on carpets and flannels are 15 per cent, while our rates are nearly double that. I believe that this is an opportune time for Canada to extend her export trade to South Africa and to Australia. It is all very well for us to expound the sentiment of Canada for Canadians, but we will never build up a large export trade if we confine ourselves to that idea. For those who are complaining of the tariff in connection with the manufacture of woollen goods, I think this is the time for them to avail of the opportunity of extending their trade to these colonies. There must be direct communication to enable them to do so—I was going to say from the St. Lawrence—to South Africa and to Australia ; because it is impossible for them to send their goods to Vancouver en route to the east, and if they send their goods to New York they would have to pay the freight, and they would be met at once by the American manufacturers, who would have the advantage to that extent. The Americans are pushing their trade in Australia with great energy, and it is therefore to our advantage to encourage this trade now, so that Canada may get hold of a large portion of it. There is scarcely anything produced in Canada but there is a market for it in Australia, provided you have the means of conveying your goods direct from our own ports.

Mr. BROCK. I was very much delighted to hear the remarks of the Prime Minister regarding his visit to England. When we speak of extending our trade to Australia and South Africa, it is of a great deal more importance for us at the present time to endeavour to do our own trade at home amongst our own people. How can we expect to export goods when we cannot even manufacture goods for our own people in Canada ? In one of our greatest industries we find our own market at the present time flooded with foreign goods and goods of British manufacture. The United States are doing a large business in Australia, but they first of all captured their own market and made their own market impregnable. Canada can never do a foreign trade while the Canadian market is being invaded in the very lines which we want to export. I read with a great deal of pleasure a letter from a gentleman in Australia—I think a son of the Hon. Mr. Ross—and that letter had many strong points in favour of our attempting to do business there, which ap-

pealed to me as a Canadian. But he forgot, as our own government are forgetting, that we have not even got our own market. The government are so afraid of offending members on that side of the House who say they have come here with a mandate from the people to advocate free trade. Well, so long as they are afraid of that element, we can do no export trade from Canada. First of all, my advice, very humbly submitted to the Prime Minister, is to take every means to protect our own markets for our own people, and when we have risen to the elevation that the manufacturers of the United States have risen to, and when we commence to overflow with our own products, then we will be able to capture other markets. The time of the most talented business man who will go to England will be wasted in attempting to advocate a foreign business unless he can first say that we are supplying our own market. Until that is done, there is no use wasting time attempting to do a foreign business. You may subsidize all the steamers you like to Australia, but we must have a return cargo. You are preventing us from doing a woollen business in this country, and one of the great staples of Australia is wool. How can we use their wool if we cannot capture our own market for woollen goods. If you are going to give a preference, as our respected premier did to the manufacturers of Yorkshire—and Canada is just as much a part of the empire as Yorkshire is—you hamper us in our own market and you afford facilities to men who already have a great advantage in all the markets of the world. In order to enable us to do a foreign trade, we must have increased duties on certain lines of goods that we can manufacture here. When we have that, the Prime Minister can go in confidence to England, and he can talk to the other colonial delegates with something like business acumen. He can say to them : We are able to supply our own market; and they will not be able to throw in his face the remark: What are you talking about exporting goods to Australia for when you cannot supply your own market. I would humbly submit that this would be a better course for the premier than making all kinds of offers of preference. Let the right hon. gentleman provide, first of all, that the Canadian market shall be for the Canadian manufacturers.

The PRIME MINISTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) will not succeed in throwing cold water on my enthusiasm. I do not hope, and perhaps it would not be wise for me to hope, that we should take wool to Australia any more than we can carry coal to Newcastle.

Mr. BROCK. I said manufactured wool.

The PRIME MINISTER. There are other things besides wool. I do not see why we should not take cotton to Australia, as well as to China, and I understand we have had an export cotton trade to China for some time, and that a profitable business was done in that line a few years ago.

Mr. BROCK. What are Canadian cotton stocks to-day ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We are at the present time sending agricultural implements to Australia, and we are pretty successful competitors with the Americans, and I think we can even do better. But, of course, if my hon. friend (Mr. Brock) says we must have a high tariff in this country, I despair of having any preferences. I always understood, however, the argument of hon. gentlemen opposite was that if they adopt protection in England, then we might hope to have a preference, but now I understand from the hon. gentleman that he wants a high protection against England as well as against the rest of the world, and no preference with the mother country. If the views of my hon. friend should prevail I cannot see any future for this country. I am sorry to say for my hon. friend, and happy to say for myself, that I hold altogether different views from him on this matter.

Mr. BROCK. Excuse me for a moment. We are holding out very great inducements to bring in immigrants into this country, and at the present time we are succeeding in getting thousands of settlers in the North-west. Is the right hon. gentleman perfectly satisfied that we should be always hewers of wood and drawers of water ? Is he perfectly satisfied that we in the east should not supply manufactured goods to those people on whom we are spending thousands of dollars to induce to settle in the North-west ? If this country can double its population, we shall be in a far better position to make a trade arrangement with the other dependencies of the empire and with the empire itself than we can, situated as we are at the present time. I do not always take my politics from the United States, but in this matter of trade they have shown themselves wise in their day and generation. They have protected their market almost to prohibition, and they are the most successful nation on the face of the globe to-day. Weak-kneed politicians on the other side of the House disparaged a high tariff and kept on disparaging it. Fortunately they remained in opposition. Unfortunately for us, weak-kneed people are in control of the government to-day; but the right hon. leader of the government, surrounded as he is by business men, may depend upon it that sooner or later that kind of politics will come to grief in this country. The larger the influx of population, the greater is the necessity of our being able to supply them with our own goods. If we are going to maintain anything like a patriotic sentiment in this country, we

must encourage our people to buy goods in the country. The hon. gentleman says we can export cotton to Australia. I happen to deal in cotton myself, and I know something about the cotton trade. It is simply ridiculous for us to suppose that we can compete with Great Britain in sending cotton to Australia. The United States invariably gains entrance to a foreign market by slaughtering goods at prices much less than they are sold at in the United States. That is the only way they capture a foreign market as against England. We must first protect and capture our own market. We might have a chance of selling woollen goods in Australia. That is one of the manufactures in this country in which we excel. Our woollen manufacturers have the best machinery in the world and the best workmen, and are to-day turning out as fine goods as are made in any part of the world. But our market is so limited that we are not able to make the goods in sufficient quantities to make the business profitable. We only ask the government to give us our own market. If they would only experiment on that one line of woollen goods, I will guarantee that in three years they would find it so successful that they would repeat the experiment in a great many other lines.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) There is a Canadian woollen factory which is exporting woollen goods to Huddersfield, the very centre of the woollen manufacture in Great Britain. There are other things that can be exported to Australia besides woollen goods, which appear to be of so much interest to some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. There is one firm in Sydney, New South Wales, which would take a shipment of 2,000 tons of rolled paper for printing yearly. But that cannot be sent from here until we have direct communication. I saw it stated in the papers that Canada is competing with Great Britain in Australia in agricultural implements, and I am sure that the Massey-Harris people are taking hold of the Australian trade very largely, and also the New Zealand trade. You will find their goods advertised in all the papers of those colonies. Then, a trade in boots and shoes, which are largely manufactured in Quebec and Montreal, could be cultivated there. You only require the steamers to carry goods backwards and forwards, and the trade will increase. When goods have to be sent via New York or via Vancouver over the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is impossible to extend our trade to that country.

Mr. SPROULE. The valuable advertisement we have had in South Africa will, I am sure, result in giving us a very important and valuable trade there, if we take time by the forelock, and push it as much as possible. There is no doubt that the quantity of goods sent from Canada to that country during the last year or two has given us an introduction which with a little care should enable us to hold and considerably extend that trade in the future. In Australia, a friend of mine is erecting saw mills which are manufactured in Brantford, Ontario; and in a letter received from him during the last few weeks he states that there is a magnificent opening there for a great trade in that line as well as in agricultural implements; and he suggests that direct steam communication between Canada and that country would enable that trade to be extended considerably. He says that people came hundreds of miles to see the band saw and the mill after it was set up, the first one in the country; and the immense timber areas there would afford an opportunity for a large trade in that line as time goes on.

For payment in connection with construction of Marconi wireless telegraph station at Glace Bay, N.S., in accordance with agreement, $70,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought we voted an amount for that already.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The contract price is $80,000, which has been divided into two parts—$70,000 in these estimates and $10,000 in the estimates for the coming year.

Mr. SPROULE. What in substance is the contract made with Marconi for establishing this station?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The papers were brought down, but I can state it briefly to my hon. friend. At the time Mr. Marconi was in Newfoundland, and in consequence of the difficulty he met with there, through the objections of the cable company, when it appeared that his experiments in America were likely to be frustrated, we thought it a wise policy to invite him to come to Canada and continue his experiments with the view of establishing a station. He came, and was very much pleased with the courtesy extended to him by the government, and that led to our making the suggestion that Canada should participate in his undertaking; and it was agreed that we should contribute this much towards constructing the station, and that he should give us an engagement that if the experiment proved successful, as we hope and believe it will, his company would carry trans-Atlantic telegraphic messages for us very much below the current cable rates. For instance, where cable rates are 25 cents a word, he gave us an engagement that he would charge us not more than 10 cents a word.

While there is a possibility that it may not prove a commercial success, we consider ourselves justified in encouraging a man of great scientific attainments in carrying out an experiment which, if successful, will be of great advantage to the whole

country. If, however, it should prove a failure, we shall lose our money. On the contrary, should it turn out successful, we will have the great advantage of a trans-atlantic rate sixty per cent less than we are now paying, as well as special rates for the press and government messages. Mr. Marconi is now constructing works in Glace Bay and hopes to be able to send a message to His Majesty on the day of Coronation. I hope he will be able to do so, and that we may have the benefit of a reduction of sixty per cent on all business messages, namely, ten cents as against twenty-five cents, and a half rate or five cents on press and government messages.

To pay the Canadian Bank of Commerce for services in the Yukon Territory from 1st May, 1900, to 30th April, 1901, $26,575.65 ; and from 1st May, 1901 to 24th April, 1902, $26,593.71, $53,-169.36.

An hon. MEMBER. This is a large sum.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This represents very large transactions. It will be remembered that at the beginning of our operations in the Yukon, when there were no banking facilities in that country, we arranged with the Bank of Commerce to act as our agent, and agreed to pay it a commission, to be fixed from time to time by the Minister of Finance. The bank had to be content to accept his judgment as to what was a fair commission. The first year we had to pay a high rate, I think as much as one and a half per cent, but we have been reducing the rate from year to year. This vote represents, in the first part, a commission of three-quarters of one per cent, and in the second a commission of five-eights of one per cent, so that we have been gradually reducing the amount, as the conditions in the Yukon were brought nearer the ordinary conditions of banking in the older portions of Canada.

To pay Nelson R. Butcher, stenographer, for transcribing of evidence in Klock vs. Baring, $64.50.

The PRIME MINISTER. That was incurred at the time of the Nipissing election. A mandamus was issued to the returning officer and a law suit resulted, in consequence of which we have to pay that amount to the stenographer. The Minister of Justice could give the particulars to my hon. friend if he were here.

Mr. SPROULE. That was when the returning officer took the liberty of postponing the election after he had put up the notices.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, it was when he had a new writ sent to him and he had to do what he did.

To pay Messrs. Browning and Senkler, Klock vs. Baring, Nipissing election, $60,00.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why should the government have to pay that ?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a very unusual item. There was a good deal of dissatisfaction over that election, and somebody ought to be able to explain why we should pay this. If the election had been contested the expenses would have had to be paid by one or the other of the parties, but we are here called on to pay a share of the expenses.

The PRIME MINISTER. As the Minister of Justice is not here, I would ask that the item be allowed to stand.

Item allowed to stand.

To pay expenses of Chinese and Japanese commission, $27,600.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there not another item in connection with that commission.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, that will cover the whole expenditure.

Mr. TAYLOR. Judging from the size of the report, it is very cheap.

Mr. MORRISON. What is the total cost of the commission ?

The PRIME MINISTER. $27,600.

To pay one half arbitrators and stenographers fee Eastern Extension Arbitration, N.S., $3,-952.62.

The PRIME MINISTER. There was an arbitration consented to between the Dominion and the provincial government with regard to the claim which the province advanced to a share of the award, on the ground that it was made in the favour of the provinces. No provision was made in the estimates for paying the cost of the arbitration, and in the meantime the provincial government paid the arbitrators and claimed one-half of the expense. It was agreed that each party should pay his own share of the expenses. This deals entirely with the expense of the arbitrators and the stenographers, and as regards the other items, each party paid his own fees.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that this is one of these cases which we are likely to have for years to come. We are likely to have another claim of the same kind from Prince Edward Island next year. Is there any truth in the statement that they are preparing to make a large claim and expect to be compensated ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My right hon. colleague, the First Minister, made a statement the other day concerning this matter. There has been a somewhat hazy claim regarding the fishery award in the air a long time, but no understanding whatever has been arrived at between this government and the provincial government of Prince Edward Island. An intimation has been given that if, in consequence of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as to the relative rights of the provinces and the Dominion, it is the

provinces and not the Dominion which should have received the award, then the fishery bounties which we have been allowing the provinces, and by means of which we have been practically paying them the interest on the award, will have to be stopped. Therefore, so far as the finances of the Dominion are concerned, the result that may be come to will be as broad as it is long. But no understanding whatever has been come to between the Dominion and the local governments upon the subject.

Mr. SPROULE. This was supposed to be a hazy account, but still, after a time it has materialized and we have to pay the money. Is the hon. gentleman aware of any claim having been made by the province of Quebec ? I saw an announcement to that effect in the local House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There has been no time within the last ten or twelve years when some one or other of the provinces has not claimed that it was the provinces and not the Dominion which should have received the amount of the fishery award, and the claim is just in the same position as it has been at any time in the past. There will always be somebody in some provincial legislature who will raise the claim that the provinces should receive the money and not the Dominion, and of course we cannot prevent any such pretention being raised. But all I can tell the hon. gentleman is that there has not been any understanding whatever arrived at between the government and the government of Prince Edward Island or any other province on the subject. These provinces are free to follow whatever course they think best in these matters.

Unprovided items—1900-1901—to cover unprovided items, 1900-1901, as per Auditor General's report, page C—4, $211,394.12.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A similar item has been in the estimates for many years, yet, it is but natural that hon. gentlemen should ask an explanation. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the Auditor General's Report at the page cited, they will find that, in the course of the year there are cases of over expenditure, and, at the close of the year the Auditor General asks parliament to confirm these by pasing a general vote aggregating these small items—though some times they are not small. It is a confirmation of past expenditure not an appropriation of anything for the future.

Legislation—House of Commons—additional amount for publishing the debates, $20,000.

Mr. SPEAKER. There is usually a supplementary vote for the publishing of the debates. Last year, we asked $40,000. Generally the amount expended is $60,000. At the end of the session, we come to the House for a supplementary vote.

Mr. SPROULE. If the amount required is $60,000, would it not be better to put that amount in the main estimates, and then we would know. This looks as if it were a shortage, a case of emergency, and not a thing expected.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is a good suggestion. It ought to be done.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that will do now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Adjourn.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. Would it not be better to take the census item ?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is not here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I hope, if we sit a little longer, to be able to lay on the Table further supplementary estimates. Perhaps, we might take concurrence and so advance the business. If a desire is expressed to have any item held over, of course, there will be no objection.

Some resolutions reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Charges of management—expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, $70,000.

Mr. SPROULE. We were to get some information about this item so, perhaps, it had better be left over.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. The Minister of Finance can give the information now.

Mr. SPROULE. It has been stated repeatedly that we have been paying very much less for this service than under the old contract. As the present contract has been renewed, the question arises how much we are paying now and how much we paid under the old contract; also for what length of time does this contract run.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We are paying in the aggregate more than we paid before, because the volume of business is greater; but we are paying lower rates than we were paying before. The contract has been laid on the Table, and all the details are available. The contract has been renewed for five years.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the aggregate of the contract ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is not for a lump sum, but for such quantities as we may need from year to year, and these are to be supplied at rates specified. As I say, they aggregate much more because we are using a very much larger quantity, but the rates are decidedly lower.

Printing, printing paper and binding, $110,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is in connection with the Printing Bureau, and we were to get information on concurrence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If the hon. gentleman will let it stand until it appears in the 'Hansard' in the morning, so that we may see what is required.

Mr. SPROULE. We want to find out how much printing was being done outside, what we are paying for it, what departments it is done for, and the number of hands that are employed in the Bureau.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The order of my hon. friend is a large one, but I will do my best if the information is available.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think we had better stop here as I know the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has something to bring up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am sorry to find that the estimates have not yet arrived, and if we were to sit a little late I am advised that we could not get them. Under these circumstances I think we had better adjourn.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is to be the business to-morrow ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We will take up all the Bills that remain on the Order paper, then we will go into the estimates for agriculture, immigration and the interior.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was the Prime Minister to give some information in reference to the Bill of the hon. member for Montreal, Ste. Antoine (Mr. Roddick) to-night ?

The PRIME MINISTER. I told him I thought we could take it up to-morrow evening.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 7, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. KEMP moved :

That the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee regarding certain purchases by the government from Gaudry, be printed, and that rule 94 be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 159) to incorporate the Maritime Stock Breeders' Association—The Minister of Agriculture.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman.—Mr. Flint.

CITY OF OTTAWA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 164) to amend the Act of 1899, respecting the city of Ottawa. He said : Mr. Speaker, I thought at one time of making a proposal with the view of consolidating the work of the Ottawa Improvement Commission and the Ottawa Parks Committee, a body under the control of the city of Ottawa, or, a body that has recently been abolished, and its powers transferred to the city of Ottawa by an Ontario Act. However, I realize that at the present stage of the session we would hardly have time to deliberate upon a measure of that kind. The amendment I propose now is merely to enlarge the number of the commission, without in any way changing its powers or responsibilities. It is proposed that there shall be added four commissioners to those already appointed. The object is to broaden the scope of the commission. It is not intended that all these gentlemen shall be from the city of Ottawa, but the design is to take some gentlemen from outside the city of Ottawa, and perhaps some hon. gentlemen sitting in parliament, who have an interest in the national capital, and who will have sufficient leisure to enable them to assist in its improvement. I do not anticipate that there will be any objection. If there is, I quite realize that any Bill at this stage will not get through.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the Governor in Council who appoints the additional number of commissioners ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Before this motion is carried, I would like to draw the attention of the government to the fact that on the 14th day of this session there was supposed to have been a detailed statement brought down to this House concerning the expenditure of this Improvement Commission. It does strike me that the section of the Act requiring this return has not been complied with. I have here a statement as brought down by the commission, and it is not a detailed statement at all. It is not a detailed statement, as the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) will see, by comparing it with the re-

quirements of section 11 of the Act. This section reads :

The commission shall render to the Minister of Finance and Receiver General and to the corporation, on or before the first day of September in each year, detailed statements of all their receipts and expenditures up to the last day of June in such year ; and copies of such statements shall be laid before parliament by the Minister of Finance and Receiver General within the first fourteen days of the next following session thereof.

I have the statement here, and although it involves something like $92,000, it does not give the names of the streets that the money has been expended upon. I will read the list that it gives.

Princess Terrace, King street, printing and advertising, Concession and other streets, stationery and office supplies, telephone, rent and storage, Rideau River bridges, road machinery, Rideau canal driveway and parks, Rideau street, Keefer property, tools, implements, &c., Wellington street, Bank street, McKay and other streets.

It is due to this parliament that we should know upon what streets the money is being expended. I did take occasion, when the estimates were before this House, to make some inquiries in connection with this expenditure, and I find that I have been greatly misunderstood. The 'Journal,' of this city, which seems to take great interest in the few remarks I made on that occasion, accuses me of having been loaded up by some disgruntled Liberals of this city, but to clear the mind of the editor of the 'Journal,' let me say that I have not had any conversation with any disgruntled Liberal in this city or outside of this city regarding this question. I have had no conversation with any of them in connection with this matter, and I am not here for the purpose of cleaning the decks of hon. gentlemen opposite.

It is the duty of the members of this parliament to inquire into an expenditure involving $60,000 a year. If we desire to make this the Washington of the North, it is just as much our duty to consider a matter of this kind as it is the duty of the 'Journal' newspaper of the city of Ottawa. What I did on that occasion I believe was my duty. I for one am not opposing this expenditure, but I am opposed to this Star Chamber method of doing business. I believe this money should be expended in a business-like manner, as all public money should be expended, and it was for that reason I rose to object to certain things being done by this Improvement Commission. I have been here for a number of years, and I have watched carefully some of the improvements made in the streets of Ottawa, and I wish to say I believe this expenditure could be put to better uses. I have heard rumours going around this city in connection with this expenditure, and one would have to be deaf if he did not hear them. For my part, should I occupy a seat in the House, I intend to pay a little more attention to this expenditure in years to come. I ask that a more detailed statement of the expenditure of that money be laid before parliament, in order that we may have a chance of sizing up exactly how it is expended. We can criticise the general estimates submitted to parliament, but we have no opportunity in this case of criticising the expenditure unless an amendment is made to the Act. A detailed statement is brought down within the first fourteen days of the session, and that is the only statement upon which we can hope to give the matter fair criticism. I wish to point out that in giving the expenditure a fair criticism, I do so not for the purpose of opposing it, but in order to ensure that the money is not improperly expended.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Although it is not usual to debate the question on the introduction of a Bill, yet I wish to make a few remarks. I have heard it said on thoroughly good authority that this commission transacted business behind closed doors. I regard that as entirely wrong. If there is nothing done which is improper, then they need not be ashamed to have their proceedings open to the public. I agree with the proposition to increase the number of the commissioners, because if the information we have is anything like correct, the whole work is done by one or two individuals, and the disclosures which took place under the late mayor showed a state of things which is anything but proper. My memory is, that one of the commissioners who is largely controlling the business was furnishing the supplies himself ; that practically the money was expended where ever he desired ; that it was expended upon streets where it was in the interests of himself and others that it should be expended, and that in reality the money which parliament voted for the purpose of improving the streets of Ottawa was practically put in the pockets of the commissioners by dealing with themselves through fictitious names. The statement is made that they were enabled to do this largely because of the smallness of the commission. It is, therefore, important that the commission should be enlarged and that some one outside of the corporation should have the authority to appoint the additional commissioner that it is proposed to put on that board.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I may say that when the gentlemen upon this Ottawa Improvement Commission were appointed I did not know a single one of them personally, and I am not sure that I have known any of them since except that I have once or twice spoken to Mr. Bate and Mr. Cunningham. I have no special acquaintance with the details of their work, but I think I can say that if hon. gentlemen made an examination of it and drove over the work which

has been done, they would say that it would be impossible to do better work or more work for the amount of money expended. That, after all, is the purpose that the government and parliament have in view in the constitution of the commission and its appointment. I am quite satisfied that I can safely say that the government and parliament can congratulate themselves upon the fact, that the work undertaken by the commission has been most successfully and most efficiently done. There has been no waste of any kind whatever. There was some discussion in the local press, but if my hon. friend follows that discussion I think they will find that it arose largely from the jealousy between different municipal bodies, which under the circumstances may readily be understood. A close examination of the matter will, I think, show my hon. friends that there is no doubt but that the Ottawa Improvement Commission got first-class value for every dollar of money it expended, and that it would be quite impossible for anybody however constituted to get any better value than they got.

Mr. SPROULE. May I have the consent of the House to say one or two words more. It was brought out in that examination that load after load of stones was brought around the streets of the city time after time, and the same load weighed and charged to that account and paid for. It was also brought out that materials which went on the streets belonged to one of the commissioners, was taken out of a storehouse of his own under another name, and that it was traced back that it was really sold by the commissioner himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not sympathize with the view that the public press should be admitted to every meeting of every public body. There are hundreds of cases where the admission of the press, even to meetings of bodies of a public character, may not be advantageous to the public, and I believe that the best journalists of the country will approve of that view. There is no use generalizing in this matter ; we must take each case as it comes up. Let me point out to the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) that if there was any exception to be taken to the details which were furnished in the statement required by the statute, if the hon. gentleman had called attention to it at an earlier stage of the session I would have been very glad to look into it and see if there was any cause for complaint.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). When we were discussing the estimates for the Maria street bridge I called the hon. gentleman's attention to it, and the hon. gentleman said : We had better allow that to stand over as I propose to amend the Bill, and when that comes up it will be the proper time to discuss this question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly it is the proper time, but if the hon. gentleman wanted to complain that any information brought down was defective, the proper time to complain was at an earlier stage of the session when we could make it good, which we cannot do now. In the Act respecting the Ottawa Improvement Commission it is required that the accounts should be audited in the same manner as the accounts of any public department. Every item of the expenditure of that commission is fully set forth in the report of the Auditor-General—as fully as it could have been if it had been the direct expenditure of any department of the government. If the hon. gentleman turns to page G—31 of the Auditor General's report he will find six pages filled with all the details of the expenditure of the Ottawa Improvement Commission down to the last cent.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman that the statement which he is supposed to receive from that commission is required to be laid before this House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I had great pleasure in placing that statement before the House as contained within the four corners of this admirable blue-book on almost the first day of the session, and if my hon. friend has not had his attention drawn to it, it only goes to show that he does not value this book as highly as I do. I do not object to any fair criticism ; but I do regret that at this stage of the session observations are made reflecting on the good faith of the members of the commission. I have no special knowledge of the work of the commission other than that which I get from the public reports ; and, while I have a great admiration for the press, and while as an old journalist I should be the last to speak disparagingly of the press, yet I do not think my hon. friend should accept everything that appears in the press as absolutely certain. As the whole matter involved in this Bill is a mere addition to the number of the commissioners, I admit that the discussion upon it might as well take place on the first reading ; and if objection is not to be taken to the Bill itself, I hope hon. gentlemen will not too hastily assume that statements which appear in the public press reflecting on the commission are correct until we can have an opportunity of inquiring into them before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. minister in favour of keeping the press excluded from the meetings of that commission ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would reserve my judgment as to that ; but I would be inclined to think I am.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). I cannot allow this occasion to pass without expressing my regret that the hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken should on mere street rumour felt themselves called upon to repeat in this House statements which are not only very much exaggerated, but which have been shown to be without any foundation. I do not think the gentlemen who compose this commission—such men as Mr. Henry Bate, Mr. Cunningham and Mr. Riopelle—who have very generously during the last three years given their services gratuitously to the work of the commission, will thank these hon. gentlemen for having made themselves the mouthpieces of these street corner talks, which amount to nothing.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman: is it true that one of these commissioners threatened to resign unless the business was transacted in a different manner?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not know anything about that; but I know that these gentlemen have done good service and have received absolutely nothing for it. One of these commissioners, Mr. Riopelle, during the whole of the last working season personally superintended the work. He was on the ground day after day during the whole time the men were there, giving his services without any remuneration whatever. I think it is a very poor recompense to these men, who have shown such public spirit, to be treated in the way hon. gentlemen opposite have treated them. The only statement made, to which the hon. member for East Grey has referred, and which, like all other stories, gets bigger as it is repeated, is that a tender of some relative of one of the commissioners for furnishing cement has been accepted.

Mr. BENNETT. Was that not charged in one of the public newspapers in the city of Ottawa?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not know. I do not follow all that the newspapers say, and I do not attach the same importance that the hon. gentleman does to what appears in them. If that charge was made, it should have been investigated; I do not know why it was not. I do not think there is any truth in it. But I am not directing my attention to that. What I am finding fault with is that gentlemen who have given their services to the public for nothing should be treated in this way. If there is any accusation to be brought against any one of them, it is only fair and just that it should be properly made and investigated, and that mere street rumours should not be repeated in this House, and amplified and exaggerated in the way these statements have been to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to ask the hon. member if he supposes that the statement I made was exaggerated. I gave it exactly as it was given to me by a reliable and respectable citizen of Ottawa, and I gave it as nearly as I could in his own words; and, so far as I can judge, I believe the statement to be correct.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

DISMISSAL OF THOMAS DOYON.

Mr. MORIN asked:

1. Why was Thomas Doyon, postmaster at St. Odilon, county of Dorchester, dismissed from his office?
2. What persons laid complaints against the said Thomas Doyon?
3. Were those complaints communicated to the said Thomas Doyon?
4. Did he have any opportunity to exonerate himself?
5. Who asked for his dismissal?
6. Who recommended the said Thomas Doyon's successor?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Mr. Thomas Doyon was dismissed from his position as postmaster at St. Odilon on the statement of Mr. O. E. Talbot, M.P., to the effect that during the last Dominion election Mr. Doyon had been an active political partisan. There appearing no doubt as to the accuracy of the charge—a formal investigation was not deemed necessary.

ST. EUGENE DE GRANTHAM MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. LEONARD asked:

1. Did the Post Office Department, in July last, receive any tenders for the carrying of the mail between St. Eugène de Grantham and the Intercolonial Railway station?
2. What tenders did the department receive?
3. Did the department accord the said carrying of the mail to François Vadnais, of St. Eugène de Grantham?
4. Did the department have him sign a contract to that effect?
5. Why does not the said François Vadnais carry out that contract?
6. What person or persons object to the said François Vadnais having that contract?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock):

1 and 2. No.

3 and 4. Yes; but under a temporary agreement only, which, however, did not go into effect.

5 and 6. This agreement, which was entered into temporarily, was subsequently terminated and on Mr. Lavergne's recommendation the service was awarded to Mr. D. Belleville, at the same rate.

Mr. LEONARD asked:

1. Who is the present contractor for the carrying of the mail between St. Eugène de Grantham and the Intercolonial Railway station?

2. Since when has that person been carrying the mail in that place, and what is the amount of his contract ?

3. Who recommended that person to the department ?

4. Were tenders called for that contract ?

5. What were the tenders sent in ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. D. Belleville.

2. August 1, 1901, at 33 cents per trip.

3. Mr. Lavergne, M.P.

4 and 5. Tenders were not invited, but prices were obtained previous to the establishment of a baggage car service over the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. Pie and St. Guillaume station, necessitating a rearrangement of the service between St. Eugène de Grantham and St. Guillaume station, and involving a service between St. Eugène de Grantham and railway station.

THE REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette) asked :

1. For what reason were 98 full page pictorial illustrations inserted in the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901 ?

2. Where were the half-tone illustrations made for the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901 ?

3. What was the additional cost of inserting 98 full page illustrations on heavy plate paper in the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901 ?

4. Are the full page pictures, pages 209, 291, 295, 299, Part III. of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, printed to illustrate types of beauty among inhabitants of Canada ?

5. Were the pictures in the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, pages 213, 215, Part III., illustrating ice and snow in Canada, in the middle of May, published with a view to encouraging immigration into the Dominion ?

6. What interest of Canada was to be served by printing plate No. 1, page 159, of Part III. of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901 ?

7. Is the picture, page 165, Part III. of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, calculated to encourage immigration into Canada ?

8. Is the full page picture of the 'Maine Hotel, Lake Wares,' on page 191, Part III. of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, intended to win settlers by illustrating the luxury of Canadian hostelries ?

9. Were the pictures, pages 211, 221, 223, 225, 227, 231, 233, 243, 253, 259, 261, and 271, Part III., in the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, published to illustrate the comforts of Canadian homes ?

10. Were the pictures, pages 311 and 313, Part III. of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, printed with a view to supplying intending visitors to Canada with an idea of the costumes, weapons and outfit they would require ?

11. Were the pictures on pages 237, 245, 269, 297, 301, 303, 319, 327 and 329, Part III. of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, printed with a view to arousing the enthusiasm of foreigners over the comforts and conveniences of Canadian travel ?

12. How many copies of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901 were printed ; and is the government aware how many of the same have been sent to points outside of Canada ?

13. Did copies of the Report of the Department of the Interior for 1901, sent to Great Britain and other places outside of Canada, have in them the 98 half-tone plates illustrating Canadian life and scenery ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) :

1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. The illustrations referred to are taken from photographs which accompany the reports of explorers, and the purpose of their insertion in the departmental report was to afford information of an accurate character in regard to the territory traversed by the explorers.

2. In Ottawa.

3. 41 cents per volume.

12. 4265. No.

13. Yes.

I.C.R.—ROUND-HOUSE AT TRURO.

Mr. GOURLEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Does the government intend to build a round-house at Truro this summer ?

2. Is the government aware that the present turntable at Truro is in a dangerous condition and liable to break down at any time, with serious injury to life and property ?

3. Is the government aware that the present round-house is out of date, and almost useless for the purposes for which it is used ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. Minister of Railways has furnished the following reply :—

1. No, there is no appropriation for a round-house at Truro.

2. The government is not aware that the turntable is in a dangerous condition, but it is too short for the new locomotives and a longer one has been provided which will be placed in position soon. Even if the present turntable should fail, there can be no delay to trains as there is a 'Y' track convenient for turning locomotives.

3. The present round-house having been built many years ago, is not as large as is desirable for modern engines, but it will continue to be used until it is possible to increase the accommodation.

I.C.R.—STATION AT TRURO.

Mr. GOURLEY—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Does the government intend to build a new Intercolonial Railway station at Truro during this summer ?

2. Is the government aware that the present station is utterly unsuited to meet the just requirements of the travelling public at this point, and the importance of the town as a contributor to the revenue of the railway ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The hon. Minister of Railways furnishes the following reply :—

1. It is not intended to build a new Intercolonial Railway station at Truro during this summer.

2. The government is not aware that the present station is utterly unsuited to meet the just requirements of the travelling public at this point.

POSTMASTER WM. McPHERSON.

Mr. PRINGLE—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Why was William McPherson, postmaster at Williamstown, county of Glengarry, Ontario, dismissed from his office ?

2. What persons laid complaints against the said William McPherson ?

3. Were complaints communicated to the said William McPherson ?

4. Did he have an opportunity to exonerate himself ?

5. Who asked for his dismissal ?

6. Who recommended the said William McPherson's successor ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock) :

1. The late postmaster of Williamstown, county of Glengarry, was, on the report of the Post Office inspector, removed from office on account of his intemperate habits.

2. Representations were made by Miss Catherine Bellemere, Mrs. Sarah McPherson and by Mr. McWhinney.

3 and 4. The Post Office Inspector visited Williamstown and called upon the postmaster, when the charge of drinking to excess was established and admitted.

5 and 6. It was considered necessary in the public interest to make a new appointment, which was done upon the recommendation of Mr. J. T. Schell, M.P.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved :

That when this House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Friday, the 9th instant, at eleven a.m., and that when the House adjourns on that day, it stand adjourned to Saturday, the 10th instant, at eleven a.m., and that Government Orders shall have precedence on that day.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered the following messages from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the messages, as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1902, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, May 6, 1902.

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending June 30, 1903, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, May 6, 1902.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the messages of His Excellency together with the estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

PACKING AND SALE OF COMMODITIES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 141) to amend the Act respecting the packing and sale of certain commodities.—The Minister of Trade and Commerce.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Some hon. gentlemen have expressed the desire that stocks held by dealers should be exempt from the operation of this Act, and I agreed to provide an amendment to that effect. I propose, therefore, that a clause be added in these words :

Provided always that nothing in this Act contained shall be construed as affecting any dealer in respect of stocks actually in his possession at the date of the passing of the Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 156) to amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—The Minister of Trade and Commerce.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 162) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act of 1900. He said : It is my intention, when we go into committee on this Bill, to propose a number of amendments of some importance. I shall not ask the committee to pass upon them to-day, but what I propose is to submit these amendments to the committee, so

that they may be read by the chairman, and may appear in 'Hansard' to-morrow morning. I will have the Bill printed with all possible expedition, with these amendments, so that hon. members may have time to consider them before they are discussed on Friday. That, I suppose, will answer all purposes.

Motion agreed to; Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendments proposed by Sir Richard Cartwright are as follows:

1. In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'the said Act' means: 'The Manitoba Grain Act, 1900,' chapter 39 of the statutes of that year.

(Interpretation.)

2. In the said Act, unless the context otherwise requires:—(a) The expression 'operator' or the expression 'lessee' shall include any buyer of grain having allotted to him any storage or working space or bin or bins in any elevator or warehouse; (b) The expression 'commissioner' means the warehouse commissioner for the inspection district of Manitoba; and (c) The expression 'Minister of Inland Revenue' shall mean the 'Minister of Trade and Commerce.'

3. Subsection 1 of section 34 of the said Act is hereby amended by inserting between the words 'shall' and 'keep' in the second line thereof the words: 'Receive the six standard grades of wheat established and described in the General Inspection Act,' as amended by chapter twenty-five (25) of the statutes of 1889, and shall.

4. Subsection 1 of section 41 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following subsection substituted in lieu thereof: '41. On a written application to the commissioner by any person or persons residing within forty miles of their nearest shipping point, he may give permission to any person or persons to erect under the provisions of this Act, a flat warehouse with power to enlarge the same should necessity require it, at such shipping point. Such flat warehouse shall be erected on the railway company's premises after getting location of a siding, and the railway company shall be compelled to give such location with siding on its premises, in some place of convenient access, to be approved of by the commissioner, at a rental not greater than that charged to standard elevators. If in the judgment of the commissioner more than one such warehouse is required at a station, one or more additional warehouses may be authorized by him, and in such case all the provisions of this section shall apply to the construction of such warehouses.'

5. Subsection 8 of the said section 41 is hereby repealed.

6. Section 42 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following section substituted therefor:

Loading Platforms.

42. On a written application to the commissioner by ten farmers resident within twenty miles of their nearest shipping point, the railway company shall within the time hereinafter mentioned erect and maintain at such point a loading platform, as hereinafter described, suitable for the purpose of loading grain from vehicles direct into cars.

2. Each loading platform shall be erected at a siding which the railway company shall provide on its premises in some place convenient of access to be approved by the commissioner, and shall be at least ten feet wide and of such other dimensions and be constructed of such materials and in such manner as the commissioner shall designate.

3. Such loading platforms may be used free of charge for the loading of grain.

4. The railway company shall construct such loading platform within thirty days after the application is made to such company by the commissioner, and shall be held liable to pay a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars for each day's delay beyond that time. The period in each year within which the commissioner may receive such applications shall be April 15 to October 15.

5. Railway companies shall furnish cars to farmers, without undue delay, for the purpose of being loaded at such loading platforms; and at any shipping point where there is no loading platform cars shall be furnished by the railway company, without undue delay, for loading grain direct from vehicles.

Section 57 of the said Act is hereby repealed and the following section substituted therefor:—

57. Any person, firm or a corporation guilty of an infraction of or failing to comply with any provisions of this Act for which a penalty is not in this Act provided, or of any rule or regulation made pursuant to this Act, shall upon summary conviction in addition to any other punishment prescribed by the law, be liable to a penalty of not less than fifty dollars nor more than one thonsand dollars, and in default of payment, to imprisonment for not less than one month nor more than one year.

8. At each station where there is a railway agent, and where grain is shipped under such agent, an order book for cars shall be kept open to the public, in which applicants for cars shall make order. Applicants may make order according to their requirements for forty-eight hours in advance; cars so ordered shall be awarded to applicants according to the order in time in which such orders appear on the order book, without any discrimination as between elevators, flat warehouse, loading platform or otherwise; and any applicant who fails to make use of the car or cars ordered by him and which may be furnished by the railway company within the aforesaid time limit, and in the case of a farmer or flat warehouse owner who fails to fill said car or cars within forty-eight hours from the time such is or are furnished by the railway company shall lose his right so far as concerns the car or cars not so used or filled.

(1.) When the railway company shall be unable, from any reasonable cause, to furnish cars at any shipping point to fill all orders as aforesaid, such cars as are furnished shall be apportioned to the applicants in the order of application as appearing in said order book, until each shall have received one car, after which the surplus cars, if any, shall be apportioned rateably according to the requirements of each applicant

Progress reported.

LAND TITLES ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 149) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—The Minister of the Interior.

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the custom in dealing with lands belonging to a second party ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The only change made in this section is to settle a question with regard to a power of attorney. Where a general power of attorney has been given there was a difference of opinion as to whether that prevented the owner from dealing with the land himself while the power of attorney was in existence. The hon. gentleman is aware that in the province of Ontario you can give a general power of attorney to John Smith to deal with your land, and you can still sign or deal with it yourself. This does not interfere with that power. Under the Torrens system, when a power of attorney was given, the land had to be specifically described in every case. Then we introduced in Manitoba, and subsequently into the territories, the idea of a general power of attorney, as under the old system. Then cases arose in which the judges expresssed the opinion that the giving of a general power of attorney excluded the right of the owner to deal with the property until the general power of attorney was cancelled. This provision is to clear up any doubt.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

LOAN FOR $15,000,000.

Bill (No. 157) to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the public service (the Minister of Finance) read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I hope that the hon. Minister of Finance will be in a position to tell us how much he has authority to borrow outside of this power that he is now asking for, and what will be the amount of the loans maturing during the coming fiscal year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Perhaps it would be convenient if the hon. gentleman would permit me to refer to this year's budget speech, and also to the public accounts, in which this statement appears. The amount outstanding at this moment of available borrowing power is something over $2,000,000, so that we have altogether including the $15,000,000 that we are now taking, $17,000,000 of borrowing powers if this Bill passes. This is the lowest amount of borrowing power that has been taken in a loan Bill for some years, and it is usual to have borrowing powers for several years ahead. We do not have a loan Bill every year.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. How much is maturing the coming fiscal year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will have to get the public accounts and show my hon. friend.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is hard for hon. gentlemen to remember all these details if the hon. Minister of Finance is obliged to consult his note book.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not profess to remember every item in the public accounts.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that it is provided in this Bill that the interest shall not be more than 3½ per cent. Is it believed that you will not be able to borrow as favourably as when the last loan was made ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No. We always fix the maximum rate of interest. We do not expect to pay 3½ per cent, but we can never say what may occur on the money market.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). British consols have fallen 20 points since that loan was negotiated. It may be as well to remind my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) and the House, that when we borrowed the money at 2½ per cent British consols stood at 113 to 114, and that now they are at 93 to 94.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that with the additional advantage given to us by the admission of Canadian securities to the list of stocks available for the investment of trust funds in England, we would derive some benefit in the way of reduced interest.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It has kept our credit well up.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A comparison of the difference between British consols and Canadian securities shows that the difference is much less than at the time of our previous loan, so that we have got the benefit of it. Our securities are not selling at a higher price than before, but the drop has been much less than it would otherwise have been.

In answer to the question of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. LaRivière), I would say that in 1903 there will be maturing in London unguaranteed Intercolonial Railway 4 per cent loan to the amount of $7,300,000, and there will also be maturing the unguaranteed 5 per cent of loan of $2,433,000. These are the only government loans maturing in the coming year. These maturing later are fully set forth in the public accounts.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). I presume this Bill will have to go through, and permission will have to be given to the hon. Minister of Finance to borrow money to pay our debts, but if these hon. gentlemen had carried out the promises they made to the country there would have been no necessity at all for borrowing. I see that the main estimates for 1901-1902 amounted on revenue account to $48,826,878.16, and on capital account to $11,097,862.71. Then, we have supplementary estimates down, amounting to $1,358,683.70, and further supplementary estimates amounting to $4,189,-245.07. These supplementary estimates provide for sums required to carry on the expenses of the country up to the 30th June this year. These sums make a grand total expenditure voted for this year to carry on the affairs of the country of $65,472,669.54. If the hon. gentlemen had kept their promises, they could have run the country as efficiently as the late Conservative government did on $38,000,000 or $39,000,000, and they should have saved this year $25,000,000 out of the revenues of the country, and had $10,000,000 to spare besides. If they had done that it would not have been necessary for the hon. Minister of Finance to borrow money. They have sunk the country in debt. I suppose that having such a buoyant revenue last year the hon. gentlemen felt justified in spending on consolidated fund and capital account nearly sixty-five and a half million dollars. They promised to carry on the affairs of the country for $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 less than the late government were carrying on the affairs of the country, when all they required to spend was from $38,000,000 to $41,000,000, including both consolidated fund and capital account. If hon. gentleman had kept their word, the revenue would have been coming in all the same, and they could have paid off our debt, and have had sufficient money to have carried on the affairs of the country, and saved $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 a year to pay off our mortgage debt. They should have done that, but in place of that, all the money has been spent. Here is this sixty-five and a half million which has been spent this year, and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot point to any permanent improvement other than those which are usually made, notwithstanding this enormous expenditure. They are spending $65,000,000, paying two or three times what they should for taking the census, and allowing the money to be frittered away, while they cannot point to any Canadian Pacific Railway or large improvement such as was carried out by the Conservative government. Yet, in the face of all this, they are coming and asking power to borrow more money, with the object of increasing our expenditure, instead of decreasing it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have been all over this question half a dozen times during the session, and I am afraid the audience is not large enough now to justify me in making a long speech upon it. I would only say to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that I think he is mistaken as to the aggregate of the estimates which he gave us. The aggregate estimates which have been brought down will be found to be something less than the aggregate brought down for the previous year. However, that is a matter which we can look into later. As to my hon. friend's figures, I think they are inaccurate. As to the question of the loan I would remind my hon. friend that we have had only one loan Bill in five years, and that we have only used a portion of it, although we have been carrying on very large operations. I think my hon. friend's surprise must be, not that we come for a loan Bill now, but that we did not require one much earlier. However, as we have been over this question several times, and as the audience is not large, I will resist the temptation to make a further reply to my hon. friend.

Mr. BELL. In these estimates I see the total is given as $5,639,000, while it ought to be $5,739,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, the consolidated fund vote is $100,000 greater than is put down there.

Mr. BELL. That will swell the total ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, it will increase it by $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember making the statement that there was about $7,000,000 of floating borrowed capital that would be required to be provided for out of the money borrowed under this Bill. Am I correct in that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think my hon. friend unintentionally managed to count that $6,000,000—it is not $7,000,000—twice. But as to this temporary loan at present if we should issue bonds we would pay off the temporary loan, and while we increased our debt on the one hand we would decrease it on the other hand. Whether or not we shall issue bonds to pay off the temporary loan is a matter to be considered, as the condition of the money market affects the question. If we issue bonds to pay off the temporary loan we do not increase the debt, because while we increase it on the one hand, we decrease it on the other.

Mr. SPROULE. If you raise the loan you must take it out of the money you borrow under the borrowing powers given here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we wished to pay off the temporary loan, or we could renew it.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is done, it would practically take up the unexpired borrowing powers you have not availed yourselves of,

amounting to something like $2,000,000, and the $15,000,000 provided for here, because there are $9,750,000 of obligations coming due, and this added to the $6,000,000 would make over $15,000,000, and you will then have no money for the purposes for which you desire to use these borrowing powers.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is overlooking the fact that the Bill before the House and the resolution upon which it is founded also provide that there shall be from time to time general powers for refunding the debt falling due.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

THE COASTING TRADE.

Resolution respecting the coasting trade of Canada, and to exclude a foreign built British ship from that trade unless it has obtained a license, which the Minister of Customs may grant, upon the payment of a duty of twenty-five (25) per cent ad valorem on the fair market value of the ship (the Minister of Customs), read the second time, and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS (Hon. Wm. Paterson) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 165) respecting the coasting trade of Canada.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE TRANSPORTATION QUESTION.

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

Mr. A. F. MACLAREN (North Perth). Mr. Speaker, before going into Supply, I wish to make a few remarks on what I consider a very important subject, and before I take my seat I shall close with a resolution. A few weeks ago, in the city of Woodstock, Oxford county, while attending a meeting of the Dairymen's Association of Western Canada, I made a few remarks on this most important subject, a subject which I consider of the greatest and most vital importance to the welfare of the people of Canada. It is not necessary for me to tell the hon. members of this House, or the people of this Dominion, what that subject is, as we all know that the transportation problem is the greatest question which the people of Canada have to grapple with, have to solve, and have staring them in the face at the present moment. It is not my desire to take up much of the time of the House in discussing this very important question, and I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have been compelled, on account of my health being somewhat impaired during the last few weeks, to delay bringing this matter before the House at an earlier date. But, better late than never. The subject which I intend to discuss is that of utilizing the natural waterways of this Dominion for transporting our products to the seaboard.

It is not my intention to condemn the government, neither is it my intention to abuse or condemn the great railways of the Dominion for not having given us better accommodation and better rates of freight for carrying our goods, but it is my intention to ask this House, and to ask the country, to throw politics aside and go to work to do something to place the producers and manufacturers of this country in a position whereby they can place the products of the farm, the sea, the mines and the forests on the markets of the world at as cheap a rate of freight as that of our neighbours to the south, or for that matter, of any other country in the world. Up to the present moment we have been paying very much higher rates on everything we produce than they are paying in the United States. Over there they are utilizing their waterways for all they are worth during the season of navigation. They are also utilizing immense elevators and warehouses for storing goods, holding them at their seaports or lake ports until navigation opens, knowing they can get a very much lower rate of freight, while we on this side are practically doing nothing at all along the line of utilizing our waterways from the head of lake Superior and lake Ontario, clean down to the gulf of St. Lawrence. It is my intention, in as few words as possible, to show what the possibilities of our great waterways are, and as hon. members all know, we are now and have been spending large sums of money for the purpose of educating our people how to produce the finest goods. We have our farmers' institutes, our cheese and butter associations, our fat stock shows, our fruit, honey, poultry, swine and breeders' associations, our shows and exhibitions of all kinds, our agricultural colleges, &c., all of which are receiving assistance from the government, doing everything in our power to increase the quantity and improve the quality of our goods. But not a thing but talk, talk, talk, and no action as far as improving our freight rates is concerned. What is the use in spending money in improving the quality of our products, when we are taking no action whatever in trying to solve the transportation problem, which if we could do and place our goods on the markets of the world as cheaply as those of our neighbours to the south of us, we would be receiving millions of dollars more for the producers and manufacturers of this country's goods than we are receiving to-day. We have been talking for years and years of appointing a railway commission. We have had a railway commissioner appointed, but what has been done, or what have we been told? Not a single thing but what we have known

before, and nothing at all along the line of suggesting to the government what steps should be taken to make any improvement with regard to water transportation.

I do not intend to give the House rates of freight on all lines of products, but I will simply give a few figures of rates of freight charged on cheese, butter, bacons, hams, apples, and cattle.

Rates of freight for 1897 were as follows :

Cheese, Montreal to Liverpool, 21s. 9d. or $5.43 per ton.
Cheese, Boston to Liverpool, 13s. 3d. or $3.30 per ton.
Butter, Montreal to Liverpool, 26s. 9d. or $6.68 per ton.
Butter, Boston to Liverpool, 13s. 6d. or $3.37 per ton.

The House will observe that there was not very much change or difference in 1899 :

Cheese, Montreal to Liverpool, 23s. 9d. as against 21s. 9d. in 1897.
Cheese, Boston to Liverpool, 15s. as against 13s. 3d. in 1897.
Butter, Montreal to Liverpool, 25s. as compared with 26s. 9d. in 1897.
Butter, Boston to Liverpool, 15s. to 17s. 6d. as compared with 13s. 6d. in 1897.

Then we come to 1901, and find the following rates :

Cheese, Montreal to Liverpool, 20s. to 22s. 6d.
Cheese, Boston to Liverpool, 11s. 3d.

Bacon and hams, Montreal to Liverpool, going back to 1899, was 15s. to 20s., while New York to Liverpool was only 10s. to 15s.

Now, we will take the rail rates from points west of Toronto to Montreal, averaging 33 cents per hundred pounds, equal to $6.80 per ton. The following are the figures of 1899 : From Montreal we shipped to England, in round numbers, about 50,000 tons cheese, 10,000 tons butter, 50,000 tons bacon and ham, 270,000 barrels apples, 48,000 head of cattle. Nearly all of these were carried by railway from various points in Ontario ; and investigation shows that the rate of freight paid was very much higher than the rate by relative rail haul upon American lines. But I will not attempt to figure out this, nor to show what the exact difference was. However, we know that we could save all the way from 10 per cent to 25 per cent if we could utilize our natural waterways, as they are utilizing their waterways in the United States ; and you can imagine what a great saving this would be to the farmers of this country. A saving of 25 per cent on the above named articles alone would mean over $600,000. And this is not all, as a large quantity of our goods had to be shipped via New York and Boston, upon which was paid $3 per ton more for longer rail haul, which, added to excess upon the Montreal volume, will make about $1,000,000 more received for transportation upon this particular volume of our exports. Imagine what it would mean to Canada if we could save in proportion on all lines of goods shipped.

We will take the past season, for example, Mr. Speaker. The exportable volume of our cheese, butter and bacon represented about $40,000,000, upon which we have paid about $1,000,000 more freight than we would have paid provided we had facilities for shipping similar to those of our cousins over the line. Furthermore, our cheese has depreciated in value for want of proper cars on railways, and proper cool steamer accommodation ; and if the curing of cheese in cold storage will advance the price of our cheese one-half cent per pound more, we will be saving, or giving an increase in value of another $1,000,000 or more. The figures which I have given will bear me out in that statement.

Another matter which I wish to refer to is the depreciation in the value of our cheese which is shipped via Portland, caused by its getting over-heated. We have had a great many complaints on that score, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture will tell you.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to mean that there is cheese shipped via Portland during the time the port of Montreal is open ?

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). Oh, yes. Shippers have been compelled to send it via Portland to escape the high rates of insurance charge via Montreal. I may say that the insurance rates last year were almost prohibitive.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. During the summer season ?

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). Yes, and in consequence many people shipped produce via Portland.

Another point I wish to make, Mr. Speaker, is that of hauling cheese from different parts of the country to be placed in cold storage at central points, such as Morrisburg, Brockville, Belleville, Ingersoll, Woodstock, London, Stratford, Listowel and other centres. The concentration rates for cheese in the district west of Toronto is based as follows :

From points west of London, and north of the main line of the Grand Trunk 20½ cents per hundred pounds have been charged, and east of London and south of the main line of the Grand Trunk, 18½ cents per hundred pounds have been charged. Upon shipping these goods out of store the shipper's rate was based on the through rate via Montreal, receiving on this basis, a rebate of 16½ cents per hundred pounds.

For comparison we will take the concentration rates on cheese at cold storage points in the United States, which are based on a much more lenient plan than is the case in Canada. There are many cold storage points in New York state where cheese is concen-

trated on a basis of five cents per hundred pounds, and when the buyer wants to ship his goods out, he has the option of asking the various railways for a rate of freight on his goods to the seaboard, thus getting competition where we have none, and we are obliged to pay the high rate.

I give these figures in the House in order to show to the people of Canada what immense possibilities we have if we will only throw partyism to the winds and work together, and spend a few million dollars in assisting nature to perfect the great waterways which the good Lord has provided us with. In discussing with me the waterways of Canada, a friend of mine from Chicago, who had 40 years' experience on American waterways, said that if a corporation were organized for the transportation of western products from Fort William, Port Arthur, and other Canadian points, and also from Duluth and Chicago to the seaboard of Nova Scotia, it should be as follows :

A steamship line to start with, say comprised of seven or eight 5,000 or 6,000 ton steamers from the points above named to some point on Georgian Bay, thence by rail to Toronto, thence by steamship from Toronto to the Atlantic seaboard. On the eastern division there should be employed at the beginning, or shortly after, twenty-five to thirty steel steamers, full size of the canal locks, beginning at the western end, with the number of steamers above mentioned carrying from 175,000 to 200,000 bushels of grain, equipped with all the modern appliances for the quick handling of all kinds of freight. The eastern terminal of boats, I think, should be Collingwood, where there should be erected a modern elevator ; two elevating legs which would discharge the cargo in about five hours. These two legs should have a capacity of 20,000 bushels per hour, and be similar to those used in Chicago, Buffalo and such large centres. In addition to this, freight sheds for rolling freight and merchandise should be erected, and everything modern connected with the rapid and cheap handling of freight should be installed.

From Collingwood to Toronto the railroad should be an air-line practically, laid with 100-pound rails, and equipped with 75-ton cars, and Collingwood being more than 300 feet higher than Toronto, the heavy products eastbound would meet with the downgrade the greater part of the way, excepting one short distance of five or six miles, where the slightest up-grade exists. This speed would be reinforced with an auxiliary engine, thereby enabling one engine to draw immense trains.

Having reached Toronto, a similar elevator to that at Collingwood, with the exception of the elevating legs, which are not required, should be built, and in addition, an elevated trestle should be erected so that trains can be run up this elevation and the cars dumped in the hopper, which should ride the board of the ship, without the grain passing through an elevator.

With this new system, vessels such as will go through the locks would be loaded in one and one and a half hours, loading about 70,000 bushels of wheat. They will then proceed to Montreal, where another elevator will be erected and kept full of grain. With from 30,000 to 40,000 bushels in the shipping bins, the additional lighterage should complete the cargo of the ship from Toronto, so that at any hour of the day or night when the ship arrives in Montreal, the watchmen could draw this quantity into the ship in from one to one and a half hour's time, the elevator not being required to use any machinery during the putting aboard of the lighterage, as the additional cargo would run by gravitation into the ship. Why this lighterage system would be used is that the ship can only load to 14 feet draught passing through the canal and locks from Toronto to Montreal, while they can be loaded to their full capacity when they arrive at Montreal, which means about 110,000 bushels. They will then proceed to the eastern terminal down by the sea. An elevator should also be erected there similar to the Collingwood elevator, with two elevating legs, and which would discharge the full cargo in about five hours. This done the ship would immediately pass to the coal trestles or shutes, and with a cargo of coal awaiting her would be dumped into the boat in three or four hours' time. This, with any other local, package or import freight would be put on the twin deck of the ships and carried through the Gulf, the River St. Lawrence and Lake Ontario, to Toronto or any other way port between the two points.

The Toronto terminal should be equipped with the most modern machinery for the rapid handling of coal cargoes, and with three or four of the modern fast hoists, costing about $20,000 each. The cargo of 2,000 tons would be taken out in five or six hours' time.

The unloading machinery of this plant should unload three hoists per minute of four and four and a half tons of coal each bucket for each hoist, and three or four hoists unloading will readily determine the result. Fast hoist coal docks should also be established in Montreal.

The further aim of the company should be to have large elevator storage capacity, warehouse and cold storage at the seaboard, whereby shippers of all classes of merchandise may send their goods forward, at a season when they can have suitable markets for such merchandise in Europe. It could be stored at a nominal charge at the seaboard and held there until the dealer or producer thought fit to send it forward to England. In this case it would be well to have shippers rush their goods forward to the seaboard before the close of navigation, and they could ship them across the ocean any time during the winter months. The

same rule could be applied to imported goods or articles, storing them there during the winter months and forwarding them to all parts in western Canada as soon as navigation opened. My idea would be to build ships suitable to pass through the present canals and locks and to build them with a view to the enlargement of the lock chambers between Kingston and Montreal, so that the ships can be lengthened and widened without impairing their seaworthiness or appearance in any way.

Heretofore the boat-hull and cargo insurance rates have been sadly against the St. Lawrence route, causing double, and at times, three times as great a rate of insurance as those of New York and Boston, increasing materially by grounding in the St. Lawrence river between Montreal and Quebec, where ships were drawing a greater depth of water than there was in the river, or if loaded to the regulation depth the fluctuation of water frequently causing them to ground, entailing heavy average and often more than average charges; or in other words, we have been trying to force a 10,000 ton ship through a 5,000 ton channel. With the great draught of water, the channel being but three or four times the width of the ship, no room for action is left for the free movement of the ship, and grounding is the result. Here is the direct cause of the increased insurance rates, and at least it will be borne in mind that these extra rates of insurance have not only affected the ship but the cargo as well, both export and import, and in consequence import cargo has been diverted from the Canadian channel, finding its way through Boston and New York and over the Suspension bridge into Canada. The volume of this cargo, so diverted, will average 20,000 cars yearly, crossing the Niagara river for distribution in Hamilton, Toronto, London, Stratford and all western points. All through western Canada this will be overcome ; the rates of insurance will be cut in two, at least, for instead of the narrow contracted channel for deep draught ships, we have a river half a mile or more wide, where a ship drawing 18 or 19 feet can run full speed with impunity day or night, avoiding the grounding, tug bills, extra labour, and damage to the hull that the ocean ship is subject to.

In consequence of the frequent groundings in the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, the underwriters charged last year as high as $1.20 for every $100 of insurance and they figure on a loss in one case out of five.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. During what period of time do they figure losing one vessel out of five ?

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). In one season, and that would be seen to be the fact, judging by the high rate of insurance charges on the St. Lawrence route as compared with the Boston and New York routes.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That is absurd. They may charge on that basis, but it is not the fact.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). That may be, but we do not want to have to pay these high rates of insurance. I am not making any statement which I do not believe to be correct, and I think that I can prove pretty well any statements I make. Certainly a very large proportion of goods from the old country, intended for Canada, come via New York and Boston. I suppose that from 15,000 to 20,000 car loads annually come that way, across the Niagara river ; while nearly all these goods could be brought through the St. Lawrence route if we had our waterways properly equipped. It is a sad state of affairs to contemplate, that all this traffic has to come through foreign routes, when, by spending a little money, we could get it through our own St. Lawrence route.

The foregoing will give an idea of what my views are as to the method and manner of handling this class of freight. Now, there is another class of freight of the perishable nature, such as dairy produce, bacon and hams, and fruit and poultry, requiring faster transportation and cold storage. Special provision should be made as follows :

Ships of greater speed, at least 20 miles per hour, fitted for passenger trade, and being equipped with cold storage, should stop at leading points of shipment, or natural assembling points, or what may be termed express freight, such as butter, cheese, eggs, fruit, poultry, &c. These points should have two or three sailings each way each week. Each point above referred to would be supplied by the company with permanent cold storage facilities for the better protection of perishable freight. Warehouse receipts could be given to the dealer or producer, on which he could draw 50 to 75 per cent value of goods from the bank, and he could hold the goods in store until ready to ship, when he would get the best rail or steamship rate which could be procured. I feel safe in saying that the cost of transportation upon Canadian exports and imports would be very materially reduced by the inauguration of such a system. I also feel safe in saying that wheat from the North-west would be laid down at the seaboard, from Fort William or Port Arthur, at from 5 cents to 6 cents a bushel, and a good profit made, a distance of 1,700 miles.

By this route the distance from Chicago, Duluth, Port Arthur and Fort William to Liverpool, would be almost 800 miles shorter than between the same points via New York.

The great difficulty I see is in getting our Canadian people to see and to grasp the great opportunities we have in store for us. I do not blame our railways for mak-

ing the best bargains with the people that they can, as business is business, and they are out for the profit. But I do blame our Canadian government and our Canadian people for sitting idly by, for not rising up and insisting that we should place our goods on the markets of the world at as cheap a rate as our neighbours to the south of us. I heard an American gentleman state a few days ago that nature had provided us with seventeen hundred miles of the grandest waterway in the world, from the head of Lake Superior to the seaboard. He also said that if we could only assist nature a little in perfecting and developing our waterways, that we would in a very short time be in a position to place our goods on the market at as cheap a rate as they are doing it in the United States.

I will now, for argument's sake and comparison, give you a few quotations from an address which I delivered before the Dairymen's Association in Woodstock, in January of this year. In the first case I spoke of the export wheat trade from Buffalo to Liverpool. The rate of freight from Buffalo to Liverpool was 11½ cents per hundred pounds, while the rate from points in western Ontario to Liverpool was 21 cents per hundred pounds. Cattle from Toronto to Portland, 28 cents, cattle from Chicago to Portland, a distance of over 500 miles greater, 28 cents, cattle from Chicago to Montreal, 25 cents, cattle from the counties of Perth, Bruce, Huron or Grey, to Montreal, 33 cents to Montreal, or 8 cents more than from Chicago to Montreal. A car load of cattle from Listowel, a town in the county which I have the honour to represent, will cost $1.25 per head higher rate of freight than from Chicago to Montreal, a distance of over 400 miles longer haul than from Listowel.

In 1901 the United States shipped over 500,000 head of cattle to England. If they had paid at the same rate of freight we pay in Canada it would have cost them over $500,000 more. If they had paid for freight so much per mile it would have cost them $1,000,000 more.

The American people have developed 1,000 miles of their great waterway, starting, we might say, from Duluth, Chicago, Milwaukee, &c., to Buffalo. Twenty-two years ago, in 1880, the rail rate from Chicago to New York was 19½ cents per bushel. In 1899 the rail rate from Chicago to New York was 11 cents a bushel. During the same period by water the rate was as follows, between above named points :

1880.. .. .. 13 cents per bushel.
1899.. .. .. 5¾ " "

This steady decline in rates has been the direct result of waterway improvements at the Sault and other channels.

Now, another interesting feature about these rates, Mr. Speaker, is the cost. According to undisputed authority, the great volume of tonnage which now passes through the Sault canal, and which this year exceeded 28,000,000 tons, was moved at a cost of 80-100ths of a mill per ton per mile. The average cost upon trunk lines of railway in the United States is shown to be 8 mills per ton per mile, so we have here an object lesson that the United States waterway from Duluth and Chicago to Buffalo, 1,000 miles, is carrying freight for one-tenth the rate of the railways running parallel thereto. In other words, the waterway is doing for $1.00 what the railway would get $10 for.

It has been estimated by those identified with the commerce of the great lakes, that the 40,000,000 tons moved upon the lakes last year, west of Buffalo, if carried upon the basis of our railway rates, would have cost the American nation about $200,000,000 more than it did, and it is further estimated that at least 10,000,000 tons of the commerce passing through the Sault canals, would not have moved except for the facilities of water transportation. The railway charges upon it would have more than equalled its value at the point of destination. I have pointed out to the House the activity that is to be found upon the American waterways, its marvellous development and what a tremendous force it has been in the development of that country's western resources. Now, then, Mr. Speaker, I want the country to look for a moment at our own waterways, and what is the conspicuous feature ? That although we have from the head of Lake Ontario to the seaboard a waterway unsurpassed, and to which we as a province have contributed about $47,000,000 for the improvement of the canals, &c., we have not a single vessel to carry our products to the seaboard. This is my answer and my solution for the condition that exists to-day in the country and the excessive railway tax that has been levied upon the people of our province—a province in which our agricultural interest represents an investment of $1,200,000,000, with an annual output of $300,000,000 of wealth wrung from its soil by the industry and labour of one and a quarter millions of our inhabitants.

If this great problem of transportation is solved upon true commercial lines we will quadruple our exports, we will double our farm lands values, and besides utilizing our waterways in the summer time, we will more than double the freight to be handled by the railways. During the past year the rates of freight and insurance via our Montreal port have been so excessive as to be practically prohibitory. As an illustration—the rates from west of Toronto in Ontario have ruled about as follows to, say, London, England

Cheese, via Montreal, 68·90 cents per 100 pounds.

Cheese, via Portland, 55·50 per 100 pounds.

Now, then, the House will observe that the

insurance rate is very high, via Montreal, it being from 40 cents per $100 to $1.20 per $100, while via Portland it was only 35 cents per $100. Why should the rate out of Montreal be 68·90 as against Portland 55·50? why should there be such a difference in the insurance? If we could reduce our freight rates in this country by utilizing our waterways as they do in the United States, the amount saved would buy a good many farms, a good many head of cattle and a good many boxes of cheese. Now, I simply give the House these few facts and figures which speak for themselves, and they are facts and figures which no one can dispute.

If the American people can utilize their waterways so as to make great reductions in their freight rate, why can we not do the same thing in this country? I, for one, think it could be done, and I would like to see the people of this country go right to work and do it. There is nothing in the world that we can do that will assist us in increasing the population of this country so much as that of reducing our freight rates. It is all right to talk about making more cheese and more butter, raising more cattle and hogs, more poultry, apples, eggs and dozens of other things which I might mention, but why should we go on in this way, spending so much time and money and doing so much hard work, when we can go to work and save so much money to the manufacturers and producers of our goods by spending a few million dollars, which will all come back to us in a few years and which will give us better rates of freight for the balance of our natural lives.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). When you left the Chair at one o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was speaking of the necessity of reducing freight rates on the various products of the farm, the field, the forest and the mine; and I was pointing out that a reduction in the freight rates would enable us, not only to make a greater profit, but to raise more butter, more cheese, more cattle, more poultry, more hogs, and so on and so on. I pointed out that our interest lay in utilizing our waterways so as to make great reductions in our freight rates. I may here say that after I concluded making the above remarks, or similar remarks, at the Woodstock Cheese Convention, Mr. Robert Ballantyne, the chairman of the meeting, who is connected with one of the largest firms of exporters of cheese and butter in Canada and England, stood up and made the following remarks:

The facts and figures presented by Mr. MacLaren are no doubt startling, and I know the rates are true, and I know the people of this district, west of Ontario, are more interested than the men of the east. I know you pay a much greater rate out of this section than the men do out of the eastern section. I know the railway companies join together and agree among themselves to get a higher rate out of you by Montreal than they get out of you by Portland, and I know your cheeses are tremendously injured by shipping by Portland. I have had a lot of experience. I believe we were the biggest shippers out of Portland this last summer, and I believe we suffered enough to pay three rates out of Montreal. In quoting cheese to our customers in England, if our quotation is sixpence higher, we cannot sell our cheese, and it is necessary to quote our cheese by the cheapest route in order to sell them. The facts of the matter are that the Canadian Pacific Railway use the St. Lawrence route and make that route by Quebec in order that they may make a competitive rate to get these goods by the Canadian Pacific Railway and haul them to Quebec instead of Montreal. In future we will have steamers with cold storage out of Montreal, and you had better ship your cheese by these cool steamers, and we want a cheap rate out of Montreal. It should not be impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway to say to you, 'We will take them from Quebec at a rate of 13 cents a hundred cheaper than we will from Montreal,' and I feel that when it comes the time for resolutions, that there should be a resoultion on this subject.

I shall not dwell at any length upon the speech of Mr. Ballantyne, but have simply read it to the House for the purpose of showing that he is fully in accord with what I have to say on the transportation question. I will now read to the House the resolution on transportation which was endorsed by the members of the Dairymen's Association at the close of that convention:

That the Dairymen's Association express the opinion of the importance of improvement being made to the Canadian canals and waterways and to the St. Lawrence river, in order that the Canadian producer may be placed in the very best position possible for competition with the producers of other countries for the British and foreign trade, and that this resolution be transmitted to the Minister of Railways and Canals. That the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa be asked to take such steps as will ensure a sufficient supply of refrigerator cars for shipment of cheese during the coming season, and also provide icing stations at shipping centres.

The above resolution, Mr. Speaker, speaks for itself, and I trust it will have a good effect, and will be the means of bringing about more satisfactory transportation conditions.

I will now quote from a letter from a friend of mine in Chicago rates of freight during the month of March just past, on produce going from Chicago to Liverpool:

Via Portland and St. John, rate on butter was 63 cents per 100 pounds.
Via Portland and St. John, rate on cheese was 48 cents per 100 pounds.
Via Portland and St. John, rate on meat was 43 cents per 100 pounds.
Via Portland and St. John, rate on live stock, 28 cents per 100 pounds.
Via Boston and St. John, rate on butter was 65 cents per 100 pounds.
Via Boston and St. John, rate on cheese was 50 cents per 100 pounds.

Via Boston and St. John, rate on meat was 45 cents per 100 pounds.

Via Boston and St. John, rate on meat was 45 cents per 100 pounds.

The above figures are all on car load rates—and many times during the year rates are cut, so that a cut on cheese of 5 and 10 cents per 100 pounds is at times obtained, and even as much as 15 and sometimes 20 cents per 100 pounds lower rate is obtained on butter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask hon. members on both sides of the House to sit down and look this matter up for themselves, and figure it out, and then stand up and do as I am doing. Tell this House and tell this country what they think of the manner in which we, the people of Canada, are slumbering and allowing our competitors to cut our business clean away from us. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the great American railway and steamship syndicates have their eye on securing control of our railways as well as our ocean transportation. The Hill system from the west to the cities of New York and Boston is now further reaching out upon the Atlantic for the control of ocean steamers. The buying of the Canada Atlantic is but a part of that great policy, and is, in my opinion, the handwriting on the wall of a policy to pull and haul all that Canada produces into New York and Boston by the great American railways and waterways, and then ship across the ocean our goods on American steamers, while we, with our undevloped waterways and undeveloped electric railways, sit idly by and look at the Americans doing us up. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say undeveloped electric railways, which in my opinion should be developed and running all over this country, running into our back townships, carrying into the great centres our cattle, our hogs, our wheat, our eggs, our poultry, our fruit, our cheese and butter, in fact, everything we have to ship, and we should have large elevators, sheds and storehouses in such centres as Hamilton, Toronto, Port Hope, Belleville, Kingston, Brockville, Ottawa, Ogdensburg, on the United States side, Montreal, and clean down to the sea. If goods were stored in this way a shipper could have his choice of rates by steamer, if our waterways were developed, or by the great railways which go through all these centres. We must do something of this kind in Canada, and we must do it at once.

I just wish, Mr. Speaker, to give to the House a few more quotations and a few more illustrations, and will then read my resolution and sit down. I have here a quotation from a speech delivered at a banquet a few weeks ago by my hon. friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). When talking on the transportation problem, he used the following words :

Another fact that must be remembered is that the measure of distance is no longer the mile, but the hour. We must not only have cheap transportation but rapid transit.

I may say that I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend, as in my opinion the commercial distance is not reckoned by mileage or time, but by the cost of transportation. For example, although the province of Ontario is 1,000 miles nearer to the British market than Dakota or Minnesota, the latter named places are commercially 1,000 miles nearer to the British market by the effect of their cheaper transportation. A barrel of Minneapolis flour is carried from Duluth to Buffalo, 1,000 miles for 16 cents. A barrel of flour for the same distance along through Ontario to the seaboard costs 45 cents.

Now, then, for a few moments we will go back to the great western lakes of Canada and the United States. The principal receiving centres for the produce of the northern and western states, and the provinces and wheat-producing territories of the great Canadian North-west, are the cities of Chicago, Milwaukee, Duluth and Fort William, situated on the head waters of Lake Michigan and Superior. The staple export trade from these points consists of wheat, corn, flour and provisions. Of the vast volumes which were assembled at these ports in the season 1900, there were for export : 6,000,000 barrels of flour, 200,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn. Of this export volume 5,850,000 barrels of flour, and 170,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn were carried through Buffalo to the Atlantic seaboard, while only 150,000 barrels of flour and 30,000,000 bushels of wheat and corn went out by Montreal and the St. Lawrence route.

The figures for the past season from the port of Montreal, I have not at hand, but the volume has been very considerable less than those above quoted.

Now, for a moment, Mr. Speaker, we will tell the House something about our present export channels. You will have observed that the volume of the above named goods passed through Buffalo was carried there over a 1,000-mile waterway, in vessels of the most modern and efficient type, while the small Montreal volume was carried to that port by the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway and Canada Atlantic Railway, over a very long rail haul. As I said before, a barrel of flour is hauled from Duluth to Buffalo—1,000 miles—for 16 cents, while a barrel of flour for the same distance in Canada, from Ontario, costs 45 cents and sometimes more, for the reason that notwithstanding our unrivalled waterways, Canada has no properly organized system of inland water transportation.

No more striking example can be given of the growth and future possibilities of the great west and the value of water transportation as an economic factor in that marvellous development than the growth of the Sault canal traffic.

Growth of Sault Traffic.

Year.	Number of Vessels.	Tons of Freight.
1890..	10,557	9,041,213
1895..	17,956	15,062,580
1901..	20,041	28,403,065

Stupendous as these figures are, they only reveal a portion of the great lake commerce —the greatest in the world. The volume last year passing through the Detroit river totalled nearly 42,000,000 tons. This volume is almost four times greater than the Suez canal, which is the great artery of commerce between Europe and Asia. It exceeds the combined entrances and clearances of Liverpool and London, two of the world's greatest seaports. It almost doubles that of the port of New York, which for the twelve months ending July, 1901, was 25,085,000 tons.

In order that the House may comprehend in another way the commercial activity of the great lakes, I may say that the total fleet engaged therein amounts to the enormous number of 3,500 vessels. Let the people think seriously of this for a moment, and can they ever imagine, we Canadians, on any Canadian route, employing 500 vessels, to say nothing about the 3,500 ? On these 3,500 vessels they carry regular crews to the number of 52,000 men, and directly afford employment to 150,000 men, as clerks, coal, ore and grain shovellers, stevedores, deck hands and others. During the eight months or season of navigation for 1900 :

The total arrivals and departures from—
Chicago, 17,017 vessels, 13,834,000 tonnage.
Duluth, 11,526 vessels, 14,433,500 tonnage.

The arrival and clearances at the port of Chicago equal the cities of New York and New Orleans combined, and almost equal the combined total of the cities of Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia and New Orleans, which are all-year open ports.

Another item of interest is that pertaining to the value of the commerce passing the Sault canal during the season of navigation, which for the past year was 28,403,065 ; an increase of two and three-quarter million tons over the previous year. The total valuation given to this enormous volume has been $288,529,500.

Without going into detail, 18,000,000 tons of the gross volume represented iron and copper ore, leaving a balance of 10,000,000 for food stuffs and general merchandise.

The commercial advantages of a waterway route through the centre of Canada cannot be estimated. First as an export grain route, second as an export route for Ontario products ; third, as an export and import general merchandise route ; fourth, as a coal line from Nova Scotia to Ontario cities.

The economy of this route is acknowledged by experts to be pre-eminent, in view of its unquestioned geographical advantages.

2. As being the great and cheap outlet for the great North-west wheat supply.

3. Because of the local commercial possibilities which will be afforded by the province of Ontario and northern New York states supplying large volumes of high class freight, producing a very high percentage of earnings and revenue, and I think the Gulf of St. Lawrence should be the assembling ground for both import and export commerce for all parts of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might go on talking for hours, giving you quotations, comparisons, illustrations and arguments why the people of Canada should, in my opinion, lose not a day in sending out a company of expert engineers and expert commercial men in search of the best system of developing and utilizing our waterways so that we can place ourselves in a position to compete with Australia, South America, United States, Argentine Republic, Russia, or any of our great competitors who transport their goods by water.

I trust that even at this late hour the House shall hear from many members on both sides something with regard to this great problem, and I may again say, Mr. Speaker, that I regret very much having been compelled to wait, on account of poor health, until this late date to bring this matter up. However, I trust that my few feeble remarks may result in some good to the people of this country. I beg to move, seconded by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) :

That during the past twenty years Canada's food producing competitors in the British market have made phenominal strides in agricultural development owing largely to the favourable rates afforded them by adequate competitive transportation routes and which have enabled them practically to fix and determine the value of food products the world over ;

That the intensity of the commercial struggle of to-day imperatively demands the advancement of our national development and that every handicap existing against the transportation to the world's markets of our agricultural or industrial products shall be removed ; that our commerce shall be untrammelled ; and that conditions shall be made to subserve the interests of commerce, and not commerce that of arbitrary or artificial conditions ;

That it is in the interest of our Dominion at large—in view of the economy of water transportation—that greater use shall be made of our waterways between Lake Superior and the seaboard, thus affording cheaper and better facilities of transportation for our exports from the Western Territories and Ontario, and the development of interprovincial trade.

Therefore, in the opinion of this House, it is both expedient and indispensable that the government shall at once inaugurate such a policy in connection with our waterways and the shipbuilding industry as will speedily lead to the completion of a Canadian system of both inland and ocean transportation.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much indeed that neither the govern-

ment nor the House had an opportunity of knowing about this amendment that has just been proposed by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren). Hearing it read, as I have now for the first time, there does not seem to be anything very objectionable in the terms of the amendment, but under the circumstances I do not see how it is possible for the government to accept an amendment of this kind on a motion to go into Committee of Supply; an amendment that we have not had an opportunity of reading or of considering before hand. I fear, therefore, that I will have to ask the House to vote against this amendment. As regards the speech which the hon. gentleman (Mr. MacLaren) has delivered, I must say that I am very glad indeed to have the very valuable figures which he has placed before the House recorded in 'Hansard,' so that they may be thoroughly understood and known by hon. gentlemen and by the people of Canada. Many of these figures have already appeared in the public press, but not in such a form that they could be thoroughly understood and digested, and I must congratulate the hon. member upon the form in which he has put them before the House. The hon. gentleman, I am well aware, is deeply interested in all problems affecting agriculture, and especially the dairy trade of Canada, and I am quite sure that the results of his long study of these problems, as developed in the speech which has just been delivered, will be read by the members of the House and by the people of the country with a great deal of interest. My only regret is that the attendance of members was so scanty this morning, and that all who were here were not able to follow very closely my hon. friend's remarks. There are, however, one or two points which stand out particularly as the burden of his speech, to which I shall refer for a few moments.

One is that our waterways in Canada are defective and must be improved. Now, I venture to take issue with my hon. friend at once. The waterways of Canada are far superior to those of the United States. We have in the western lakes the same waterway opened to us as is opened to the United States. Whether the shipment starts from Duluth or from Fort William, that shipment can go down to the eastern end of Lake Erie just as well as to Port Colborne at the mouth of the Welland canal as it can to Buffalo, although the facilities at Port Colborne for handling the traffic are not as great as those at Buffalo. But that the government have already taken steps to remedy, and to-day there are large contracts being carried out for the improvement of Port Colborne, at the completion of which I venture to think that port will seriously rival the port of Buffalo in the facilities and advantages which it will afford for the transhipment of grain and other products from the ships plying on the great lakes to those which ply on the canals.

My hon. friend has made a comparison between Buffalo and Montreal in regard to rates; but I venture to think it is an unfair comparison, inasmuch as Montreal is a seaport, while Buffalo is separated by several hundred miles of either railway transport or very poor canal transport from the American seaboard. Therefore the comparison between Buffalo and Montreal is an entirely unfair and unwarranted comparison.

My hon. friend has spoken about the American waterways having reduced the rates on American railroads. I have not studied this subject in its entirety so as to be able to follow out that argument; but from what I do know of railroad rates in the United States, I do not think the Erie canal from Buffalo to New York has materially affected them. If these rates are lower than the rates in Canada, it is due to two things: In the first place, the enormous traffic which has enabled them to grade their roads better and to provide better accommodation; and, secondly, the keen competition which exists between the large number of railroad corporations engaged in the carrying of goods from Chicago and other points in the west to the Atlantic seaboard.

It is true, there is a very serious discrimination against our agricultural products in Ontario, when we compare the cost of laying them down in England, the great market for our agricultural products, with the cost of laying down there American agricultural products, which come from points further west. This is one of the most grave difficulties which we have to overcome in connection with the export of our agricultural products to England; and any proposition looking towards a solution of that difficulty is well worthy of the utmost consideration of parliament and the country. I venture to think that Canada has done in the immediate past and is doing to-day a good deal to overcome that discrimination. In the first place, within the last few years our canal system has been enlarged to a depth of 14 feet, so that now vessels carrying something like 60,000 bushels of grain can leave the western end of the great lakes and carry their cargoes to Montreal without breaking bulk. This fact of itself makes our waterways far superior to the waterways of the United States, where no such cargo can be carried from the interior of the continent to the seaboard without breaking bulk at Buffalo and transhipping into smaller vessels to pass through the Erie canal. Notwithstanding this fact, the rates in Canada to the seaboard are a great deal higher than the rates in the United States for the same distance.

This difference in rates, is not, however, so much a difference in railroad rates on

this continent, as a difference in the rates on the Atlantic steamships.

This question is a serious one, with which this country has been face to face for many years. It is one which the government have been trying to deal with in what way they could. The fact which the hon. gentleman himself has brought forward, as to the insurance rates being so much higher on the St. Lawrence route than the insurance rates from Boston, New York and other American ports, is a very serious factor in this comparison of rates. That is a matter which has been before the government and the country for two or three years past; and so important has it been felt to be by the government that if the hon. gentleman will look at the supplementary estimates which have been laid on the Table this morning for the year 1902-3, he will find an item of $280,000 which is asked for by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the purpose of improving the lights and buoys and the other aids to navigation on the river and gulf of St. Lawrence. These works, we believe, will have a material affect in reducing the rates of insurance on vessels using the St. Lawrence route. In fact, the insurance companies and the shipping companies have informed the government that if the improvements involved in the scheme of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries are carried out, the result will be a reduction of the rates on the St. Lawrence route. My hon. friend will therefore see that not only are the government not unmindful of this question, but they have investigated it, and are prepared, if parliament grants this money, to go to work during the coming season and carry out the improvements which those familiar with the business have recommended to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

My hon. friend spoke about the discrimination in railroad rates. I do not know what can be done to remedy this discrimination except to appoint a railway commission. A Bill to create such a commission was introduced in the House this session and thoroughly discussed, and I hope that before the session closes it will be still further ventilated, so that the whole country will be fully seized with the subject. Next session I have no doubt that this measure will be re-introduced early enough to be carried into law, and it seems to me that a railway commission, such as is provided by this Bill, will be the simplest and most effective means of providing a remedy for the evils which now undoubtedly exist with regard to railway rates and transportation. At the moment I am not prepared to say to what extent the evils complained of interfere with our traffic. That is a question which will have to be settled by the railway commission. Individual instances will have to be submitted to that commission and evidence concerning them given under oath. And I am sure that no better tribunal than a commission of this kind, specially created for that work, could be devised to thoroughly sift the evils and disadvantages complained of and apply a remedy.

My hon. friend has also spoken about the necessity for encouraging a line of vessels to carry freight from the western end of our waterway down to Montreal. I regret extremely that such a line was not established long since, but the reason it has not been is no doubt the want of enterprise on the part of Canadians and their unwillingness to take every advantage of the waterways placed at their disposal by the country. We have a splendid chance of communication from Fort William to Montreal. Our coasting laws furnish every facility and encouragement for the establishment of lines of steamers on our great lakes, and if these facilities have not been taken advantage of, it seems to me that it is because the capitalists of this country have not seen their way clear to make the investment. I do not understand my hon. friend to suggest that the government should do any more than provide these facilities. It has indeed been a matter of surprise to me that in days gone by a line of boats was not established to carry the enormous export trade of the Niagara peninsula, especially in fruit, from Hamilton and the adjoining ports down to Montreal. Instead of that, the railways have been allowed to monopolise that immense traffic. In view of the well established fact that water carriage is cheaper, especially in bulky freight, than rail carriage, I cannot understand why so small an amount of this western business has been carried in boats from the west to Montreal. That is one of the things that ought to be investigated. It is certainly astonishing that with the splendid facilities offered by our canals and lakes there has not been any improvement in the direction of supplying vessels to carry this western trade.

I venture to say that in addition there is abundant opportunity for me of enterprise to establish cold storage boats, which would run through Lake Erie and Ontario and down through the canals in summer to Montreal, where their freight would be transhipped into ocean vessels, which are all equipped with cold storage facilities. I need not dwell on the facilities provided for cold storage freight from Montreal to Europe. My hon. friend himself read an extract which showed clearly that these are far superior to the advantages provided in American ports. His own cheese trade has shown clearly that while the rates are cheaper via Portland, the cheese becomes damaged on that route, whereas, although the rates may be a little higher via Montreal, the cheese suffers no damage, but arrives in good condition, and I think he will agree that it is better to pay a little higher freight at Montreal and have the cheese arrive in good order in our cold stor-

age vessels than ship it at a lower rate from American ports and have it arrive in a damaged condition. I shall not say anything further on this point, except to remark that when my hon. friend asks us to help him in securing better accommodation at Portland, he must not forget that Portland is a foreign port and that we have no control of the vessels leaving it.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). My hon. friend is mistaken. I am not advocating any assistance to an American port, but simply that we should improve our Canadian waterways.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understood my hon. friend to read and endorse the views expressed by a gentleman at the Dairymen's Association, who advised that we should provide better accommodation at Portland. I am not going into the figures which my hon. friend has given. They need to be studied very carefully before attempting to deal with them, but before sitting down, I would like to say to my hon. friend—and in so doing, I wish to set aside all politics, which he seemed to think ought to be introduced into the matter, since he brought his motion as an amendment to the resolution to go into supply. Such a motion, unless previously submitted to the government, is necessarily a motion of want of confidence.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). I did give the Minister of Public Works a copy of the resolution yesterday.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. My hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works was not here, and I did not know anything about it, nor did the other members of the government. But putting politics aside entirely, let me say that Canada as a whole, both this government and its predecessors, has devoted enormous sums of money to the solving of the transportation problem and has never shrunk from doing what the country thought necessary in order to provide transportation facilities. Our canal system is probably the greatest on the face of the earth. Our government railway, the Intercolonial Railway, and the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway, both of which have been largely assisted by this country, are probably, in proportion to our wealth and population, the greatest railroad system on the globe. Canada has borne, and is to-day bearing the burden, by paying the interest on the debt incurred for the purpose of perfecting our transportation facilities. These facilities are not at all utilized to their full extent. Our canal system is not utilized to the one-hundredth part of its capacity. If the enterprising capitalists of this country would undertake to supply the necessary vessels, there is nothing to prevent our canals being utilized in a way hitherto undreamed of, and I have no doubt that the investment would prove profitable, both for the promoters and the country.

Under these circumstances, I venture to think that neither the government nor the people of Canada can be looked upon as recreant to this part of their duty or lacking in enterprise and determination to advance along the lines of material progress. If these facilities have not been utilized to the utmost possible extent, it is because the people of Canada have been devoting themselves to other things—the farmers to the production of goods, the merchants to selling those goods to advantage. And now they are beginning to see and understand that greater facilities in the way of transport are necessary, not in the shape of canals, not in the shape of railway tracks, but in the shape of improved rolling stock for the railways, and of ships for the utilization of the canals which now exist. The people of Canada will take that up and carry it out in a way commensurate with the facilities already at their disposal and commensurate with the enterprise they have shown in providing these facilities and in the development of the country's resources thus far. I am satisfied that hon. members on both sides and the people of Canada at large are expecting that this will be done, and I venture to think that, in the near future, such work will be done to greater advantage than heretofore. As I have said, I regret that it is impossible under the circumstances to accept the motion, especially in the form in which it has been given. But I sympathize with a great deal of what has been said by the hon. member for North Perth, and I am satisfied that Canadians will take advantage of the facilities they have and will soon have a fleet upon our lakes that will rival that of the United States, and that will cause our trade to pass through our canals and ports instead of so much of it going to the south.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). The motion now before the House is, perhaps, the most interesting for the farmers of this country that has yet been discussed. As the Minister of Railways promises that next session he will introduce a Bill to regulate the traffic on the railways by establishing a railway commission, perhaps it will be well to wait and see what the government will do. The farmers are all deeply interested in getting their products to the market at as cheap a rate as possible. It has been clearly established that Canadian farmers are discriminated against by the railways. Whether the commission will have power to relieve them of that discrimination remains to be seen. We find that to-day cattle are carried from Chicago to Boston at a cheaper rate than that which is charged on cattle from a point fifty miles north of Toronto to Boston over the same lines. I hold in my hands a shipping bill from Chicago for cattle shipped from there

for 28 cents per 100 pounds to Boston. I have another shipping bill from a point 80 miles north of Toronto for 33 cents per 100 pounds to Boston. And there is a rebate on the shipment from Chicago of $7.50, reducing the Chicago rate by about 3 cents further. Now, if this is a fact—and it is a fact, for I have the shipping bills here—it is a grievance which should be remedied. I have another shipping bill for cattle from Toronto to Boston for 25 cents per 100 pounds with no rebate. Now, this makes a difference of $1.14 on every beef weighing 1,400 pounds to get it on ship-board, the difference being against the Canadian farmers. I am credibly informed that, on the average, the American farmer has an advantage of $2 on every beef shipped to the old country over the farmers of Canada. What does this mean? It means that our farmers who are looking to better their condition will go and live in a land where they can get the best advantages. Is it any wonder that farm lands in Ontario and in Canada generally are depreciating in value when our railways discriminate against us in this way? The Minister of Railways cannot establish his railway commission too soon. I am not prepared to condemn the government because they have not done it yet, for these discriminations have been going on for many years. But if the government will undertake to remedy this evil, the farmers will be satisfied. In the meantime, I am not prepared to condemn the government until we see what they are going to do in the matter.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I was a little surprised at the statement of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), that this motion, being in amendment to a motion for Committee of Supply, must be regarded as a motion of want of confidence in the government. It is only a few days since the hon. gentleman's own friends accepted a motion in amendment to a motion for Committee of Supply from one of their own supporters, not regarding it as a motion of want of confidence. I refer to the motion of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) regarding the embargo on Canadian cattle. And the government could, with equal propriety, accept the motion now before the House, for there is nothing in it that goes any further or is any stronger than the motion offered by one of their own friends. The excuse that the Minister of Agriculture has given why this motion should not be allowed to pass, or his excuse for calling upon his friends to vote it down, is simply an excuse, and not a very good one either. The hon. minister said that the cold storage provided from Canadian ports is far superior to that provided from American ports. No doubt it is. Why, then, is it that the freight rates are so much higher from Canadian ports? It must be due to one of two causes—either to want of competition in the vessels carrying on that trade or to the high insurance that is charged on the Canadian route. I have reason to believe that a good deal is due to the fact that the insurance on the St. Lawrence route is so very much higher than from American ports. And yet, strange to say, we have been told over and over again in this House, within the last few years by supporters of the government, that everything has been done that could be done to make the route as nearly perfect as possible—the lighting, deepening and enlarging of the channel and the affording of 14-foot navigation throughout the whole route. If everything has been done that should be done, why does the Minister of Agriculture tell us to-day that there is a large item in the supplementary estimates which have just been laid on the Table, for better lighting the St. Lawrence route? I admit quite readily that the work is necessary. But the statement of the minister is strangely contradictory of what was said by Sir Louis Davies, the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, over and over again in this House, that everything had been done that could be done to make the route perfect and to reduce the cost of insurance.

The Minister of Agriculture wonders that freight from the western part of Ontario is not carried in boats rather than in railways. Now the minister has been informing the Canadian farmer for several years past that he has introduced a system of cold storage on the railways, capable of carrying the perishable products of the farm to the seaboard, and laying them down in perfect condition; and he wonders because the farmers have taken him at his word and are availing themselves of this cold storage system. It is true that they have not found it as valuable as he declared it would be, but they have taken him at his word, and they are using it. Now I admit that if the Canadian farmer in the southwestern part of Ontario availed himself of steamers for the carriage of his fruit it might be to his advantage. But to do it successfully there would require to be better provision made for the carriage of that fruit on those steamers than exists at the present time. Why? Because transportation is much slower, and there is a possibility of the fruit spoiling in the steamers as well as in the cars. But the Minister of Agriculture has made no provision for the better carriage of these perishable products of the farm by way of these steamers between, say, Hamilton or Grimsby and Montreal. Therefore it should not be a matter of surprise to the minister that they do not take advantage of the waterways; they cannot do so on account of the inferior transportation facilities that are afforded them by these steamers. The Minister of Agriculture says that the Canadians should take advantage of the splendid waterways provided by the country. Now, does it not occur to him that there

must be some defect, or otherwise they would take advantage of them? It may be in freight rates, it may be in the want of more rapid transportation, it may be in facilities for handling—there must be some reason why the people do not take advantage of it. The very fact that they do not take advantage of it ought to suggest to the hon. gentleman the necessity of inquiring into the cause and providing a remedy as early as possible. It is not enough to say that it is provided. These splendid waterways are not all they have been represented to be; the shippers of the country declare they are not what they have been represented to be. We often find Canadians shipping by way of American ports, availing themselves of the transportation facilities through American ports while leaving the waterways and railways of our own country. Then I say we cannot move one moment too soon in remedying these defects so that our shippers will take advantage of our waterways as they ought to be able to do.

The hon. minister told us a short time before that they had improved the St. Lawrence by lighting it better. Well, that is right, but they have contended for years that they have done all that was required; and the hon. gentleman's own friends have most positively assured us that everything was done that could be done. Only last session the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that navigators found no fault with the St. Lawrence, that he had asked captains what more was necessary to be done, and they told him nothing, they could suggest nothing more to be done. But to-day the Minister of Agriculture tells us that there is an item of over $280,000 in the supplementary estimates presented to this House to-day for the purpose of better lighting the St. Lawrence route. There must have been something wrong, then. My impression is now, as it always has been, that the St. Lawrence was not as well lighted as it should be, otherwise the insurance rates would not be so high. It is evident there has been some defect in that route, and the minister now acknowledges it by making better provision for lighting it. The minister says the waterways of Canada are far superior to those of the United States. He said that in justification of the contention that we could ship cheaper to foreign markets through Canada than we could through the United States. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) said that this justifies us in adopting his resolution, namely:

> That in the opinion of this House it is both expedient and indispensable that the government should at once inaugurate such a policy in connection with our waterways and the shipbuilding industry of the country, as will speedily lead to the completion of the Canadian system by both inland and ocean transportation.

Now, the hon. minister says the waterways of Canada are far superior to the waterways of the United States, and he gives that as an answer to the allegation that shipping is carried on more cheaply through the waterways of the United States than through those of Canada. Well, I know there is a good deal in the fact that the larger country has a larger quantity to ship, that there is greater competition in vessels, and that perhaps the insurance is much lighter. Those facts may partly account for the larger quantity of shipping carried through the United States waterways. But I think there is another reason that accounts for it, and that is that we have not paid sufficient attention to our own waterways. There is no doubt of that whatever, in my judgment. I do not see any reason in the world why our railways cannot carry the produce of Canada, say from Windsor, if you like, to Montreal, as cheap as they can from Milwaukee, or St. Paul, or Minneapolis to Montreal. Why can they not do it? Does it cost less or more to carry a hundred weight of freight fifteen hundred miles than it does to carry it a thousand miles? It cost more to carry it a longer distance, and yet they are carrying it a longer distance for a cheaper price. What does that suggest? Does it not suggest that there must be an overcharge on the freight carried through Canada? Does it not suggest the necessity of a railway commission, or some other power, to control the railways in fixing their freight rates? It is not so much competiton that does that, because some railways carry freight through Canada and are taxed to their utmost capacity at times to handle it. Therefore they ought to be able to carry freight for Canadians at least as cheap, if not cheaper, than the Americans do, because sometimes they carry it a much longer distance.

Then there must be some other cause, and what is it? The Canadians do not avail themselves of our splendid waterways. Why do they not? There must be some shortage of vessels, and if there is a shortage of vessels, is not this resolution an appropriate one which suggests that the government should direct their attention to the matter: 'Inaugurate such a policy in connection with our waterways and the shipbuilding industry of the country as will speedily lead to the completion of the Canadian system by both inland and ocean transportation.' Is that an improper suggestion to make to the government? Is it improper for this House to ask the government to direct their attention to those things?

We had a deputation here a few days ago waiting on the government asking them to give a bounty on ship-building. Suppose the government acceded to that request what would be the result? It would certainly lead to the building of more ships in Canada and if we had more ships built in Canada there would be a better system of transportation. There would be a greater

competition and the result would be that we would have an ample supply of vessels for our carrying trade, whereas, we have not now an ample supply. We are many times short of what the country needs. This resolution could not be out of place if the government accepted it and there is no good reason in the world why the government should not accept it and say that we desire to do what is there proposed. We are directing our attention to the subject, but if we can get a spur, or any valuable suggestion from the opposition that will help us, we are willing and desirous to avail ourselves of such assistance and at the earliest possible moment to do everything we can to improve the shipping facilities of the country. We have been told that we have a 14 foot system of waterways from Lake Superior right down to Montreal. Some shippers say we have not. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) has told us over and over again that we have. But, whether we have or have not, we do find that vessel-owners are reluctant to avail themselves of our waterways to the extent that we would desire to see them do. There seems to be some reason for this and I say that it is the duty of the government to seek out that reason and remedy any defect that may be found to exist at the earliest possible moment. The hon. member who moved this resolution gave us some statistics to show the amount of trade that is passing through the Sault canal, the improvement in that trade and the value of it. The number of vessels that passed through the Sault canal last year was 2,041. Well, it suggested one thing to my mind and it was that there is ample competition in these waterways so far as our American friends are concerned and that if we had the same competition there is no doubt whatever but that it would result in the lowering of freight rates to the Canadian people. We find that a great deal of the grain that passes through the Sault canal is taken to Buffalo. We are told that it goes there because that is a cheaper route and some people say it is a cheaper route because they have better facilities for shipping to the seaboard. Their route does not compare with ours. The Erie canal is by no means equal to the St. Lawrence route. That does not affect the question, but the real reason is that they have better competition in railways from Buffalo to New York. I believe that fact accounts for the shipment of such a large amount of grain by this route rather than that the route from Buffalo to New York is superior to ours. It is by virtue of that competition that the freight rates are lower and that is the reason why a large portion of the grain is going that way rather than by way of Montreal. It is sometimes said that if we had the Georgian Bay canal this condition of affairs would be remedied. Well, it may be to some extent. I believe so far as the carriage of the grain of the North-west Territories is concerned it would be of material advantage if we had it. The next question is whether the cost of that canal is not beyond the reach of the Canadian people at the present time, and whether we would be justified in incurring the very large expenditure which would be necessary to build that canal by the expected return from the shipping brought to the country on account of it. We do not think we would be at the present time, but we do think that the improvement of the other waterways should be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. We have heard it said over and over again in this House that since the present government came into power they have finished the St. Lawrence route, that our canal system is finished. We need only look at the estimates to satisfy ourselves that the canal system is not finished by any means, because we are spending money right along the same as we have done in years past. I do not complain of it, because I think that expenditure is absolutely necessary, but I think that the work might be hurried up a great deal faster than it has been carried on during the last four or five years. We have not made the progress we should have made. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte)—with that constant discussion going on between three or four ministers of the Crown it is difficult to proceed. I desire to get their attention, because, if I can hope to make any impression upon them it will be through them hearing what I have to say. If they will only extend to me the courtesy of listening to me I will be very much obliged. I have noticed this practice so often that I am obliged to speak of it. The hon. Minister of Public Works, in my judgment, has displayed more enterprise and energy in his efforts to carry this out than any other minister of the Crown, but I do say that during the last four or five years, although they said much about the expenditure and the work done by their predecessors, the work is going on more rapidly to-day than for many years past. This fact suggests to us the necessity of hurrying up, because as time goes on and new routes are being constructed it would be much more difficult to divert the trade of the country from these new routes when we get our own completed than to secure this trade if we had our routes ready for the carriage of the trade when the trade is offered to be carried. In going over the returns that were given to us a short time ago showing the quantity of grain going from ports on the Georgian Bay they show that a large share of that trade is being carried by railway notwithstanding all the money that we are spending on the waterways of this country. We have the Canada Atlantic Railway carrying millions and millions of bushels of grain from Parry Sound to Montreal, we have the Grand Trunk Railway carrying 11,000,-

000 or 12,000,000 bushels of grain from Midland every year to Montreal, and we have the Grand Trunk Railway carrying a large amount of wheat from Meaford, Collingwood, Goderich and Sarnia to Montreal. All these railways are carrying the grain and if facilities are given for the handling of the grain at these ports through elevators and through improved facilities for transhipment it will materially assist in carrying the grain from these ports by these routes. The more grain that is carried in this way the less will be taken to Buffalo. If we continue to improve our waterways as we are doing by providing better lighting and reducing the cost of insurance and otherwise improving them we will induce the Canadian people to avail themselves of these routes, to ship their grain by Canadian routes rather than by American routes as the hon. Minister of Agriculture told us they are doing. Our attention cannot be directed a moment too soon to the importance of this resolution and the hon. member for Perth is entitled to the thanks of this House as well as to the thanks of the shippers of the country and especially the agriculturists of the country for introducing this subject and giving the House the benefit of the large amount of information which he has collected in regard to it. The details which he has given to this House I take to be approximately correct, as correct as it was possible for him to obtain them. It is valuable information, as I have said, and the introduction of the subject draws our attention to the subject in a way that should make the government desirous at the earliest possible date of directing their attention to it more energetically than they have done in the past. That being the case why should they not accept the resolution ? If the government have nothing to fear, if they have been doing all they could this would be a justification for what they have done. Then I say that the government should accept this resolution and let us pass it unanimously as they did in reference to the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) the other night in regard to the cattle trade of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). I have addressed the House so often on the transportation question, that I hesitate to speak once more; but the subject is of such vast importance that I may be pardoned for saying a few words. My hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) has rightly stated that it is perhaps the most important question that we have to deal with at the present time. The amalgamation of many lines of steamers on the Atlantic ocean has created a new interest in that question. No one can tell what the result of that may be, because it is too early yet to make any prophecy about it. There are those who believe that Mr. Morgan's plans are not only to amalgamate as many steamer lines as he can, but to work these lines in conjunction with the American railway system, and I am one of those who take that view. I believe that before we are very much older, we will find that Mr. Morgan and his syndicate who are stock holders in American railways will amalgamate both railways and steamship lines, not only on the ocean but on the lakes as well. In other words, they will be able to make a through rate from west to east. There is no doubt that we are not in a position to-day to face such a strong combination, but I do not despair of the future of the country. We live in a century of progress and activity, and ships can be built in a very short time indeed. We are not so poor that we cannot provide for our needs in that direction. We have made a great deal of progress during the last year. I do not say that boastfully because I feel in my bones and sinews that this question is far above party politics. Our predecessors have worked in that direction more especially on the land, and the Canadian Pacific Railway was built and part of the canals completed. The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway engaged our attention for several years, and not only our attention but our money and credit. Now we have to grapple with the problem of transportation as it is presented to us to-day. My hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren) should not lose sight of the progress we have made, and it is just as well that I should make it as clear as I can. We are improving our harbours on the lakes. The hon. gentleman has asked why our Canadian canal system has not developed more trade. The reason is obvious. He has been to Buffalo and he has seen the immense organization they have there, and that they have five miles of a breakwater in Buffalo harbour. On our side at Port Colborne, we had not a shadow of a harbour. How could a big ship loaded with grain or other produce come to Port Colborne when she had no accommodation there ? Well, we are equipping Port Colborne to-day and it will be so much done. Our system of canals is about completed, and the minister will have them lighted by electricity in order to make them more available. We are making improvements at Midland, Collingwood, Owen Sound and Parry Sound, which are all reservoirs of trade. Let me call the attention of the House to the new policy of the Grand Trunk Railway. That company has been for a few years past an American road both in summer and winter, but I am glad to be able to say that Mr. Hays has fully made up his mind to take advantage of the St. Lawrence route, and the Grand Trunk Railway is going to erect a large elevator and a large warehouse in the port of Montreal to accommodate their trade. This fact alone proves that we have made a great deal of progress, because if the St. Lawrence had not been improved the Grand Trunk Railway would not have come back

to Montreal. The route between Montreal and the sea is being improved as rapidly as money can improve it, and if my hon. friend (Mr. MacLaren, Perth) were in my position he could more readily appreciate the difficulty of carrying out such vast works. When I took office, for one reason or another, my department had no fleet of dredges. Dredges are not built in a day; I had to organize the whole thing, and I regret that we are going to prorogue before the dredges are at work, because I had the intention of inviting the leaders of both sides of the House to make an inspection of the works on the St. Lawrence, but that will come another season. The port of Montreal is being equipped, and the port of Quebec will be equipped also. In spite of all the money we have spent in days past in Quebec, there is scarcely any space available for large vessels. The ships that carry freight from New York, Boston and Philadelphia take a whole world of merchandise on each voyage, and with the relatively inferior ships which we had on our route in the past we could not compete with them.

Mr. SPROULE. Is it not a strange fact that the same ships sailing from Montreal and from Portland will carry freight from Portland at several shillings per hundred weight less than they will carry the same freight from Montreal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There may be reasons for that, and one of the reasons is that most of the ships that sail from the American ports are larger than the average of those that in the past have been navigating our waters. We say in French: 'Paris n'a pas été bâti dans un jour'—Paris has not been built in a day—and energetic as we be, still a young nation like us cannot do everything in a day. I hope that before our hair is much grayer, we will have a fast line coupled with a line of freight carriers of the first magnitude, and then perhaps we will not be far from the solution of this difficult and expensive problem. We had to equip the St. Lawrence route in many ways. Our telegraph system to Belle Isle is completed; dredging is going on; the Minister of Marine is asking the House now for a sufficient sum of money to give a better service in lighting and buoying the river. Perhaps that should have been done sooner. At the same time, so far as the river between Quebec and Montreal is concerned, it might have been just as well to have waited a little, so that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could have taken advantage of the new dredging work that has been going on in the channel. I do not believe that it is necessary to say more. My hon. friend from North Perth has, in a very particular way, called the attention of the House to that important question. The manner in which he has made his motion prevents our accepting it, because it appears to be a motion of want of confidence. I would not take it in that way, and I know he does not intend it as such; but I suppose the procedure of the House makes it necessary to so regard it. I think my hon. friend, after having given us the benefit of his experience and his ability in trade matters, can very well afford to withdraw his motion. It has been accepted in a friendly spirit. He has called the attention not only of the House, but of the commercial community to the necessity of going on as speedily as possible. Speaking for myself, I am very thankful to him for having given us the great advantage of his knowledge and commercial ability in such matters.

Mr. N. BOYD (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, the importance of this subject to the western portion of this country is my only excuse for taking a few moments of the time of the House in discussing it. There is no issue before parliament of such great importance as the carrying trade, so far as the western portion of Canada is concerned. People are to-day going in there in thousands, and, as I had occasion to point out when the House first opened, the trade of that country was practically blocked during a great portion of the winter for the reason that we were not able to get the products of the country taken to the markets. The people are going in there in vast numbers, far in excess, I fear, of the enterprise of the government or any private enterprise to meet their future requirements. I may mention to the House a conversation which I had with the superintendent of the Canadian Pacific Railway when I waited upon him with regard to the shortage of cars. The burning question all over that country is how to get this great disability removed; and every person who has any influence at all is expected to exert it in that direction. I said to Mr. Leonard: 'Provided there are no more railroads opened up and we take merely the natural increase of acreage that will be broken up, and the natural increase of the produce that will come from the people now in the country, to say nothing of the people who are coming in, what are you going to do with the produce of that country six years from to-day?' His remark was: 'Mr. Boyd, ten railroads will not take the produce of this country out in double the time you at present seem to think it should.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a question which this House might well consider, and it is this: The millers of Minneapolis, recognizing the importance of this great wheat field, have made an arrangement with the authorities at Washington, whereby they are permitted to grind wheat in Minneapolis in bond; and if our government and people do not rise to the emergency of the occasion, you may be prepared to see a great volume of the trade of that country pass-

ing to Minneapolis and other American cities. The point which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works frequently refers to is the port of Buffalo. He speaks feelingly, and I believe sincerely, when he complains of the trade of this country passing from Buffalo to New York. But shippers have told me that the cheapness of the ocean carriage from New York to the European markets is the great cause of that. The immense shipping that goes into New York enables vessels to carry grain out at a much lower rate than it can be carried at from Montreal. A man told me that he has actually had his grain carried free from Buffalo to New York, in order that it might be carried as ballast in vessels which were in a hurry to leave, when there was a great deal of shipping going on between New York and Liverpool. I fear that our Canadian ports will not be in a position to meet this competition until you are prepared to bonus vessels to come to Montreal or to whatever winter port in Canada you may decide upon. This is a very important question, and the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) has done a good thing in again bringing it before the people; because I fear that a great many in eastern Canada do not recognize its urgent importance. I say it will require four railroads between Fort William and Winnipeg, and two or possibly three more east of there to serve the trade that is looming up and is coming very soon in that country. It is only a short time since I went there, when we imported everything into the country—potatoes, meat, bread, everything; whereas to-day the country is supplying all the demands of the people, feeding every person there, and at the same time has 100,000,000 bushels of grain for export, produced by a very small number of people. If you take out the towns and the cities, the number of people employed on the land in Manitoba and the North-west Territories is estimated, I think, by Sir William Van Horne, to be less than 40 per cent of the population. Well, if 40 per cent of the present small population is able to produce such an enormous crop, what can we expect when that country has, as it must have in the near future, possibly 1,000,000 people? What are you going to do to meet that emergency? It is only the importance of this question to the western country that induces me to occupy the time of the House at this moment. It is so important that the government should not lose sight of it, and the country will hold them responsible for whatever the results may be.

Mr. T. MURRAY (Pontiac). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) made some reference to the Georgian Bay canal, in connection with the necessity of providing greater transportation facilities in the country. He said it was premature to consider the question just now, because the country was not prepared for it. But after the House has listened to the speech of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd), who has given us his personal knowledge of the magnitude of the products of the country at the present time, and has referred to its still greater prospective products, I think every one will see the great necessity that exists for providing better facilities for carrying the products of the west to the seaboard.

The question of the Georgian Bay canal is one in which the people of the Ottawa valley are very much interested, and in which the people of the Dominion should likewise take a great interest, as it will no doubt be a great national waterway. There is no question but that the work is one of great necessity, and I am surprised and disappointed that the hon. Minister of Public Works has not a sum in the estimates for the construction of the French river route. I believed that he would have provided an amount for that purpose. I am disappointed also that he has not provided in the estimates for going on with the total survey, so that the country might have an idea of the probable cost. At all events, it is well understood that the cost will be in the neighbourhood of some $80,000,000, but that is a small item compared with the great advantages to be derived from the construction of this great undertaking. It is admitted to be the shortest route, and one on which freights may be transported with greater speed than on any existing route. I know that there is a sectional feeling in the west adverse to that enterprise, but it seems to me that we all ought to look at it in a national spirit. I know that some people are in favour of a company building that great work and others want the government to build it. For my part, I am in favour of the country doing the work, because I think that it will turn out a good asset. I believe that it will yield a good interest on the money expended. It would also be a great aid to colonization. Instead of the government employing immigrant agents in foreign countries to bring out immigrants, some of whom may be objectionable, their services could be dispensed with, as the construction of that work will attract a vast amount of labour, a considerable portion of which would settle, as they did when the Canadian Pacific Railway was built, on places that are now regarded as unfit for settlement. It would not only help colonization, but develop the great water powers which we now have along the Ottawa river.

I am sorry that this subject was not taken up earlier in the session, and do not feel warranted in inflicting any lengthy remarks on the House at this period, but I do trust that the hon. Minister of Public Works, who is an active man, and who has given a part of this route at least his personal inspection, will go on vigorously with the

work next session, and obtain the consent of his colleagues to providing the necessary amount to start the French river route and then proceed with the whole undertaking.

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). I agree with the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat that it is very much to be regretted the discussion of this most important question did not take place at an earlier period, but in view of its vital importance to the Canadian consumer, I think that my hon. friend from North Perth was justified, even at this late hour, in drawing our attention to it. And in view of the very elaborate statement he has made and the amount of information he has given us regarding the discrimination in rates which prevail at present, he has, I consider, placed us under a great obligation to him. I was glad to notice in the speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture that he admitted there was nothing objectionable in the resolution as presented, and I regret that, under the circumstances, the government did not consent to its being accepted and passed unanimously. It is recognized on all hands that the question of transportation is the great national question in Canada to-day—one that ought not to be discussed from a party standpoint. The figures presented by my hon. friend are of such a character as to warrant our giving the matter immediate attention, and the first place in our deliberations; and as my hon. friend gave notice yesterday to the hon. Minister of Public Works of his intention to propose this resolution, I do not think he has been treated with the courtesy which he was entitled to expect under the circumstances. It is hardly possible to take up a newspaper, no matter in what part of Canada it is published, and not find in its columns some reference to this transportation question. It is hardly possible not to find in any newspaper facts and figures showing the discrimination practised against the Canadian farmer and the advantages given the farmers of the United States to induce them to ship their products over Canadian routes to the sea. I cannot add anything to the facts and figures which have been presented by the hon. member for North Perth, but I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution, because I think the matter he has brought before the House is of vital interest to every consumer and producer in this country.

Mr. A. E. KEMP (East Toronto). As it is now so late in the session, and so much business has to be done before the adjournment, I do not propose to take up much of the time of the House in discussing this transportation question. It is a question which cannot be discussed in one day. I regret, in common with the hon. members who have spoken, that it was not brought up earlier in the session, but at the same time. I think that my hon. friend from North Perth deserves to be commended for having drawn the attention of the House and the country, as he has done, to so many matters of interest. The facts and figures he has stated, we will now have on record, and will be of great advantage to us in future debates, in arriving at a solution of this problem. The transportation problem has many features, but there are three which seem to me of paramount importance. These are the equipping of the lower St. Lawrence in a suitable manner, the providing of suitable Canadian inland marine, and the adjusting of our inland freight charges. With regard to the St. Lawrence route, no doubt every hon. member is of the opinion that we must spare no pains or money to develop that waterway, and that in it are centred the hopes of the country. We may differ as to the routes our products should take in the winter season, but during the open season of navigation it is in the interests of every province of the Dominion that the St. Lawrence route should be properly developed and equipped, so that vessels may use it under as favourable conditions as they do the competing American routes.

I would like to say a word about this question of marine insurance. If it were in the power of the government to tax vessels using the St. Lawrence route, say $5,000 each vessel on each trip, I venture to think that the shipping people in Great Britain would carefully avoid it. Yet the same thing is done, if not by the government, by the insurance companies. The discrimination against that route by the insurance companies, as compared with American ports, amounts, on an ordinary freight carrier, to $25,000. It amounts to $5,000 per trip, and a fair estimate of the excess of insurance on a cargo of such a vessel would be, in a season, about $7,500. Therefore, there is a discrimination against every vessel trading in the St. Lawrence of from $30,000 to $35,000, as compared with vessels going to Boston, New York and Philadelphia.

We have heard that it is the intention of the government to spend $280,000 on further equipping the St. Lawrence route with whistles, buoys, lighthouses, signals and all that sort of thing. I would like to know if the government have ever consulted people who are thoroughly competent to judge of what it will cost to equip the St. Lawrence route so that vessels will be able to come in and trade on as good terms as are offered them in American ports. And, if the government have learned the facts, I would like very much to know what the cost will be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Sutherland) before placing in the estimates the amount that is there

now, consulted parties who are most interested in Montreal and in the shipping trade; and I feel confident that the amount in the estimates will be enough to light the St. Lawrence route in a very perfect way.

Mr. KEMP. I am very glad to hear it. But, the point I want to make is this—that we, as members of this House of Commons should be convinced that we can make the St. Lawrence route so perfect that the rate of insurance by that route can be made as low as that of any of the American ports. For my part, I am convinced that that can be accomplished. But I am not so sure, from the discussions I have heard in this House, that the members of the government have a policy before them by which they can actually accomplish that end. It seems to me that that cannot be accomplished by this expenditure of $280,000. But what I wish is that we were convinced that we can make the St. Lawrence route as attractive to tramp vessels, in insurance rates and otherwise, as other routes. We have a number of British Canadian lines trading in the St. Lawrence, and we have captains who are accustomed to navigate that route. But I understand it is very difficult to get captains and officers who are accustomed to trade to other ports to come into the St. Lawrence. Therefore, this is a very much larger question, I think, than a great many have considered it to be. Until we can remove this discrimination on insurance rates in the St. Lawrence route, we cannot progress as we hope to do.

We have another handicap in this, that we have pilotage waters of three hundred miles. That handicap we cannot overcome but we can make the best arrangements possible.

It is not enough to talk of freight from Montreal or Quebec. It seems to me we are sending to those places as much as can be carried away with the facilities afforded. The next step, therefore, is to see about the lower St. Lawrence and how we can induce ships to come in. I doubt that we will have to bonus the vessels to come into the route; it seems to me we can so improve the route that they will come in without that.

The question of the lack of a Canadian marine on the lakes has been discussed. I do not profess to offer a solution of that problem. Many views on that question have been expressed. It may be necessary, in the future, to protect these vessels in a way that has never been done before; it may be necessary to bonus them. If the Americans have ships on the inland waters, we should have them too. Until we have Canadian bottoms on the lakes we cannot take advantage of the facilities afforded by our waterways. We do not need any new canals from Georgian bay to Montreal; we need to use those that we have. I would like very much to see made up by competent authority an estimate of the capacity of the St. Lawrence canals—how many bushels of grain could be carried over them in a season? I believe that if we had that information, we should see that we now have facilities for carrying all the grain that can be produced in Ontario and the North-west for many years to come.

Let me refer briefly to the question of freight charges. The hon. member for North Perth has placed this subject before the House in such a way that it will be very easy for us to get at the facts in the future. Some of these facts have come before the attention of hon. members from different sources in the past. In this case it is very difficult to know just what should be done. So far as the producers in this part of Canada are concerned, they are paying 20, 25 or 30 per cent more freight charges on their produce than their neighbours to the south are paying. Perhaps the difference is even greater in many cases. This will always be a grievance. So long as the people of Ontario permit to cross the line and see much more favourable conditions existing there, they will not be satisfied. It is for us to compare the conditions in the country to the south of us and in this country, and see whether we cannot place our finger upon the difficulty and furnish the remedy.

I shall not take up further time, I merely say, as I said in opening, that the hon. member for North Perth has done well, even at this late date of the session, in bringing the matter to the attention of the House, and I shall have much pleasure in supporting his resolution.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I regret very much that the hon. member for North Perth did not reach this motion, which he has had in contemplation for a long time, until so late a date that, it is impossible to deal with it in a satisfactory manner. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass without making a few remarks. The hon. gentleman dealt with a problem upon the wise solution of which depends the question whether Canada shall or shall not receive something like an adequate return for the money expended on the St. Lawrence canals. Two or three years ago, on looking into the question, I was surprised to find that, though Canada had gone on building and perfecting the St. Lawrence canals, so far as the returns of freight from Montreal showed, the amount of grain carried by that route was a diminishing quantity. Apparently, our whole outlay had been made upon a mistaken policy.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the reason, if my hon. friend will permit me to speak for a moment, is that, while we left Port Colborne unequipped, while we did not provide ourselves with proper railway facilities, our American friends were equipping Buffalo and equipping their railways in a way to make successful competi-

tion on our part difficult. That is the whole reason.

Mr. BELL. On looking into the matter further, I found the reason to be what has been pointed out in the brief remarks just made by the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). In the first place the port of Montreal was not adequately equipped; and in the second place the front door, as we may say, of the whole system, Port Colborne, was in such condition that no considerable volume of traffic could make its entrance to that route. Now, if we can, by any reasonable national expenditure, enable the people of Canada to receive from the St. Lawrence system of canals that return which I believe they can receive, the country will sustain the administration in making that expenditure. When the deepening of the canals to fourteen feet was spoken of and that result was looked forward to, and many persons interested in traffic in the lower provinces felt that the day was coming when a large inter-provincial trade would follow, when our heavy products, particularly coal and iron, would be carried in large quantities to the upper provinces, and we would receive in return, by cheap water carriage, an enormous quantity of food stuffs, manufactured goods and the imported articles of commerce from Quebec and Ontario. It has been stated to me by a person well qualified to judge that, if the St. Lawrence system were equipped with necessary facilities to use the extreme depth of fourteen feet, heavy freight, such as coal or iron ore, could be carried from the port of Pictou, or some other convenient port in Nova Scotia, to Port Arthur at the head of the lake system of navigation, at a cost not exceeding one dollar a ton. If that could be realized, it would mean an enormous market opening up for the coal mines of the lower provinces, a market which at present, those coal mines do not occupy; for it is quite evident that, at present practically the whole coal supply of the province of Ontario and of the province of Quebec almost equally, comes from the United States.

We have in the lower provinces, particularly in the province of Nova Scotia, enormous supplies of coal which we are only too anxious to supply to our fellow citizens in the upper provinces from whom we buy so largely. The improvement of the business conducted over these canals would also have a great meaning for every prospective manufacturer of the lower provinces. One of those with which I have been connected was so handicapped, so hampered and embarrassed by the high cost of freight incurred in order to send the products of that business to the upper provinces where they found almost their entire market, that in the end they had to abandon the business as unprofitable. I am sure that nothing has been brought before the House this session of so much importance as this great question of interprovincial traffic which has been opened up by the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren), and I am sorry that we have not the time to discuss it more fully. But I am glad to express my entire good-will towards any effort that may be made to improve that traffic; and I hope at a very early day to see realized a system by which some of the ports in the lower provinces will be made shipping depots from which ocean steamers will go with great cargoes abroad, while these depots will be kept filled by a large fleet of river and lake carriers coming from the ports of the upper provinces, bringing grain and other products, and will then return to the west laden with our coal and other articles for which we can find a market up above. There are so many considerations belonging to this matter that it is idle to attempt to touch them at this time, and I have only spoken in order to express the deep interest of my constituents in this question, and at the same time to express my warm approbation of the able and exhaustive manner in which this subject has been dealt with by the hon. member for Perth.

Mr. REID (Grenville). At this late hour of the session, I do not intend to make any lengthy remarks. Still, I wish to mention one or two matters to the minister. In the first place, we all realize the great growth of the North-west, and are gratified at the enormous quantity of grain that is being forwarded from that country. That is a reason for deepening the canals. But we want large vessels, large Canadian vessels, on the upper lakes; and so long as it not definitely understood that the Minister of Public Works will not give to the Americans annually the right to use American vessels in bringing grain from one Canadian port to another Canadian port, I feel that the ship-building industry of Canada will not progress as it should.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That assurance has been given, and it has been carried out.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Now, will the country understand from this time forward that there never will be another privilege of that kind given by the government to carry grain from Port Arthur to Midland?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Prime Minister has stated from his place in the House what our policy was. Now that policy in the past has been violated on one occasion, at the request of Mr. Booth, in order to allow him to carry grain from one Canadian port to another Canadian port.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If that policy can be relied on, I believe the ship-building industry will increase, and we will have Canadian vessels to carry our own grain.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are ten new boats under construction now on the lakes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If such is the case, I have no fear of Mr. Morgan and his syndicate ever absorbing Canadian vessels. There is in my opinion another cause that seriously interferes with grain going down the St. Lawrence. When grain reaches Port Colborne, it is there met with a tax of 15 cents a ton as a canal toll for passing through the Welland canal. Grain going to Buffalo goes through the Erie canal free. That 15 cents a ton is equal to about half a cent a bushel, or nearly so. In addition, as I mentioned in a previous session, the vessels have to lighten their cargo, if full loaded, and allow the railroad that lies along the Welland canal to carry the lighterage. If the government absorb that, so that a vessel could go from Duluth to Port Colborne with 100,000 bushels of grain, which she could take right through to Montreal, it would have a tendency to bring the grain through the St. Lawrence route, as the rates are often so high it does not pay to lighten. I have heard a great many vessel captains complain about the Welland canal tolls. They claim that the tolls on the grain are much larger than they are on iron ore or products of that kind. I have been asked to draw the attention of the government to that fact. If they would remove those taxes, I believe it would have a great tendency to bring more grain through the canal. Then again at the port of Montreal I understand there are government taxes, while grain entering New York has to pay no charges of any kind.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The charges in New York are very much greater than they are in Montreal—charges of all kinds.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, when the grain arrives there, is there any government charge of any kind ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The charges are higher than they are in Montreal.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood there were no government charges whatever in New York.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There are no government charges in Montreal, but there are harbour dues.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There are harbour dues in Montreal, but there are none in New York. That, they claim, interferes with the grain going through the St. Lawrence route. But the 15 cents a ton on grain passing through the Welland canal is a very serious affair. And when we take into consideration the insurance on the grain after it reaches Montreal, you will see that everything is against us. I have simply risen on this occasion to put before the government the request which I have received from a number of vessel men to see if something cannot be done to remove these tolls, and thus place them on an equal footing with those who use the Erie canal. I am glad to support this resolution of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. MacLaren). I think it is well that he has brought it before the House, for I desire to see more grain carried through the St. Lawrence route than is now carried.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon friend from Perth will withdraw the motion, I hope.

Mr. MACLAREN (Perth). I have no intention whatever of withdrawing the motion.

House divided on amendment (Mr. MacLaren) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

Avery,	Kemp,
Bell,	Kidd,
Bennett,	Lancaster,
Birkett,	LaRivière,
Blain,	Lennox,
Borden (Halifax).	Leonard,
Boyd,	MacLaren (Perth),
Bruce,	McGowan,
Calvin,	McIntosh,
Carscallen,	Morin,
Clare,	Osler,
Clarke,	Porter,
Cochrane,	Reid (Grenville),
Culbert,	Richardson,
Earle,	Robinson (Elgin),
Gilmour,	Roche (Marquette),
Hackett,	Sproule,
Haggart,	Taylor,
Henderson,	Tolton,
Ingram,	Wilmot,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Wilson.—43.
Kaulbach,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Legris,
Bazinet,	Lemieux,
Beith,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Loy,
Bernier,	Macdonald,
Blair,	Mackie,
Borden (King's, N.S.)	McCarthy,
Bourassa,	McCreary,
Bourbonnais,	McGugan,
Brown,	McLennan,
Bruneau,	Madore,
Bureau,	Malouin,
Calvert,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Campbell,	Martineau,
Carbonneau,	Matheson,
Carroll,	Meigs,
Champagne,	Morrison,
Christie,	Mulock,
Copp,	Murray,
Costigan,	Paterson,
Cowan,	Préfontaine,
Davis,	Proulx,
Demers (Lévis),	Puttee,
Douglas,	Re'd (Restigouche),
Dugas,	Riley,

Erb,	Roche (Halifax),
Ethier,	Ross (Ontario),
Farquharson,	Ross (Rimouski),
Fielding,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Fisher,	Russell,
Fitzpatrick,	Schell,
Flint,	Scott,
Fortier,	Sifton,
Fraser,	Smith (Vancouver),
Galliher,	Stephens,
Gauvreau,	Stewart,
German,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Gibson,	Talbot,
Gould,	Tarte,
Harty,	Thompson,
Hughes (King's P.E.I.)	Tobin,
Hyman,	Tolmie,
Johnston (Cape Breton	Tucker,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turgeon,
Laurier (L'Assomption)	Wade,
Lavergne,	Wright.—93.
LeBlanc,	

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Logan,	Lefurgey,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd)	Tupper (Sir Charles Hibbert),
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Horsey,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
McEwen,	Sherritt,
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Bickerdike.	Cargill,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Guthrie,	Hughes (Victoria),
Béland,	Monk,
Heyd,	Maclean,
Gallery,	Casgrain,
Delisle,	Roddick,
Archambault,	Ball,
Lang,	Trooman,
Holmes,	Clancy,
McCool,	Rosamond,
Demers (St. John),	Brock,
Edwards,	Barker,
MacLaren (Huntingdon)	Smith (Wentworth).
Power,	Kendrey,
Kendall,	Robinson (Northumberland),
McIsaac,	Hale,
MacKinnon,	Ganong.
Maxwell,	Seagram,
Turcot,	Alcorn,
Geoffrion,	Lavell,
Harwood,	Broder,
Lovell,	Halliday,
Marcil (Bagot),	McLeod,
Girard,	Gourley,

Motion negatived.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to inquire of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if it would be possible to get the return brought down that was moved for a month or more ago respecting the number of passes issued on the Intercolonial Railway during the past twelve months.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). I have been trying since I was reminded of this matter to complete the return, and I will have it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in regard to the resolutions of the various boards of trade which the right hon. gentleman promised would be laid on the Table of the House.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not forgotten it.

RAILWAY COMMISSION.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention to the House that I propose to ask that Friday afternoon and evening, as far as may be necessary, be devoted to the discussion of the Bill to create a railway commission.

NORTH-WEST TOWN SITES.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I wish to bring to the attention of the government and of the House a matter, which, though not so important as most of the subjects that hon. members from the west discuss, is still of very vital importance to the inhabitants of no less than four considerable towns in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. In the year 1882 an arrangement was made between the government, represented by the Department of the Interior, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for speculation in four western towns. These were the towns of Virden, Manitoba, Qu'Appelle, in Eastern Assiniboia, represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Douglas), Regina and Moosejaw in the district which I have the honour to represent. That arrangement was in the nature of a pool, the first part of the agreement being that each party, namely the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should contribute an equal portion of the lands necessary for these town sites. The arrangement is still in force. These four town sites were put into the hands of trustees to administer their affairs in the interests alike of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the government. The government and the Canadian Pacific Railway were to participate equally in the net proceeds. I may say that of all the policies which were adopted by the late Conservative administration for the opening up of the Canadian North-west no single item or no part of the policy which that government adopted can be cited more appropriately than this as an illustration of the insanity—I think that the term is quite justifiable—which prevailed in the ideas of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the opposition seats in this House in connection with what would be for the well being and progress

of that country. It seemed to be taken for granted at the inception of the opening up of the North-west Territories that that vast country was a vast preserve which might be made profitable to the private pockets of friends of the Conservative party. I think this particular matter of which I speak, illustrates as well as any other item of policy that notorious fact. I may mention, promising not to speak for any great length of time, some of the peculiar transactions of the trustees in whose hands the affairs of these town sites were placed. First, perhaps I had better state who the trustees were. These gentlemen were Mr. R. B. Angus, Sir Donald A. Smith, Mr. E. B. Osler, and Mr. W. B. Scarth. The affairs of these town sites are still in the hands of these gentlemen. They conducted business of various sorts. On some occasions they had transactions with the government, on other occasions they had transactions with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I may mention just a couple of instances which I may say were brought to light through the investigations made by a commission which was appointed two years ago by the government to inquire into the affairs of these town sites. I mention these instances to show the character of the transactions which the trustees thought proper to enter into. In one case they sold part of a town site to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Some time subsequent to the year 1897 the trustees sold part of the town site of Moosejaw to the Canadian Pacific Railway, 33 acres in extent, at the price of $3 per acre. When the commissioners who were appointed two years ago to make an investigation into the affairs of these town sites, took evidence at Moosejaw they received the evidence of the trustees' own agent in the town to the effect that this land which had been sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway for $3 per acre, was in reality worth $50 per acre. This was evidence tendered by the agent of the trustees. There was also a transaction in Regina in connection with a building. In the early days the trustees erected a brick veneered building in Regina at a cost of $15,000. They rented that building for a number of years to the government, and in all the government paid them a rental of $17,435. Later still the trustees sold the building to the government and the government paid them $16,000, so that in all the trustees received from the government $33,435 for the building whose first cost in the early days, at a time when building was very expensive in that country, was only $15,000. The House will at once recognize that there was a material difference in the nature of the business transacted with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the business transacted with the government. Another most peculiar item of their business which was brought to light by the investigation of the commissioners was in connection with the town site of Virden. The arrangement made between the government and the company was that an equal portion of land for each town site should be contributed by each. When the town site of Virden was located, there was a gentleman named Mr. T. M. Daly who entered for half a section of the land. Mr. Daly, as probably the House is well aware, was a very prominent member of the Conservative party, and he was later on Minister of the Interior in the Conservative government. Another quarter section of the land which afterwards formed that town site had been entered for by a lady named Mrs. Willis. The government cancelled the entry of Mrs. Willis, and thereby came into possession of her quarter section. The government also was the possessor of the fourth quarter section, and the other two quarter sections had been entered for by Mr. Daly. Mr. Daly had not commenced his homestead duties, and the records of the department show that he voluntarily abandoned his entry, but when the commissioners, two years ago made their investigation, they found that an amount of $6,400 had been paid to Mr. Daly on account of this half section of land entered for by him, but which he had subsequently abandoned as far as the records in the Interior Department disclose. A further fact disclosed was, that, notwithstanding that the government had contributed the other half of the town site, the quarter section that had been entered for by Mrs. Willis, which had been cancelled, and the quarter section which the government always owned, they were charged in the books of the town site trustees with half of this $6,400 which had been paid to Mr. Daly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In what year was the entry made by Mr. Daly ?

Mr. SCOTT. I will give that information later. I do not bring up this matter for the purpose of entering into any personal or political recriminations, but to urge that the people of these four towns have laboured under a very serious handicap for years on account of this town site arrangement, by reason of an exemption from taxation enjoyed by the trustees. The government hold one-half interest and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company held only in reality a quarter interest. It will be necessary for me to explain that before the arrangement was actually made between the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made a prior arrangement with a company called the North-west Land Company, and this latter company was brought in and made a party in this town site arrangement. Since 1882, when these town sites were constituted, the position has been that the government owned one-half interest in the net proceeds of these town sites, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company having one-quarter interest, and the North-west Land Company the other quarter interest. The interest of the government was exempt from taxation, and

under the terms of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract of 1881, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company contended that their quarter interest was also exempt from taxation. I do not think the matter went so far as a law suit, but after considerable negotiations, an arrangement was made—and the municipalities were led to believe that they were compelled to agree to the arrangement—by which only one-quarter of the taxes should be collected by the municipalities from the trustees. For nearly twenty years, on a considerable portion of each of these four town sites, the municipalities have been able to collect only one-quarter of the amount of taxes which should properly have been paid. This is the phase of the question which I have risen chiefly to bring to the attention of the government and of the House. In the year 1894 the right hon. leader of the government visited the North-west, and this town site matter was brought to his attention, and speaking at Moosejaw upon his responsibility as the leader of a great party in this country, he said :

> In his opinion it was an improper thing for the government to be holding property in this way for speculative purposes to the detriment of municipalities.

The right hon. gentleman has now been leader of the government of Canada since 1896, and the people of these towns are thinking that it is time that the pledge which in effect he gave in the town of Moosejaw in 1894, should be implemented by action. I may state that for a considerable length of time past efforts have been made by the Minister of the Interior in the direction, as we have understood it, of relieving these municipalities from the handicap which they labour under, and I believe it was the efforts which the minister was making which led to the appointment of this commission two years ago to inquire into the affairs of the town sites trust, because certain difficulties had been encountered in the way of giving the relief which is necessary. I am given to understand that within recent weeks an arrangement has been practically entered into by the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the division of the property of these town sites, by which an equal division shall be made in each town, the Canadian Pacific Railway accepting one-half and the government assuming control and possession of the other half. I am very glad to know that the arrangement is likely to be very shortly completed, but what I want to do this afternoon is to urge upon the government to, at the earliest possible moment, dispossess themselves of this property so that the property may become liable to the ordinary taxation. I go further, and I urge that it would be only fair and reasonable, in place of putting the property up at auction and thereby tending to some extent to depreciate, for the time being at least, the value of this property itself and of all the other property in these towns; it would be only fair and reasonable for the government to hand over to these municipalities the half portion which comes to the government in the division. As a reason for this request, I would point out that the total receipts of the trustees from these town sites up to the present time have been: in the case of Regina, $254,485.92, and in the case of Moosejaw, $114,606.63. These amounts were the net proceeds to the trustees from two of the four towns. The government have received from these four town sites no less sum a than $141,200. There is still due to the government from the trustees—or at least there was when the commissioners made their report, and so far as I know this amount has not been paid since, although it may have been paid without my knowledge—there was still due to the government when the commissioners made their report a sum of $46,855.99. This was some $30,000 more than was to the credit of the government on the trustees books, but the commissioners found that some of the bookkeeping of the trustees was very peculiar, and they stated in their report that there should be paid to the government by the trustees about $30,000 more than was credited to the government on the books. In view of the fact that these municipalities have been handicapped and have been losing very considerable amounts through the peculiar position in which a great part of the property within them was placed. I think it is only fair that their request be granted now, and that the government's portion of these town sites should be handed over to the municipalities. In the case of Regina, the amount of taxes which should have been paid by the trustees in these years is $56,054.60. The amount of taxes which was actually paid is only $14,013.65, leaving a loss to the town of $42,040.95. It is therefore only reasonable and fair that the government should put these municipalities in the possession of this property, rather than to throw the whole property on the market by auction sale. But, however, the property may be disposed of, I would urge most strongly on the government and on the House the rightfulness of the government becoming dispossessed of their property in these towns at the earliest possible moment, so that the handicap against the towns which for nearly twenty years has prevailed, shall be removed at last.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, personally I have no thought one way or the other whether it would be better for the government to transfer these town sites to the municipalities or to keep them; but I must deal very shortly with some of the remarks made by the hon. member. When this question was brought up in the House two or three years ago, I thought I answered the accusation which was made

against the trustees as fairly and squarely as any man could expect who asked for an explanation. I stated at that time, and I state again, that the report which the commissioners brought in was a partisan report, got up for a particular purpose, a report which the trustees absolutely contradicted; and I am rather surprised that any one should get up in this House and by implication say that Lord Strathcona, Mr. Angus, Mr. Scarth and myself had rendered false returns to the government, had cooked accounts and had been guilty of doubtful book-keeping. I do not think that statement requires a contradiction from me in this House or anywhere. With regard to these town sites or the administration of them, I make the statement that there has never been a fund in Canada administered as well, as faithfully, as honestly, in the interest of the trust and for the benefit of the country. Charges were made as to the proper distribution of certain accounts, as to the power of the trustees to expend money for building purposes, and to allot a part of the land for railway purposes or for government purposes. In that connection—I am speaking from memory, not having the figures before me—the government received in the proportion of two to one in round figures as against the railway company. The trustees acted entirely within the rights of the trust, and no action was done by the trustees except under the conditions imposed by the trust. They were empowered to expend money for the development and for the benefit of the towns. For many years past the trustees have endeavoured to get themselves freed from further participation in the matter; but the government put every check and obstacle in their way to prevent a division of these town sites. When the report of the commission, which I say was an absolutely partisan report, was brought in, making the claim that the trustees were debtors to the government to the amount of $30,000 or $40,000, because of certain expenditures they had made under the trust, the trustees at once demanded that the government should take action against them in court to recover that money. The trustees from that day to this have endeavoured to have that matter brought to an issue, but have not been able to do so, and an hon. member from the North-west now accuses these gentlemen of having maladministered the trust, although the government have refused to bring an action, and there is no possible means by which the trustees can shake themselves free of the matter, so as to be in a position to show that the report of this commission was false and partisan, and was got up for a special purpose. That commission expected to find maladministration, but they were unable to find any; and the government have failed to bring the question to an issue. The trustees of that fund handled property to the extent, if my recollection serves me rightly, of between one million and one million and a half dollars; and during the time of the sales no member of that trust, so far as I recollect, had anything to do with the government. I was not at that time a member of parliament; I was simply a private individual acting as a trustee. From the inception of the trust to this day no trustee has been paid a single dollar of commission, nor one dollar for travelling expenses or as fees for attending meetings or for any other purpose, with the exception, as I think I explained to the House two years ago, that I drew $250 or $500 for the purpose of giving bonuses to some of the clerks in the office of the trustees when they were dismissed or when the office was removed from Toronto to Winnipeg. I do not mind having these things ventilated in court if a charge is laid or a claim is made; but I do certainly object to a member getting up in this House and making statements which leave the impression on the House, whether intentionally or not, that there was wrong-doing on the part of the trustees. I say that the government, either wilfully or through absolute neglect, have refused to bring the matter to an issue in court. Each of the four trustees has done his best, both by himself and through his solicitors, to get the matter brought to an issue. I do not wish to speak any further on the subject, but I do object to statements of this sort being made in the House when the conditions should be thoroughly known, and I think it is entirely improper that any member of this House should make accusations reflecting upon the character of Lord Strathcona and Mr. R. B. Angus, when they are not here to answer for themselves. For myself, I am ready to answer anything.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The question as to whether the trustees did or did not improperly charge any money to the government is a question that cannot be settled by statements on the floor of this House, but has to be settled in the ordinary way through the courts; and the department have taken steps to have it settled in that way. The department found some time ago that it was necessary to have an investigation of the accounts of this trust, and a commission was issued for that purpose. The commission consisted of E. F. Stephenson, inspector of Dominion lands agents, and Mr. Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior. They made a report, as has been stated by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). The report showed that, in the opinion of the commissioners, a considerable sum, I think about $30,000, had been improperly charged to the government. The trustees disputed this finding of the commission. The action taken by the department has been this: Pending the settlement of the dispute, as to this alleged improper charge, we have entered into an agreement with the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way Company and the Canada North-west Land Company, by which the town lots which are still unsold have been divided. Within the past few weeks the Land Commissioner of the government and an officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, acting for the other party, have made a division of the lots, and there only remains to be settled the question as to the final closing of the accounts between the trustees and the government. The Department of Justice has been instructed to take action for the purpose of having this matter settled in court. I presume that the action is now pending. As to the difficulties under which the corporations have laboured, I sympathize with the view of my hon. friend at least to this extent, that I do not think the towns should be left with such a considerable portion of their area not liable to taxation; and I have intimated to him that steps will be taken to bring the government's interest in the town sites to an end. Whether that will be done by disposing of the lots by auction or otherwise I am not in a position to say; but I think the government should not hold simply for speculative purposes a considerable area of a town, as it imposes an undue and unfair burden on the town population. My hon. friend has urged very strongly that this amount ought to be contributed by the government to the town corporation as a free gift in return for the exemption from taxes during the past year. I have not been able to give an affirmative answer to that proposition, and I cannot say what decision the government will arrive at, but the question will be taken up and disposed of in a very short time. The division of the town lots between the commissioner of the company and the commissioner of the government, has only taken place within the last few weeks, and at this period of the session we are unable to deal with it; but as soon as the session is over, and I have sufficient time to look into the matter, the whole transaction will be closed up.

Mr. SCOTT. In answer to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), I may say that the payment was made Mr. Daly on February 12th, 1884. I wish just to give a word of personal explanation with regard to what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has said concerning my action in bringing this matter to the attention of the House in the way I have done. Every statement I made was made upon the basis of the report of the commissioners, and so far as I have been able to judge, from what my hon. friend has said this afternoon, he has not attempted to deny a single thing I said. He made a statement at considerable length also last year, in which he complained that the report by the commissioners had been spread broadcast through the papers, but he did not attempt to deny a single fact stated by the commission.

Mr. OSLER. I denied the findings absolutely. I deny them all again to-day. They are findings that would not be affirmed by any court, but we cannot get that matter brought into court. I say that the findings are wrong. So far from the trust being indebted to the government, it will be found by any court in the land or any arbitration—and the trustees are willing to leave it to any court or arbitration—that the government is indebted to the trust for a much larger sum than they claim the trust is indebted to them. I deny every statement made in the report.

Mr. SCOTT. That is certainly a broad, wide and specific denial.

Mr. OSLER. If I could make it any broader or wider or more specific in words, I would do it.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

On the Order being called for :

Third reading, Bill (No. 107), respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg to move :

That the order for third reading of Bill No. 107 be discharged and that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that the following clause be added to the Bill :

The company shall not exercise its power under this Act in respect to the section from Lake Nipissing to the Georgian Bay, otherwise called the French river section, until and unless an order of the Governor in Council shall pass authorizing the same.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I might say that if we were not renewing a charter I would not vote for the Bill. I feel that in granting charters we should be very careful indeed, especially when we have to deal with our rivers and waterways. The French river and Lake Nipissing can no more be called a canal than I may be called the Pope or the King of England. The French river is essentially a navigable river, a deep waterway. Again, if parliament had not granted a charter to people

who have advertised that great waterway, I would not feel inclined to-day to grant this charter, but as parliament many years ago has granted the charter and as there are, to a certain extent, vested rights, I think it is only fair that the charter should be renewed. On the other hand, the promoters themselves recognize and admit that the French river is not in the same position at all as the other parts covered by the charter. The Mattawa and Ottawa rivers must be canalized in certain parts if we want to have a waterway twenty feet deep to the St. Lawrence. I would not undertake to say that that depth of water can be easily got from Lake Nipissing down to the city of Montreal. I have not the necessary information to form a correct opinion; my department has no survey of the Mattawa and of the Ottawa rivers. I have, however, a complete and careful survey of the French river. I have plans prepared, and if parliament made up its mind to grant a contract there would be very little to be done before having tenders called for. I repeat that the French river is essentially a navigable river, and that is the reason why I have asked the promoters of the Bill to consent to the amendment or addition which I have just suggested. I feel that this country must keep the control of that waterway. Of course, nothing can be done by any department of state without the consent of parliament. This clause that I am suggesting does not pledge us to anything; it gives us only more freedom. If the Governor General in Council later on believes that the company which is seeking for the renewal of their charter offers sufficient guarantees to go on with the whole work, an Order in Council will decide. If not, well, we might later on come to the House and ask for the amount necessary to improve the French river so as to make it a waterway twenty feet deep. I will not discuss the features of that work to-night, because we have discussed it already on many occasions, and I believe this would not be the time to offer any lengthy discussion of it. Before I take my seat, let me thank those who have done the very useful work of calling public attention to that magnificent waterway. I confess that I did not know anything about it before I read all the prospectuses, all the articles and pamphlets published by the Georgian Bay Canal Company. They deserve consideration at our hands, great consideration at our hands, and that is the main reason why I made up my mind—speaking for myself—to consent to the renewal of their charter. It is said that the company can find the money necessary to carry out the work they have in hand, namely, to canalize and improve the Mattawa and the Ottawa rivers, without asking any grant of public money. I hope it is the case. I am not sure about it though, but I hope it is the case. If it is the case, and if we are not called upon to give them any guarantee or any subsidy, well, I suppose, we can afford to let them go on with the work.

Mr. SPROULE. If this waterway is ever improved, so as to make it one of the great highways of commerce and to become a competing line with the other highways both in our own and the neighbouring country, it can only be successfully accomplished by having no toll gates on the route. The fact that tolls are contemplated is, to my mind, one of the very strongest objections to allowing any private company to take over that waterway and build the canal. There is no doubt that if it ever becomes half as useful as the promoters of this Bill tell the public it will become, it is desirable that the government should build it. The probability of a company building it without any guarantee or bonus or assistance from the government seems to me to be extremely problematical. So far as it goes, I think this amendment is in the right direction, namely, to hold under the control of the government at least a portion of the route, and it would be much more agreeable to my views if they held the whole of it. I confess that there is a great deal in what the Minister of Public Works has said. This company has, in a measure, some vested rights, because they have been working at it for a long time, and they have spent a good deal of money on it. However, I do not think that even that should be a justification for a private company holding any one of the great waterways of commerce.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let my hon. friend remember that if these gentlemen go on with the work, it will be always our right to take possession of the work by only paying the amount that will have been actually spent; so there is no great danger after all.

Mr. SPROULE. But we know how these accounts are usually made up when the government comes to take them over.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no immediate danger, I think.

Mr. BELCOURT. As being in charge of the Bill I wish to say that the gentlemen who asked me to place the Bill before the House have instructed me to consent to the amendment proposed by the Minister of Public Works. In doing so, I wish to say that I have heard with considerable satisfaction the opinions expressed by the Minister of Public Works. I cannot help indulging in a little self-congratulation in the matter. I look back four years to the time when our good friend, Mr. Poupore, who so ably represented the county of Pontiac and myself brought this subject to the attention of the House. But it is not so much for the purpose of congratulating Mr. Poupore and myself that I rise, as to express the great satisfaction and pleasure that I feel in seeing the progress which this project

has made since 1898. I am delighted to see that those who have charge of the affairs of this country have realized the tremendous, I might almost say the vital importance and necessity of this great highway. The tremendous development which has taken place in the North-west and Canada generally has made that route an absolute necessity and one which in importance, I think, does not take second place even to the Canadian Pacific Railway—

Mr. CLARKE. Oh, oh.

Mr. BELCOURT. I know that my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) does not agree with me, but I think the time is not far distant when that hon. gentleman himself will accept that view. I hope the government will take the matter into very serious contemplation ; and, if they are not prepared to allow this company to go on and build the canal, they will themselves, at an early day, enter upon the construction of it.

Mr. E. B. OSLER (West Toronto). I am sorry that I came in too late to hear the first part of this discussion. I understand that the object of this Bill is to give a private corporation power to make a waterway from the French river to Montreal. While I am in favour of developing our canal system and of spending public money in carrying out public works, I am opposed to granting to a private company the right of control over waterways. We have before us great problems, but none I think greater than the problem of providing means of transport for the increasing produce of the west to the seaboard. We are spending enormous sums of money—from my point of view we are throwing away enormous sums on useless works—but, while I do not approve of some of the expenditures that are being made, I do believe that the government ought to develop to the fullest extent our transportation system. If the Georgian Bay canal can be made part of our waterway system, if with any reasonable expenditure of money it can be made so successful that by it the grain of the North-west can be carried to the seaboard more cheaply than by rail or by the present waterways, I am in favour of it being made a national work. So far as I know, there is not before the country to-day information showing what that undertaking will cost.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) will allow me, I would like to say that I am in a position to state that the improvement of the French river so as to make it a twenty-foot ship waterway from Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing would not cost more than $5,000,000, and I would expect to carry it out for less. I have accurate plans of the whole work.

Mr. OSLER. And how about the other end of the work ?

Mr. BELCOURT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know about that.

Mr. BELL. Would that $5,000,000 complete the route to North Bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. North Bay is on Lake Nipissing. Yes, that would build it to North Bay or to some other point on Lake Nipissing.

Mr. OSLER. As I say, I was not here at the opening of this discussion. But I understood that this was a Bill covering the whole system from Georgian Bay to the St. Lawrence at or near Montreal, and that it is proposed to hand over the control of that waterway to a company. I am against any private company controlling that waterway or any part of it. If it is to be a waterway developed in the interest of Canada the government should control it. Possibly it is an undertaking that the country should assume, but I believe we have not before us official records of the cost.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes we have.

Mr. OSLER. We have records of long ago.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, last year.

Mr. OSLER. But what I wish to say and I say it without reserve, is that the waterways of the country should not be allowed to pass into private hands. Let the railways be privately owned if you like. Railways can be built by anybody. But it is not so with waterways, they are nature's courses through the country. You can duplicate a railway but—

Mr. BELCOURT. We will bring this canal around by Toronto and then it will be all right.

Mr. OSLER. I think it is a great compliment to my hon. friends from Toronto and myself that whenever we propose anything in the public interest we are taunted with being moved by consideration for the interests of Toronto. I deny that I represent the interests of Toronto alone or that my views are influenced by any consideration but that of the public interest.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

An hon. MEMBER. Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. OSLER. I deny that I have ever voted or spoken in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway in this House. I am astonished that members of this House, and even ministers of the Crown, lacking any other answer to what I have said at different times, should so often reply with the taunt : Oh, you speak as you do because you belong to the Canadian Pacific Railway company. It shows but a poor conception of their position and duties as members of this House that they cannot conceive of a

man taking an independent position on this floor, that they cannot conceive of a member of this House sinking his individual interest in the interest of the country. I deny for my part, that I am not able to sink my own interests if they conflict with the interests of the country. And I defy any member of this House to point to a speech or vote, or canvass of mine—I have never canvassed a member of this House for any vote—that was in the interests of any corporation or any section. It is my right to object to this Bill or any other that comes up in this House. If I make arguments that are not convincing that is my fault or it is due to the weakness of my case. But I have the right to my opinion and the right to state it without being taunted with speaking in the interests of any corporation. The members of this House, I think unanimously recognize that the transportation question is the one question before us in Canada to-day. My colleagues from Toronto and I are taunted with selfishness and with consideration only for Toronto's interests. Has there been a voice raised from any member from Toronto against the expenditure of money in Montreal harbour or the Quebec harbour, or for the purpose of deepening the St. Lawrence channel? Every member from the west has held up both hands for the development of a seaport. I agree that the most important question before the House and the people to-day is the transportation question. So far as the west and local conditions in the west are concerned that problem will take care of itself. But, as we near the seaboard, the government must take that harbour in hand. When we reach Montreal or Quebec, or whatever port it may be, the government must take charge of this problem.

No proposition to increase the transportation facilities on the St. Lawrence will be voted down by any member from the west. But what I say in connection with this Bill and I feel it sincerely, is that no public waterway in this country should be allowed to fall into the hands of a private corporation. This waterway that is now under discussion is more than a mere waterway, it means control of perhaps the greatest electric power that we have on this continent. The private corporation who obtains control of the canal, controls by virtue of that charter the water power all along that route. Now, in view of the development of electrical power and the possibilities that are before us, who can say what that power will be worth in ten years? The cheapness of production is dependent altogether upon the cheapness of our water power. If that water power gets into the hands of private individuals they will control the cost of production in this country, and they will control the transportation problem.

I do not think that any member of the government, any member on that side of the House, will say that our waterway transportation is satisfactory to-day. It is very unsatisfactory. We complain of want of shipping; we complain of want of proper transportation facilities. I can tell this House that there is capital in abundance and to spare to build every vessel that is wanted to take control of Canadian shipping. Men are ready and willing to put their money into this business, and all that is wanted is a proper channel to transport our grain, the production of which is sure to increase enormously from year to year. Our grain production will shortly be such as we have at present no conception of. Let me give an illustration. I have a letter from a gentleman from Scotland who was in the capital a few weeks ago. He went to the North-west and travelled over the Calgary and Edmonton Railway. He writes a letter to his board of directors in Great Britain, of which he sent me a copy, and in which he says that from Calgary north to Edmonton, for thirty miles on each side of that road, there is more good agricultural land than there is in all Scotland. Now when you have a small stretch of country of which that can be said, what is going to be the production of that country in ten years? What strikes me in this House is that when important Bills like this are before us, as a rule we regard them from the point of view of to-day, we are not looking forward five years, much less ten years. We are granting charters giving control of our public waterways, in this case canal privileges the importance of which not one member of the House realizes, handing over to this company this enormous privilege, equivalent to a tax of perhaps many cents a bushel on all the grain that is grown in the North-west for twenty years. Twenty years is a very short time in the life of a nation, a nation as we are just beginning to develop our resources. I for one, Mr. Chairman, will oppose to the best of my ability the granting of charters such as this, giving into private hands the control of what must be eventually an enormously valuable public franchise.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I share to a large extent the views just expressed by my hon. friend. I have stated those views on several occasions, here and elsewhere. I have said we should not hand over our waterways and our rivers to any private corporation. This vast Dominion is wide, and there is plenty of land for railways. But there are not many Ottawa rivers, there are not many French rivers. The facts of this case have to be taken into consideration. In 1894 parliament granted a charter to the Georgian Bay Canal Company, which charter was renewed in 1898. One of the clauses of the charter granted in 1894 reads as follows:

Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, may at any time assume the possession and property of the said canals and works, and of all the

rights and privileges and advantages of the company, all of which shall after such assumption be vested in Her Majesty, her heirs and successors, on giving to the company one week's notice thereof and on paying to the company the value of the same, to be fixed by three arbitrators, or the majority of them, one to be chosen by the government, another by the company and a third arbitrator by the two arbitrators.

Now, if I had not found this clause in that charter I would not for a moment have consented to any renewal of the charter. But this clause being here, the charter having been renewed twice, the company having made great efforts to advertise the project and consented to give up their rights as to the French river section, I think that, as my hon. friend as said, we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. CLARKE. How are they going to get out from the Georgian Bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By the clause that has been added the company has no right whatever on the French river except upon Order in Council. The French river does not form part of the Bill to-day. Now the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler) says we must have control of the rates, that if the Ottawa and Mattawa part of the scheme fall into the hands of a private corporation we will not have control of the rates. Let me tell him that we have control of the rates by this Bill to a certain extent, and let me remind him that the government have in their hands the French river part of the scheme. We are altogether masters of the situation. My hon. friend knows better than any one else in the House perhaps that we must not rely on waterways only. I for one have the greatest confidence in railways and waterways combined. For instance, Buffalo is the gateway of the great system of American railways leading to the American ports. Midland, North Bay, Collingwood, Owen Sound and other ports will be reservoirs of trade. I have no doubt whatever, speaking after giving the question the most careful consideration, that the very moment the government announce that the French river will be improved so as to have a depth of 20 feet, there will be at least twenty-five or thirty large lake boats built immediately. There is no doubt as to that. I may add more. The Grand Trunk Railway have fully made up their minds to settle in Midland and in Montreal. This means an immediate and large addition to their carrying capacity on the lakes. The Grand Trunk Railway will settle in Midland to a very large extent. That does not mean that they will not carry trade elsewhere. But it has been suggested that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway might perhaps use part of the road from Midland to Peterborough so that the two great railways might combine their efforts to take down to the St. Lawrence as much freight as they possibly can.

Now my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler), who has just taken his seat, is right when he says that we have not perhaps a right conception of the immense development in store for us. Last year our crop in the North-west Territories amounted to 100,000,000 bushels of grain. The French river and the ports of the Georgian Bay will in future not only handle the Canadian trade, but the American trade. We have the shortest route ; we have only to make it the best to get the immense quantity of trade flowing down the great St. Lawrence route. My hon. friend is annoyed, and perhaps rightly so, because he is taunted, not in a malicious manner, with being a Canadian Pacific Railway man. Let me tell him that it happens often to me to be taunted in the same way. Every time I have to stand by a waterway or a railway that is connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway I am called a Canadian Pacific Railway man. I am not ashamed of the appellation, not by any means. I was a newspaper man in the Conservative party ranks, and I may say that when that great scheme was first initiated——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am not more ashamed of that than I am of being called a Canadian Pacific Railway man. I am perfectly prepared to stand by my past here, and my past in the Conservative party, as I am prepared to stand by what I am doing now. I am often taunted with being a Canadian Pacific Railway man. I believe no greater project has ever been carried out than the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I believe that to-day we must stand by our Canadian railways and we must stand by them to the last, in the face of the organization of these great American interests. I have stated on several occasions, and I say it again, that if the hon. Minister of Finance were in a position to invest in Canadian Pacific Railway bonds at 4 per cent interest $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 of Canadian money, if we could get it for less than 3 per cent, it would be a first class investment, because it would make this country secure the control of that great national highway. I have said more than I intended. I did not expect to say so much. However, I feel that we should move in the right direction.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) has not dealt with the crucial point.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is it ?

Mr. CLARKE. As to the advisability of allowing any encouragement to be given by parliament to a private company to engage in what will be a great national

enterprise in connection with one of our public waterways passing right through the heart of the country. I think it would be a very great mistake.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I thought I had dealt with that.

Mr. CLARKE. No.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I believe I have. A charter was granted in 1894 by a former parliament and it was renewed in 1898 by a former parliament. Now, we except from the charter part of that scheme which is more at hand, if I may speak in that way, because, please not to forget that with an expenditure of less than $5,000,000 we will be in the position to make a deep waterway from the Georgian Bay to Lake Nipissing. As to the other part, if the company go on with their work, and if parliament should make up its mind that it is the duty of the country to take possession of the work, clause 43 of the Act gives it power to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. Minister of Public Works say how he could control the rates by having control of the French river, because this canal would only go to Lake Nipissing on the one hand and to Montreal on the other, and it would have no connection directly with the Georgian Bay.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be nothing easier than to have control of the rates. Suppose that we improve the French river from Georgian bay to Lake Nipissing. Then, we will make connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any other railway that may be constructed there. There are only 317 nautical miles from Montreal to Lake Nipissing. People who say that the rates will be in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway will be mistaken. If the Canadian Pacific Railway take advantage of their position, nothing would be easier than to build another railway. I might add that the Grand Trunk Railway has also a branch line from Callander to the city of Toronto, and in my opinion no other city, except Montreal, perhaps, would benefit more by the improvement of the French river than the city of Toronto.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the hon. minister misunderstood me. What I referred to was the control of rates on the canal, not the ordinary freight rates—the tolls that may be imposed upon tonnage passing through the canal.

Mr. CLARKE. The hon. minister has not dealt with a most important feature to which reference was made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler). Enormous power privileges would be developed by the construction of that waterway, and if they become possessed by the company, it may be necessary in a few years that they shall be acquired by the government.

Mr. FRASER. I think that when a company are ready to put $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 into the country without the government being called upon to do the work, even if it does include the water power, we ought not to say anything against it. If this country is not ready now to go into that project, and I think myself it is rather problematical, we should not discourage capitalists from undertaking the work. Even hon. members opposite, who are in favour of the development of these great waterways, as we all are, I think, would be rather staggered if it were proposed that the country should put $80,000,000 into this project. For myself, I am rather inclined to come to the conclusion that after all the railway problem in this country will discount every other question. I would not stop capitalists from coming in and making use of our waterways and water powers, and investing $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 in developing them. Is the country or is the government any the poorer because our undeveloped water powers are utilized? Is Canada any poorer because the power at Niagara Falls is being developed? I trust the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) will not oppose a proposition which will result in the introduction of capital into the country.

Mr. CLARKE. There is no desire on my part to prevent the introduction of capital to develop the public works of this country, but this is a most important artery of communication, one of the great natural highways from Montreal to the Georgian Bay, and the question has been raised whether it is advisable in the public interest to allow a private company to get possession of privileges that it may cost an enormous sum to purchase in a few years from now. If that power can be developed with advantage to the people at large why should it not be developed in a year or two and owned by the government for the benefit of the people of Canada instead of allowing it to be developed by a private company?

Mr. BELCOURT. Does not my hon. friend know that all the water powers that he speaks of are under the control of the provincial parliament? These water powers are not under our jurisdiction at all.

Mr. CLARKE If you incorporate this canal company the project becomes a work under the control and authority of the parliament of Canada.

Mr. FRASER. You cannot take rights away from a local legislature.

Mr. CLARKE. There are no representatives in this House from any part of the Dominion of Canada who will more cordially co-operate with the government in any scheme of national transportation than the representatives from Toronto. None whatever.

An hon. MEMBER. Glad to hear it.

Mr. CLARKE. If the hon. gentleman had listened attentively to the sentiments expressed by the members for Toronto during the past five or six years, he would have been convinced of that fact long ago.

An hon. MEMBER. Let the Bill pass.

Mr. CLARKE. Before it passes, I wish to express my opinion, and it is this, that this country is big enough and wealthy enough to undertake that work and complete it as soon as necessary, if it be a national work, and no charter should be given to private capitalists for the purpose of constructing a work absolutely essential to the future prosperity of this country. It may be said that by some provision of the Bill the government may take over the work in ten or fifteen years from now. But to do so will eventually necessitate a much larger expenditure than if the work were undertaken by the government now, and carried to completion at the earliest possible moment.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL SUBWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Montreal Subway Company. —Mr. McCarthy.

On section 8,

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Before this clause is adopted, I would like to say a word or two. We have a charter for the construction of a bridge, which has been several years on our statute-book, but the bridge never materialized. A few months ago several notices were published in the newspapers for charters for three bridges. Two of those charters are gone, and we all remember the manner in which the last charter was doomed. I have no doubt that the population of the city of Montreal and of the south shore would rather have a bridge than a subway. I was a little diffident regarding that subway, but as there is no probability of any bridge being constructed, I did not feel justified in opposing the granting of a charter for this subway. Of course, it is a new departure. Will it be feasible to carry vehicles and so on in such a subway ? The promoters of the Bill say that it will. In the committee yesterday I asked for a short delay so as to be able to consult some of the eminent financiers whose names appear on the Bill. I met one or two of them to-day, and they told me—especially Senator Mackay—that they fully expected that the scheme could be financed without the help of the government of Canada. I read to-day an interview in the Montreal papers to the same effect with Mr. Hogg, in which he says that the scheme is sure of being financed without any trouble whatever. That will be a new departure, because in the past we have been in the habit of giving pretty large subsidies to undertakings of this kind, but the moment we find capitalists prepared to take such a strong stand, who have such confidence in the development of the country, especially of the city of Montreal, as to be able to tell us that they are prepared to go on with such a work without asking anything of the government, I have not a word to say against it, but wish them success, prosperity and happiness in their undertaking.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in the understanding, from the explanation of the hon. Minister of Public Works, that this is intended to be a traffic subway as well as for railways ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be two subways—one for the railroads and another one for vehicles. The vehicles will be carried, I understand, on electric cars.

Mr. SPROULE. If my memory is correct, I do not recollect any provision in the Bill for control by the government of traffic rates.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will see that when the other clauses are read.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. Minister of Public Works has often objected to our accepting newspaper reports as authority. If the report to which he refers to is true, it is very important. What grounds have we for supposing that that newspaper report is more correct than others.

On section 20, subsection (b) :

If the company fails to bona fide expend upon its undertaking within nine months after the approval of said plans and specifications a sum not less than $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sum of $100,000 to be expended within nine months is a very small sum for such a large undertaking.

Mr. OSLER. It was understood in the committee that that was to be expended on actual work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move that it be changed to $200,000 in six months.

Mr. McCARTHY. There is considerable objection to passing an amendment in this way after the Bill has been thoroughly considered in the Railway Committee. At first $50,000 was thought to be sufficient, then it was proposed that $100,000 should be expended in twelve months, and after considerable discussion a compromise was arrived at by making it $100,000 in nine months. The Minister of Public Works had left the committee before that. The government have adopted the principle that when a matter has been thoroughly dis-

cussed before the committee the committee's recommendation shall be adopted. Why should a different course be pursued in this instance? The minister says that he is satisfied with the financial ability of the company, and when these men are willing to deposit $50,000 and to spend $100,000 in nine months putting their own money in the enterprise without asking any subsidy from the government I submit that they should not be asked for more than is asked from any other company. It seems to me that to ask the committee at this stage to amend what the committee has reported is not in accordance with precedent or with the policy of the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no intention to be unfair, far from it. No doubt an enterprise of this kind should only be put in the hands of strong men, and I saw Senator Mackay this afternoon, before making up my mind as to whether I would agree to this Bill or not. He told me that he expected the whole thing would be financed without any help from the government. Under the circumstances, I did not want to be too exacting. We have been used to so much charter trafficking in Montreal, that I feel the necessity of being careful. In the committee yesterday I inquired whether some of those gentlemen, whose names were on the Bill had not lent their names, for we have found that men just as great have lent their names elsewhere. Every day during the last week or so we have been reading what has happened in New York, and we must provide against a recurrence of anything of the kind, but I do not want to compare the men whose names are on this Bill with those who have been mentioned in New York.

Mr. BALL. It is provided that $100,000 must be spent on the construction within a certain time?

Mr. OSLER. It was stated in the Railway Committee, and agreed to, that $100,000 would be spent bona fide on the construction.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is agreed to, and any words which may be inserted to that effect would be satisfactory.

Mr. OSLER. As that clause is worded, the money may be spent on fees or commissions or charges of that kind, and not on construction work at all, and you will be locking this enterprise up in the hands of these men for five years without compelling them to do a day's work on it during that time.

Mr. HENDERSON. The amendment ought to be read to the committee so that the committee may know that the words ordered to be inserted by the Railway Committee are actually inserted in the Bill. I do not know how it is, but this is not the first instance we have had of Bills reported by the Railway Committee coming before this House, and not containing all the amendments that were ordered by the committee. This is rather an important matter. The committee decided emphatically that the $100,000 should be spent on construction work and not on plans and specifications or other such work. We should see that the clause is so worded as to leave no doubt that the money is to be spent on actual construction, and I therefore ask that it be read before it passes through the committee.

Mr. WADE. As some reflections have been cast on some of the officials of the Railway Committee, I beg to say that I drafted all the amendments myself and read them twice to that committee, and they are in the Bill in exactly the same words as I used in my drafts. Before the hon. gentleman makes any charge of that sort against the Railway Committee or its officials, he should know what he is speaking about or take it back. Those amendments whether satisfactory or not, are exactly as they were drawn and read twice to the Railway Committee. The words 'actual construction' were put in the first amendment and appear there now. The hon. member for Ottawa suggested those words, and I put them in at his suggestion and they are there now.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood that the amendment was read without those words. If they are in the amendment, then it was a mistake of the Chairman not to have read them.

Mr. BALL. As there is a doubt about the wording of this clause, I will draw your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that the time for private Bills has expired.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hour for private Bills has expired.

SUPPLY—COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

House resumed consideration of the motion of the Minister of Finance that the House go again into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask the right hon. the First Minister if he has received any further despatch or document respecting the colonial conference from the imperial government or the right hon. the Secretary of the Colonies. I would like also to bring to the attention of the hon. the Minister of the Interior——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to call the attention of the right hon. the leader of the House to the fact that there has been very bad order in this House for the past six or seven days, particularly when hon. gentlemen on this side are speaking. I am as anxious to co-operate with

my right hon. friend as any one can be to prevent this House from degenerating into a bear garden, and the next time these interruptions occur, I shall move that the committee rise, as a protest against them. Or if they occur when the House is in session, I shall move the adjournment, as a like protest; and I call on you, Mr. Speaker, to see that a little better order is kept in this House in the future than has been the case during the past week. I was about to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) to a telegram which I have received which possibly pertains to his department. I do not understand it myself, and I am asking the question for information. It is dated at Forty Mile, is addressed to myself, and is as follows:

Miners anxious to know decision regarding Miller Creek concession. Wire.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The only matter to which this telegram can refer, I think, is a dispute as to a number of entries for claims upon a place called Miller Creek. I know it was before me some months ago, and has been pending in the department from time to time since then. I think a decision was given some time ago and communicated to the gold commissioner. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) more definitely to-morrow, and I can have a despatch sent to the gold commissioner to-morrow, if necessary, which will clear the matter up.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And if the hon. minister will mention also that the matter was brought up in the House, it will make it unnecessary for me to communicate with the gentlemen who sent me the telegram.

INTER-IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

The PRIME MINISTER. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to repeat the question he asked of me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wished to know whether or not the government have received from the imperial government or from the Colonial Secretary any further despatch or communication with respect to the conference to be held in London during the coming summer. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that one of the communications laid before the House referred to a further despatch from the Colonial Secretary, but when the matter was last mentioned in the House the right hon. gentleman stated that no further despatch had been received.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have not made any inquiries, but I think I am safe in saying that there has been no further communication. I received a communication from Lord Strathcona a few days ago, not dealing directly with conference, but on the subject of the wheat and flour duties.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

DOMINION SECURITIES COMPANY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one other matter to which I desire to ask attention—a statement by a reporter in the New York 'Evening Post' of yesterday, relating to communications between the Minister of Railways and Canals and the Dominion Securities Company. It begins:

An officer of the Dominion Securities Company, which controls the Cape Breton Railroad, expressed astonishment to-day that Mr. Blair, the Minister of Railways and Canals, made a partial denial that the Cape Breton Railroad had been awarded a subsidy.

'We have a document,' said this officer, 'with Mr. Blair's own signature attached, vouching for the subsidy, and it is open to inspection to anybody desiring to look at it, including Mr. Blair himself. You will notice that he did not deny the thing flatly. It is a well-known fact that under the general statutes of Canada any railroad company is entitled to a subsidy of $3,200 per mile by complying with certain conditions. The Cape Breton Railroad complied with them, and it has received proper acknowledgment of the same from Mr. Blair, with the official seal of his department attached. I may also say that the railroad company was awarded a like subsidy of $3,200 a mile from the provincial government, and a part of this subsidy has already been paid to the company.

Then follow some further comments upon the position of the law on the subject of subsidies in Canada, with which I need not trouble the House at present. I would like to know whether the right hon. leader of the government is in a position to say whether or not this statement respecting the assurance given by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) as to the subsidy, is correct or not. The Minister of Railways and Canals is not present, but perhaps the Prime Minister may be able to give information at present, and I would like to have a statement if the right hon. gentleman is in a position to make one.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not exactly understand the question.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think the statement as read represented the Minister of Railways and Canals as stating that there was no arrangement or contract between this government and the Cape Breton Extension Railway. But the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals never said that. On the contrary, he said—and I said also, as having knowledge of the fact—that we had granted a subsidy for thirty-five miles of that road from the Strait of Canso to the village of St. Peters.

The PRIME MINISTER. By statute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, and I presume that a contract was signed, because it was authorized. What the Minister of Railways and Canals said was in denial of the statement that the parties had

subsidies for much larger schemes. He did not say that there was no contract. I have not seen the contract covering the subsidy for thirty-five miles, but I think I am safe in saying that such a contract was signed with the Cape Breton Extension Railway Company, and, I suppose, passed to the Dominion Securities Company. There is no contradiction between what has just been read and the statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was not making any assertion with regard to the matter, but merely sought information. There is this statement on the part of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals :

> I do not hesitate to say that the statements in it are absolutely false in the main, and I base my statements on this ground, that the Dominion government has given them a certain subsidy and promised them other subsidies.

That is the statement of his which seemed not quite consistent with what has been stated by this officer of the Dominion Securities Company to the reporter.

The PRIME MINISTER. There can be no document but the statute.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The document referred to, I suppose, would be the contract for the thirty-five miles which is not disputed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was that mentioned in the debate by the Minister of Railways ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I know that I mentioned it. I was aware that the subsidy had been authorized for this thirty-five miles and the scheme approved to that extent; and I assume that the contract was signed, though I have never seen it.

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

Census, $450,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) state how much has been expended on the census to date ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not the figures up to date. I made a statement of the expenditure up to a certain date——

Mr. TAYLOR. Up to the 1st March.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are spending about $10,000 a month in the Bureau, so, I suppose there will be a little more than $10,000 additional since that date.

Mr. TAYLOR. There were large accounts for unpaid claims at that time. Have they been settled ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We have been paying some accounts for the enumeration also, as well as what has been paid to the clerks here, but I have not a statement under my hand of what has been spent in that way lately. I am informed that we have spent about $15,000 since that date, including the amount paid for enumerators' bills that have come in since I gave the figures to the House the other day. Our monthly pay list amounts to over $10,000, and about $15,000 in all has been paid since that date, leaving about $5,000 paid for enumerators' accounts in the outlying districts.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister give us the information as to the amounts yet claimed by enumerators, and the number of accounts that are unadjusted.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The fishery enumeration has not been sent in yet—a few have been, but not many. I cannot tell exactly what that will amount to. I am informed there are accounts in that branch amounting to about $9,000. Those, however, will have to be gone over and checked, and according to our past experience, the total claims will not be paid. There are still some outstanding accounts for enumeration not settled. Claims have been put in and we have shown the enumerators how these claims cannot all be allowed. They have been arguing the case with us, and trying to show that their claims should be allowed. We do not call those accounts as absolutely settled, although in most cases I do not think there is much chance of the enumerators getting any more than has been allowed.

Mr. CLARKE. Has the minister made any inquiry from Mr. George Johnson, since these matters were being discussed here, as to the allegations made about the inaccuracy of the census returns of 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. I have not.

Mr. CLARKE. Is it the intention of the hon. gentleman to ask him if he can make any satisfactory explanation of those allegations ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I may do that when I get a little time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the minister the statements that were on the Table the other night giving the monthly pay list and all the names on the staff ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Everything that was laid upon the Table is still upon the Table, even the check books and stubs the hon. gentleman asked for the other night.

Mr. TAYLOR. I inquired about a gentleman named Drouin, from Montreal, who was working in the department at $2.25 a day. I said I was informed that he had

been in Montreal for thirteen days during the election campaign, and was paid full time while he was away. The minister told me that he thought he was away for only one day. I think if the hon. gentleman will look up his registration books he will find that he was absent for thirteen days in succession during the election in Montreal, and was paid for that whole time. If the minister finds that to be the case will he deduct that amount ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. All the employees are entitled to a certain number of holidays during the year, and they take them at different times. I cannot tell whether Mr. Drouin has had his holidays or not. He is entitled to be absent a certain amount of time, and if he is absent more than that, his pay will be docked.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then why did the minister say he was only absent for one day ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I was so informed, that he was only absent for one day at that particular time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then if the minister finds he was absent for thirteen days he will admit that he misled the House to that extent ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I will admit that I was misinformed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Perhaps the minister can get the information at once from the assistant commissioner.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that Mr. Drouin was away at Christmas time taking his holidays ; I am informed that at the time of the Dominion election he was away only one day. I cannot give the date.

Mr. TAYLOR. Can the hon. minister now say whether since December these balances claimed in Lisgar have been paid or not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cheque book is on the Table of the House and no cheques have been issued since this discussion took place the other day.

Mr. TAYLOR. No person can take this cheque book and tell anything about it, because there is no date given from January to the present time. If any business man had an accountant keeping his stub cheque books as these books are kept he would not keep him in his employment very long, because the stubs should bear a date corresponding with that on the cheque. There is not a stub that is dated that I can find. Nor does it give the particulars as to what the cheque was issued for, or anything of that kind. Here is a cheque book which starts on February 28th, and I think that from February 28th there is not a stub in the book of a cheque that has been issued since with a date on it.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must confess that I have not examined the cheque books myself. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman's statement is perfectly correct. I supplied the hon. gentleman with a list of the dates of payments in Lisgar, and that is a correct list.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot find it now.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Well, it was laid on the Table of the House and given to the hon. gentleman. I think he was the last man who had it. Here is a cheque book dated February 28th; I do not know whether there is any other date. I am informed that the dates at the beginning of the month are put down and then the cheques are paid out during that month. The day book of the department shows the dates of these payments, but they are not entered upon the stubs of the cheque book, as the hon. gentleman says. The list I gave him the other night, which contained a statement of the payments to the enumerators in Lisgar is a correct list with the correct dates, as made out in the department from the cheques, and it is a true and accurate list. The hon. gentleman insisted upon my bringing the cheque books with the stubs, and I brought them for him. I think I warned him at the time that the other list was much more convenient and told a great deal more than the books would. He would not take my word for it, and insisted on my bringing the cheque books.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was because my hon. friend from Macdonald says he is credibly informed that the cheques had gone out there during the time of the election to pay up the balances that were due to the enumerators. The statement which the hon. minister laid on the Table showed a large number of persons who claimed balances. Now, what I want to find out from the hon. minister is whether any of these balances have been paid.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that not one of these balances which appeared on that list has been paid. As far as that statement is concerned, I have no data to tell me at the present time whether the payments as made have been accepted by the enumerators as payments in full or whether they are still protesting. I am informed that some of the enumerators are still claiming parts of these balances, but none have been paid.

Mr. TAYLOR. The information I have received is that all the enumerators that are on that list showing the balances claimed by them were raising considerable of a row at the time the Lisgar election came on. It was decided that they must be settled with and they were settled with and my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Boyd) says that a gentleman told him that he saw the cheques.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. He could not have seen any cheques, because no cheques have been issued by the department since the date that is given there, I think it was in December. I cannot help what a gentleman may have told the hon. gentleman. I simply say that no cheques have since been issued by the department since the date given there. I have that from my accountant, and I believe it. I do not sign these cheques myself, and consequently I do not know of my own personal knowledge. But I take the full responsibility of saying that no cheques have been issued since the date on the list I put on the Table.

Mr. INGRAM. When the census were up for discussion before, I asked the hon. gentleman what additional duties were performed by the census commissioner of East Elgin. He said he would bring down that information again.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. What additional duties ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, after he had handed in his report.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am informed that there were no additional duties except the proper completion and fulfilment of his work. If the schedules come in and are not in proper form they have to be sent back to be looked over, revised and checked by him. Nothing except that, if it has been done, has been done by the commissioner for East Elgin.

Mr. INGRAM. I may say that I had a conversation with the commissioner myself, and he was rather surprised to receive this extra duty, which he thought he was not entitled to perform, and he expected extra pay for doing that duty which was imposed upon him. I would like to know whether any additional salary has been given to the commissioner ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Quite a number of the commissioners have supposed that when they were required to complete this work they were going to get extra pay, but we have not paid any of them.

Mr. INGRAM. And do not intend to ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. And do not intend to. The Census Act provides that the commissioners shall finish their work and it is the intention that they shall finish their work without extra remuneration.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the hon. minister give the cost of the census in South Leeds in 1901 and 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICLUTURE. The total cost in 1901 of taking the census in South Leeds was $3,393.53; and in 1891, $1,652.65.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the population in 1891 and 1901 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. If the hon. gentleman will wait a moment I will look at the bulletin.

Mr. WILSON. What was the population of Lennox in 1891 and in 1901, and the cost of taking the census in each year ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Population of Lennox, 1901, 13,421; in 1891, 14,900. Cost in 1891, $1,065.89; in 1901, $2,002.21.

Mr. ROSAMOND. What are the figures for North Lanark ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Population, 1901, 18,173 ; in 1891, 19,260. Cost, 1891, $1,320.27; in 1901, $2,938.24.

Mr. TAYLOR. And in South Leeds ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Population in 1901, 24,185 and in 1891, 22,449.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the figures with regard to the county of Peel ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Population of Peel in 1901, 13,687, and 1891, 15,460.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the cost ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I gave that the other day.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, but I want to have it on record in 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Cost for Peel, 1891, $1,102.03, and in 1901, $1,967.31.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What was the cost of taking the census in South Grenville ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In 1891, $834.25, and in 1901, $1,785.46.

Mr. EARLE. What was the cost of taking the population in the different districts of British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I must preface what I state in regard to this by saying that these are the payments so far. In some of the districts of British Columbia the cost has not been entirely worked out. Total cost for Burrard in 1901, $18,658.15 ; New Westminster, $7,275.67 ; Victoria, $3,375.25; Yale and Cariboo, $18,256.37. Vancouver is not completed.

Mr. EARLE. What was the cost in 1891 ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The districts were not the same in the two periods.

Mr. EARLE. Give us the figures as they are; they include the whole of British Columbia anyway.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The cost in 1891 was: Cariboo, $5,557.94; New Westminster, $12,804; Vancouver, $4,153; Victoria, $1,621; Yale, $6,667. There was a good deal of territory included in 1901 that was not in 1891.

Mr. MORIN. What is the population of Dorchester county, and the cost of taking the census in 1891 and 1901?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Population of Dorchester in 1891, 19,017, and in 1901, 21,007. Cost, 1891, $1,502.95, and in 1901, $3,200.46.

Mr. BENNETT. In view of the large decreases in the population of the bulk of the counties of Ontario, has any officer of the Department of Agriculture made a computation as to what will be the probable exodus for the next ten years?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No. We have not gone into that.

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the hon. minister think that is a vital subject which claims his attention? The decreases have been very abnormal in the past ten years.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. In some parts they are.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister promise that will be done?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I cannot promise that exactly to-night.

Mr. WILSON. Do the figures given for Lennox include the accounts in full? There was a great deal of dissatisfaction among the enumerators there. They thought they had done a good deal more work than they were getting pay for. They understood that they were to get so much per day, and afterwards they were paid so much per name. I would like to know if the hon. minister has had to pay anything for extras to the enumerators for Lennox?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I understand that we have no further claims from Lennox. The accounts have all been settled.

Mr. WILSON. Were there no claims after the first accounts were put in?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I think very likely there were after the first accounts were put in, but they were put in a long time ago.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the minister if he is through with all these private investigations with regard to the census of 1891?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I have not made any arrangements for any further investigations.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has not said whether he has concluded them.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. So far as the records laid on the Table go, they are concluded.

Mr. INGRAM. Still, that is not an answer to my question. Has he concluded all the investigations that he has started?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I notice that the population of North Lanark, according to the figures the hon. minister has given, has decreased 1,187, and the cost of taking the census is over twice as much as it was in 1891. I would like to know what is the reason for that enormous increase of over 100 per cent.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The reason is just the general reason which I stated the other night when this question came up. In 1901 the cost of everything has been greater than it was in 1891. Then, we threw a great deal more labour on the enumerators, asking in the aggregate nearly three times as many questions as were asked in 1891. The consequence was that they took more time and had to do more work, and we had to make our schedule of rates considerably higher.

Mr. ROSAMOND. I am afraid that is hardly warranted by the fact so far as my knowledge goes. My experience is that the enumerators spent very little time in taking the census, much less time than was spent in 1891.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is no doubt of that, because we had a great many more enumerators.

Mr. ROSAMOND. Well, they must have had very little to do as there was less population. I know that it did not take them two minutes to do the work at my house. I really do not think the explanation of the minister accounts for the increased cost.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to draw the minister's attention to the fact that the census of South Leeds in 1891 cost $1,652, while that of 1901 cost $3,393, and that the population in 1891 was 24,185 and in 1901 22,449, or a decrease in the population, according to the census returns, of 1,736. I am satisfied that the census returns for South Leeds are not correct, and that the population has not decreased. We had an enumeration of the town of Gananoque taken at the same time by the municipal assessors, and it showed 170 more than the number given by the census enumerators taken at practically the same time. According to the municipal census of the whole county the population, instead of having decreased, has increased. Therefore, I think this is a case in which the minister should

send a special officer to make an enumeration of the county as a test for the whole province. I know that our county has not gone back in the last ten years, but has gone ahead. The cost of taking the census of the county in 1901 was more than double what it was in 1891, the increase being $1,741 with an apparently decreased population. The minister says the increase of the cost is due to an increased schedule of rates. The old rate to the enumerators was three cents per name, and the hon. gentleman allowed five cents, a difference of two cents. On the population of 22,449 this would give $448. Deduct that from the $1,741, the increase in the cost over 1891, and there is still an increase of $1,300. How does the hon. minister account for that?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman has stated in the first place that the municipal census of South Leeds was greater in 1901 than it was in 1891, but if the hon. gentleman will look at the correct figures he will find that that is not the case. By the municipal census the population of the district of South Leeds in 1891 was 20,191, while in 1901 it was 19,193, a decrease of about 1,000. According to the Dominion census the population in 1891 was 22,449 and in 1901, 21,185, or a decrease of about 1,300, showing that the municipal census was not so very far different from the Dominion census. It is not correct, as the hon. gentleman states, that there was a decrease according to the one and an increase according to the other. With regard to the increase in the cost, the hon. gentleman has forgotten that the schedule of rates included not only five cents per name, but deaths, all farms recorded, thirty cents per industrial establishment instead of twenty, besides $1.50 per day which was allowed to the enumerators in 1901 for team hire and not allowed in 1891.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where does the minister get the figures of the municipal statistics which he has given?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. From the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. TAYLOR. Those I gave were got by writing to each municipal assessor. I got his figures of the assessment for 1901.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know why it is that in taking the population of West Elgin the minister makes out that in 1901 it had 730 fewer souls than in 1891, while it cost $2,137.08 more than in 1891 to take the census.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The same explanation applies to that county which I have given for the others.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not catch the explanation. What was it?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I can repeat it, I suppose; but I do not think it is necessary for me to go over the same thing for every county in the Dominion. The explanation is simply that the schedule rates were higher in 1901 than they were in 1891, and the enumerators were paid by the schedule rates.

Some resolutions reported.

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 11) to provide for the establishment of a medical council in Canada.—Mr. Roddick.

Mr. RODDICK. I beg to suggest the following amendment to subsection 3, of section 6:

No province shall be represented on the council either by appointed or elected members until the legislature of the province has enacted in effect that registration by the council shall be accepted as equivalent to registration for a like purpose under the laws of the province provided that when all the provinces of the Dominion shall have legislated in effect as aforesaid, it shall be lawful to appoint and elect in the manner aforesaid members of the council representing the provinces which have so legislated, and the universities and incorporated schools aforesaid constituted within such provinces and such members shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, constitute the council.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) please explain his amendment?

Mr. RODDICK. The original clause provided that when any five or more provinces had legislated, this would come into effect; the amendment provides that all the provinces shall legislate before the council can be formed.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). We are anxious to know if this medical council will come into existence if one of the provinces refuses to join?

Mr. RODDICK. No, they must all join before it can come into operation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Therefore, the hon. gentleman admits by this amendment that this parliament has not authority to pass such legislation, but he must have the authority of a provincial legislature. Why, then, should we pass this Bill? Why not leave the matter to the provincial legislatures? This is the first time I have seen such a Bill passed by this House. It is an invasion of provincial rights, and the promoter practically admits it by this amendment.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that is a fair interpretation of the matter. The mere leaving of the right in the hands of the provinces to come in or not is not an acknowledgment that this parliament has not the power to legislate on the subject. It is acting in an agreeable way towards

the provinces, when they are neither forced nor asked to come in, but allowed to come in of their own free will.

Mr. RODDICK. This arranges a piece of machinery which the provinces can make use of in order to establish a council. The provinces cannot do it themselves. This parliament simply arranges a scheme by which they can get together and establish a council which will issue licenses and allow any licentiate to practice in any part of the Dominion. Then we shall be able to have reciprocal legislation with foreign countries which is very important.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In my judgment this legislation should originate with the imperial parliament and not here. You are practically amending the British North America Act. We can understand this better by referring to a point which was explained here by my hon. friend from Hants (Mr. Russell). It is provided in the British North America Act that the different provinces of the Dominion can have legislative union, with the exception of the province of Quebec, but, before this legislative union takes place, the consent of the different legislatures must be had. This was passed by the imperial parliament in 1867. But there is nothing of that kind as to the medical profession. On the contrary, that is a civil right which belongs to the different provinces. I would be very happy to support this legislation, because I think that the motives of my hon. friend are good motives indeed, but that it is an invasion of provincial rights. By the revised statutes of the province of Quebec, clause 3975, the medical profession comes under our provincial law. There is nothing in our constitutional Act providing that this parliament can legislate in matters of that kind. I most humbly protest against this legislation. I say it is not within the purview of this parliament, and I say that if we pass such legislation, we open the door to many other Acts of the same kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I thought that this Bill infringed on any provincial rights, I would be as strenuously opposed to it as any hon. member of this House. As a matter of fact, I have, on various occasions during the present session raised the point with regard to measures before this House, and pointed out that these Bills should be dealt with by the provincial legislature, and I have not received any support in these matters from the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux). This does not seem to me to infringe in any way upon provincial rights. There is no provincial legislature in Canada that could enact a Bill of this kind—my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) would not pretend that there is. The object of the Bill, as I understand it, is, with the consent of the legislatures of the provinces, insofar as they have exclusive jurisdiction, to provide a scheme by which medical practitioners in Canada shall have, in Canada as well as in foreign countries, a Dominion status and not a merely provincial status.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) allow me to ask him a question? Is it not a fact that by this amendment the promoter of the Bill admits that the provinces alone are entitled to legislate in this matter?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend will define what he means by 'in this matter' I can answer him with greater precision. But, so far as the scheme of this Bill is concerned, my answer to his question is an emphatic negative. The rights of the provinces in the matter of property, and civil rights are conserved by the amendment that my hon. friend (Mr. Roddick) has introduced. The creation of a council which, with the approval of the provincial legislatures shall have the right to deal with the medical profession of the various provinces is attempted by this Bill and can only be dealt with by this parliament. That is a scheme which can only be dealt with by some such Bill as this, and can only be carried out with the consent of the provincial legislatures, and in every way this Bill safeguards provincial rights by providing, as this amendment provides, that the medical profession in the provinces cannot be affected except with the consent of the legislatures of all the provinces. Further than that, this council shall not be created at all unless every province of Canada comes into the scheme. That is the idea of the amendment, as I gathered from hearing it read. Now it does not seem to me that under these circumstances there can be any objection to this Bill from the standpoint of provincial rights. If I thought there was such an objection, I would be the first to stand up and support my hon. friend, because I for one am as anxious that provincial rights and the federal constitution should be preserved intact in every respect as any hon. member on either side of the House can possibly be.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the amendment that the committee has just adopted, would it not be advisable to provide in the Bill some way of determining whether the various legislatures have given the consent that the Bill requires before this Act can go into effect? There is no tribunal to determine whether the provincial legislation contemplated has or has not been enacted.

Mr. SPROULE. That is implied in the word 'legislation.'

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The words of the legislation are not set forth here. Whilst it says that the legislation shall be to a certain effect, yet it will be a question whether it was to that effect.

You might proceed to establish your schools and purport to grant licenses, and after all, on the matter being tested, it might be held that one or other of the supposed provincial Acts did not comply with the conditions of this measure.

Mr. RODDICK. The Governor in Council will determine whether the necessary legislation has taken place.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John). Where is it stated that this legislation shall not go into affect until it is assented to by all the provinces ?

Mr. RODDICK. That is provided for by the amendment which has just been adopted.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Then are we to understand that all the provinces must consent ?

Mr. RODDICK. Yes. I have amended the Bill so as to make it impossible for five provinces to begin this work, they must all consent before the council is formed. If one does not consent, it cannot go on.

Bill reported.

Mr. RODDICK moved the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOURASSA. Before the Bill is carried, I must say that I was absent when the second reading was taken, and I have only this opportunity of making some observations against the principle of the Bill. However, I do not regret to have been absent at the time, because the amendment that has just been adopted by the committee gives a special feature to the Bill which I think is an argument against the Bill itself. In taking exception to the principle of the Bill I do not do so from a professional point of view. I am not a medical man, and those medical men in my county whom I represent here are practically all in favour of the Bill, because they live on the border of the province of Ontario and they would certainly benefit by the adoption of this Bill. My objection is entirely based upon the principle of the Bill which was pointed out by the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), a few moments ago. Now I am not a lawyer any more than I am a physician ; but I think we must admit that common sense tells us that what belongs to the provinces does not belong to the federal authority, and what comes under the federal authority does not come under the provincial authority.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That may be common sense but it is not law.

Mr. BOURASSA. And gentlemen who do not belong to the noble profession of the law will admit that sometimes lawyers attempt to justify things that are not common sense.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That depends on the common sense.

Mr. BOURASSA. But it is the habit of those gentlemen to play with common sense when it suits their purpose. It is a principle admitted in law, a principle that I think the very high authority of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will not contradict, that whatever power belongs to the provinces belongs to them by the authority of the imperial government. This parliament cannot give them one iota of authority, this parliament cannot authorize the provinces to legislate on any subject. Whatever authority the provinces have to legislate is given to them by the imperial parliament, and whatever power is given to us is given by the imperial parliament. We are imperialists in this sense, that we respect what is given to us by the imperial power. So far as that is concerned I am a sound imperialist. But if we want to have peace in this country we must leave the line of demarcation between the provinces and the Dominion authority perfectly well defined. Now I have had occasion in this House to speak against some measures of the government where I thought they were not exercising the full power given to the federal authority, and were giving to the provinces power that did not belong to them.

Mr. COCHRANE. You voted all right.

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I voted against them, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) voted with the government at that time because his leader told him to vote with the government—I mean on the Manitoba railway legislation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) pardon me ? Is he referring to me ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I am not quite sure when the authority of the hon. gentleman began.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was merely suggesting that if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) referred to me as having directed any one to vote for the Manitoba Bill, or as having said a word about it, he is stating what he cannot know to be true and which is absolutely and wholly untrue and incorrect.

Mr. BOURASSA. I did not mean to insinuate that the hon. gentleman had given the word to the hon. member (Mr. Cochrane). I am sure that the docility of the hon. gentleman is such that he votes before the order comes from his leader. The ground that I am standing upon is that this very amendment which has been proposed by the promoter of the Bill and adopted by the committee is an acknowledgment that the provinces have the right to legislate in this matter. Now, the hon. leader of the opposition says that we do not encroach upon the authority of the provinces in this Bill. What do I read in section 4 of this Bill ?

The purposes of the council shall be to promote and effect—

(a) The establishment of a qualification in medicine, such that the holders thereof shall be acceptable and empowered to practice in all the provinces of Canada.

Whereas, it is known that the federal parliament has no right whatever to exercise control over the practice of the liberal professions in this country. Do hon. gentlemen pretend to assimilate the practice of the liberal professions with the exercise of trade? We have control of trade, but we have not control of the liberal professions. More than that, subsection (b) of this clause reads as follows :

The establishment of a register for Canada of medical practitioners and students, and the publication and revision from time to time of such register.

Thereby controlling the legal status or the discipline to be given to students. This is a matter of education. Here is subsection (c) :

(c.) The determination and fixing of the qualifications and conditions necessary for registration, including the courses of study to be pursued, the examinations to be undergone, and generally the requisites for registration ;

(d.) The establishment and maintenance of a board of examiners for the examination of such persons and for the granting of certificates of qualification.

Here are three subsections legislating immediately upon the subject of education. Perhaps it has been stated on previous occasions during the discussion of this Bill and perhaps it may be stated again, that we are simply legislating to give certain powers to a body of men to be exercised by them according to the authority of the provinces. But we are incorporating a body, which is not in existence to-day, to exercise control over the practice of medicine, to determine the courses to be followed by students, as well as the necessary qualifications and the examinations to which they must submit themselves before they can acquire the right to practice their profession. Therefore, we are incorporating a body that will exercise powers that heretofore have been regarded as belonging entirely to the provinces. This is only the beginning—I should not say it is the beginning, because I can refer to several instances of legislation on various subjects where the federal parliament has been trying to encroach upon provincial rights. I don't think the tendency of this parliament or of this government should be to encroach upon provincial rights. I remember the time when the Liberal party stood up, and rightly so, in favour of provincial rights, as far as education was concerned, and they were supported by the province of Quebec in spite of the natural sympathy which the province of Quebec had in favour of the minority in another province whose rights had been admittedly encroached upon by the provincial government. Why ? Because we believed that the rights of the provinces in educational matters were rights that were more precious to us than any special encroachment upon them. Now, we are coming here and incorporating a body that will have control of a certain part of the education of the provinces in this Dominion. We are told that this is for the purpose of giving our medical men a right to practice abroad, or rather of enabling them to make an arrangement with foreign countries for the exchange of rights in regard to the practice of medicine. I suppose the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick) simply meant with other parts of the empire.

Mr. RODDICK. I may say to my hon. friend that outside of the empire arrangements may be made with other countries. Reciprocity with France is quite possible.

Mr. BOURASSA. As far as this part of the project of the hon. gentleman is concerned, I am opposed to it also. Whether the reciprocity is with England or with France, or with any other country, I say that we should not open the door to an exchange of that kind. We should not in the interests of the Canadian people encourage our medical men to go and live in other countries and be replaced by foreigners. We know that in England, as well as in France, they are overcrowded more than we are with young practitioners who would be very glad to come here and invade this country, not with the greatest benefit to this country. After all, the very argument that will be used by these gentlemen will be that we are not satisfied with the courses that are given by our universities, that we are not satisfied with the studies pursued in our universities, and that we want to have reciprocity so as to invite foreigners to come and take the places of our practitioners. I may say that this view was expressed to me by a couple of physicians from the city of Toronto. Unfortunately, I did not think that I was going to take part in this discussion, and I did not obtain permission to give their names; but they are practitioners who have lived in England as well as here and they told me they were opposed to this Bill on the very ground that is taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Roddick), i.e., that it will bring about reciprocity ; because they believe that reciprocity will certainly turn against the medical profession of Canada much more than it will turn in their favour.

But apart from this objection, I say that we cannot accept the principle of this Bill without either encroaching upon provincial rights or stultifying ourselves. Without the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. member, we are encroaching on provincial rights in legislating upon a matter which has been acknowledged as being the sole right of the provinces to deal with.

Under the amendment proposed by the hon. gentleman, we are simply stultifying ourselves. Either this legislation is good or it is not; either it is within our right to pass it or it is not. If this legislation is good, let us have the courage to pass it. If it is our right to pass it, let us take the responsibility of it, and not say that we are passing legislation but that it is sham legislation, which will not come into force until all the provinces have adopted it. In respect to the argument used by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), that it is simply a matter of politeness, I would ask if we are here to pass laws for politeness ? Let parliament take the responsibility of saying for the first time that we have the right to legislate upon the medical profession ; and next year we will be called upon to legislate upon the legal profession, and the next year after we will be called upon to legislate upon other professions, and we will be encroaching upon provincial rights.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) if there is not a provision in the British North America Act under which we might legislate in regard to the provinces and their laws, and whether this legislation might not come in under that section ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has raised that argument. Section 94 of the British North America Act says :

> Notwithstanding anything in this Act, the parliament of Canada may make provision for the uniformity of all or any of the laws relative to property and civil rights in Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and of the procedure of all or any of the courts in those three provinces, and from and after the passing of any Act in that behalf, the power of the parliament of Canada to make laws in relation to any matter comprised in any such Act shall, notwithstanding anything in this Act, be unrestricted ; but any Act of the parliament of Canada making provision for such uniformity shall not have effect in any province unless and until it is adopted and enacted as law by the legislature thereof.

By this clause the right was given to this parliament to legislate as far as the three English speaking provinces are concerned, provided it was ratified afterwards by the parliaments of these provinces. Now, in the amendment which has been accepted by the hon. member (Mr. Roddick), the spirit of this clause, which does not touch the province of Quebec, is made applicable to legislation which invades practically the rights of Quebec out of the fundamental provinces in the Dominion. Therefore this is an abuse of this clause of the British North America Act, which was introduced for the protection of the province of Quebec, and it is used against the will of the majority of the medical men of that province. It may be said that the province of Quebec has the right to resist this legislation through its provincial parliament, but I say that we should not put any provincial parliament in that position. I presume that this amendment has been suggested by the government in order to smooth differences of opinion; in order to prevent any province from resenting this legislation. Well, either the people of the province of Quebec are in favour of this, or they are not. If they are in favour of it, why not adopt the legislation as it was ? and if they are not in favour of it, and if this amendment has been proposed in order to smooth their feelings, what will be the result ? Most probably the other provinces will ratify this legislation and you will put the legislature of the province of Quebec in the unfortunate position of forcing it to resist legislation that has been adopted, first by the federal parliament and then by the other provinces. The resentment which may be entertained in the other provinces will certainly be greater than it would be if this government had the courage to say that, we cannot adopt this legislation because it is against the spirit of the constitution. That is the view I take of this matter, and that is why I oppose the third reading of this Bill. I repeat that we should be careful to keep our legislation on the right track, so far as the autonomy of the provinces is concerned. If any of the provincial parliaments proposed to encroach on the powers of this federal parliament, I would say : Let us stand by the federal power and resist the province in spite of whatever unpopularity we may be subject to in a particular province. But, let us also stand by the provinces when they are within the constitution, and not invade their power. If we pass any such legislation as this we are opening the door to friction between the provincial and federal authorities, and we are not discharging our duty to the people of this country. Whatever may be the practical advantage of any such legislation, we must learn to make sacrifices so as to maintain the spirit of our constitution. This Bill is against the spirit of our constitution, and it is for that reason that I shall vote against it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) has told this House on former occasions, that he did not believe much in logic, and he has given us an example to-night which indicates in the strongest possible manner the truth of that assertion. The hon. gentleman says that the provincial parliaments should not be called upon to confer any rights upon a body constituted by this parliament, and that the line of division between the federal parliament and the provincial parliaments must be kept absolutely separate and distinct. I suppose that if what my hon. friend has argued is correct, exactly the converse must be true ; and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bourassa) supported by his vote a Bill introduced by the govern-

ment which appointed provincial officers as the persons who should regulate the electoral lists under which members are returned to this parliament. Does not my hon. friend see that if he supports legislation of that kind, it is just as competent for a provincial legislature to confer upon a body constituted by this parliament power to make regulations with respect to matters under provincial control. Does my hon. friend admit that or does he not ?

Mr. BOURASSA. Does the hon. gentleman refer to the Franchise Act ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do.

Mr. BOURASSA. The great difference is that by the Franchise Act we did not give the provinces the right to legislate as to our franchise. We chose out of our own free will to use the provincial lists, and if to-morrow we want to adopt a federal franchise we can do so. If a provincial government had enacted—and it would be absurd for them to do so—that certain lists should be used for federal purposes, then I would be opposed to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand the distinction that the hon. gentleman has made. This parliament with the assent of the hon. gentleman conferred upon provincial officers, appointed under provincial laws, the power to select the persons who are to elect members to this parliament; a right which is absolutely possessed by this parliament in the first instance. This parliament delegated that duty to provincial officers, and it enacted it in such a way that provincial legislation regulating the electorate from time to time shall absolutely apply to the electorate who are to return members to the House of Commons. The hon. gentleman was not shocked by the delegation in that case, nor is he shocked every day in this House when we delegate power to the Governor in Council ; nor is he shocked when provincial legislatures delegate their powers to municipal councils. But he conjures up a nightmare in this case because the effect of this Bill is to enable provincial legislatures to confer upon a council constituted by this parliament, power to make regulations respecting the medical profession in the different provinces. That is my hon. friend's logic. Does he or does he not think, that this parliament has the power to delegate certain powers to the Governor in Council ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In this case you advise the legislature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what way do we advise the legislature ? Even if it were so, is there anything in the British North America Act that says we should not advise the legislature ? How do we advise any more in this case than when we delegate most important powers to the Governor in Council ? Does not the hon. gentleman know that provincial legislatures confer every day upon the Lieutenant Governor in Council and upon municipal councils, power to make certain regulations which when once made have the force of law. All that this Bill amounts to is, that with the consent of the provincial legislatures, and by their enactment, a council shall be constituted which when it is once constituted shall have the power to make certain regulations with regard to the practice of the medical profession in the provinces. How can it be said that there is the slightest interference with provincial rights in this ? If you want an illustration of the carrying out of this very principle, look at the Canada Temperance Act, which is an example of the delegation of power of the most extraordinary character. We pass a law here and we say that it shall not go into effect until voted upon by the people of a particular locality. Examples of legislation of this character are so frequent that if my hon. friend (Mr. Bourassa) had only stopped to think for five minutes before he made his speech——

Mr. BOURASSA. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me. The hon. gentleman is now arguing about the delegation of powers which we have the right to recall. But in the present case it is a power that we are taking from the provinces. The hon. gentleman has just stated that the provinces cannot legislate on such matters as we legislate upon. Suppose this Bill is passed by this House and is afterwards adopted by the provincial legislatures, does he say that the provincial legislatures afterwards could amend this Bill in any way, or repeal any part of the power we are taking in passing it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think that the studies of my hon. friend in constitutional law would have taught him that any legislature which has power to pass an Act has power also to repeal it.

Mr. BOURASSA. Exactly. We have the power to repeal this Act, the provinces have not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The provinces have the right to repeal any Act they have once passed, and no provision passed by this parliament could take away from any provincial legislature that power for a single instant. If my hon. friend possessed the most elementary knowledge, as I am sure he does possess a very great knowledge of constitutional law, he would understand that that is the case. If we desired by the most emphatic words in the world to override the right of a provincial legislature to repeal an Act it once passed, we could not do it. A moment's reflection would have shown my hon. friend that that is an elementary principle of constitutional law. In the face of that, how can it be contended that this Bill is an invasion of the rights of the provincial legislatures ? If I thought

it was, I would be the first to oppose it. The scheme, in a few words, is that this parliament, being the only legislative body that has the power to do so, shall create a council to regulate the medical profession in Canada. Under the amendment proposed by the mover of the Bill to-night, that council can only be constituted by the assent of every province of Canada. Therefore every province of Canada has the most absolute and complete control over this council, because any province can prevent it being constituted, or can make any regulations or qualifications with regard to it that it desires. It can do that just as freely after this Bill passes as it could before. My hon. friend hinted at some dark scheme on the part of the mover of the Bill to begin an invasion of provincial rights, or spoke as if the Bill might be a mere cover for some attempt to invade provincial rights in the future. The scheme is one which I would have thought would have provoked the support of a gentleman of the independence and broad-mindedness of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. He has told us himself that he is very independent in all these matters, and we are bound to believe him. In fact, I think he sometimes hints vaguely that he is the only really independent gentleman in this House, with possibly one or two exceptions—that every other member of the House is more or less bound up by some ties or mysterious influences which prevent him following the dictates of his conscience; but my hon. friend always claims for himself that he is wholly independent of all such influences. That being the case, I would have supposed that my hon. friend would have looked at this Bill from this standpoint, that it was right that medical men in Canada—those of the great province from which he comes as well as those of the province of which I come—should have something more than a provincial status; that they should stand before the world as men qualified to practice all over Canada; that, having that status, they should have rights conceded to them all over the world, which, in some instances at least, they do not possess at the present time. Looking at the question from that standpoint, will not my hon. friend, who is fair in regard to all these matters, come to the conclusion that it is in the interest of the medical men of his own province as well as the medical men of every other province of Canada, that this object should be attained, and that the medical profession should not in the future have a mere provincial status, but that, while preserving to their own province the rights I have mentioned, they should have the status of Canadian medical men rather than the status of mere provincial practitioners, having no rights outside of their own province? If my hon. friend looks at the matter with his usual fairness, and excludes from his mind this bogy of an attack on provincial rights, he will really come to the conclusion that this Bill merits his support. I trust that my hon. friend will on reconsideration give it his support, and that it will pass unanimously.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I took occasion of the second reading of this Bill, some time ago, to formulate a few objections against this Bill, and I deem it my duty to enter once more my protest against this measure being passed into law.

It is agreed on all hands that, under our constitution, provincial legislatures are not given very extensive powers. Among the students of constitutional law, there is a consensus of opinion that the provinces should have wider powers. That is one of the reasons why all those who belong to the minority in this country, all those in favour of whom, after all, this constitution was framed and established, should make it a point to oppose any encroachment on the rights of the provinces by this parliament. I may be told, and we have heard it stated on the floor of this House, that this parliament has the power to incorporate companies for the Dominion at large. I quite agree that parliament has such a power, but what I cannot admit is that parliament, as is contended by some hon. gentlemen, has the right to control medical education. Still, I am free to say that if the object of this Bill were to incorporate the medical bodies of the Dominion with a view to keeping up the standard of medical education, or for purposes of mutual assistance, I would be the first man in this House to vote in favour of this legislation. But what is the object aimed at by the promoter of this Bill? This object is clearly set forth in section 4, which reads as follows:

(a) The establishment of a qualification in medicine, such that the holders thereof shall be acceptable and empowered to practice in all the provinces of Canada;

(b) The establishment of a register for Canada of medical practitioners and students, and the publication and revision from time to time of such register;

(c) The determination and fixing of the qualifications and conditions necessary for registration, including the courses of study to be pursued, the examinations to be undergone, and generally the requisites for registration;

(d) The establishment and maintenance of a board of examiners for the examination of such persons and for the granting of certificates of qualification;

(e) The establishment of such a status of the medical profession in Canada as shall ensure recognition thereof in the United Kingdom and enable Canadian practitioners to acquire the right of registration under the Acts of the Imperial Parliament known as the 'Medical Acts.'

The object referred to in the last subsection seems reasonable enough. But if you take the trouble to examine subsection 10, you will find that the council is empowered to inquire into:

(i) The qualifications to be required from all persons desirous of being registered, either as practitioners or students, under the authority of this Act, including the establishment, maintenance and effective conduct of examinations for ascertaining whether such persons possess the qualifications required ; the number, nature, times and modes of such examinations.

What would the practical result of this legislation be, were it passed into law ? When this Bill is once passed and accepted by the provincial legislatures, the medical profession will come under the control of the Dominion parliament. When the provinces have adopted this Bill, they will be dispossessed of the exercise of a right which they are now enjoying. As I said a little while ago, the subject-matter of this Bill is not within the purview of the powers of this parliament. The provincial legislatures having primary jurisdiction over educational matters and civil rights, we have no right to legislate here on these matters.

That the right to practice medicine is a civil right, and not a political right, is beyond dispute. Now, that is a subject-matter which is clearly beyond the jurisdiction of this parliament. And I say without any hesitation that, when the hon. gentlemen from the province of Quebec have an opportunity to oppose such a legislation, they would prove false to their duty should they remain silent and fail to resist any encroachment on provincial autonomy.

This Bill, we are told, shall have no force, shall not become operative, until all the provinces have concurred, that is to say, until all the provinces of the Dominion, acting through their legislatures, shall have ratified this legislation. But we all know what a pressure will be brought to bear upon such provinces as may decline to adopt this legislation ; and it will be urged that the other provinces have taken it up and made it their own. They know that the province of Quebec is large-hearted ; that it was not like to lag in the rear ; and who would venture to say that one day it will not accept and ratify that legislation ? It is on record that parliaments have sold their country ; and it would be no matter of surprise that the Quebec legislature should surrender one of its rights.

Were I satisfied that this parliament is dealing with a subject-matter which properly comes within its jurisdiction, I would be quite ready to accept it.

It is urged that the medical profession is going to benefit by this Bill. I quite agree that it would be conducive to the good of the medical bodies, were graduates in medicine to receive a qualification to practice in more than one of the provinces. But the present state of things may be remedied by other means than the one suggested here. It has not been shown that such a remedy as the one I am going to suggest would not apply to the medical profession. For instance, what has been done for the legal profession would also apply to the medical profession. There exists between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec an understanding under which barristers from one or the other province are allowed to practice their profession in those provinces, upon payment of the usual fee. Such a reciprocity has been brought about without any interference from the Dominion parliament. The conditions, however, were quite different. But the bars of Quebec and Ontario have come to an understanding, after having satisfied themselves that such reciprocity would be conducive to their mutual interests. For instance, not long ago the solicitor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was admitted to the bar of the province of Quebec, without having had to pass any examination, and upon payment of the customary fee. The members of the legal profession did not come before this parliament to ask for the passage of such a legislation as is now under discussion.

Should the medical practitioners in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec come to a similar understanding, it could certainly be brought about without being sanctioned by this parliament.

On these several grounds, I move that this Bill be not read now, but this day six months.

Mr. FLINT. It must be very gratifying to the promoter of this Bill to realize that so far the argument against the adoption of this measure has only been of a constitutional or legal character. I do not see that any argument has been made with regard to this Bill that is detrimental to the practice of the profession. Some hon. gentlemen seem to fear that the medical profession will suffer if this Bill should come into operation. Legal difficulties have operated upon their minds and created the fear that the measure could not be satisfactorily put into force. They have raised the question of provincial rights, I think, with perhaps rather undue warmth, considering the amendment proposed, and which appears to be favourably received by the House. Certainly, while we all agree that provincial rights are of great importance and that we should be very careful not to infringe upon these rights by any legislation, such as might perhaps require the intervention of the courts to decide as to whether the law we might pass were ultra or intra vires, it does seem to me that there may be almost too much of a fetish made of provincial rights. The amendment does away with the last vestage of complaint on that ground. There surely can be no objection to the provinces willingly giving up any vestige of a right they may have for the general benefit of the whole community. This was recognized by the British North America Act in one particular, though not as fully perhaps as would be desirable. But at any rate the reasonableness of such a course has been

recognized by the British North America Act. The medical profession is in many ways the most liberal of all the professions. It is one, the practice of which is not at all bounded by provincial lines. The practice of medicine involves the whole science of life in all its most minute ramifications, and is therefore not of a provincial or even of a Dominion character, but rather of an international nature, and if by any wise legislation this parliament can assist in raising the medical profession beyond provincial limits and even introduce international features into medical education and practice, I believe that we will be advancing along the lines of modern progress. The idea that a certain amount of protection should be thrown around the medical profession of each province will not stand, I think, careful examination. This Bill, if passed by this House, will not go into full operation for quite a period of time, because it must be considered and adopted by the various provincial legislatures before it can become effective, and there must consequently be negotiations between the promoters of the Bill and the various provincial medical bodies in order to bring about such provincial action. But I believe that once this Bill is adopted by this parliament the time will no doubt come when the practice and study of the medical profession will be placed upon a much higher basis than at present. It is not at all probable that the Dominion government will ever be called on to contribute financially towards medical instruction, but when this council is once established and the different provinces give up their provincial privileges in the matter of medical education and practice, it is quite possible that some great scientists and philanthropists in the future will be induced to contribute largely of their means to the promotion of medical and scientific education, and the council incorporated by this Bill will be in a position to receive gifts from such sources and utilize them for the promotion of higher scientific instruction. We know what is taking place in the neighbouring republic, owing to the munificence of Mr. Carnegie, who has devoted $10,000,000 for the benefit of science, and has established, with the aid of Congress, a board of trustees to supervise the expenditure of that fund. No doubt there were some timid souls in the American Congress who feared that state rights might possibly be violated by congress incorporating a board of trustees to administer this fund, but I have no doubt that such advocates of state rights have by this time discovered that their fears were groundless. It is possible that this measure will lead to something of that kind being done in Canada in the future. At any rate I believe that this amendment, approved, if not introduced, by the mover of the Bill, will remove all objections of this kind, and that this measure, when carried into operation, will be a means of placing the medical profession of this country upon a higher and broader basis than it has hitherto occupied. It must be a matter of regret always to the able physicians of the various provinces who have made their mark in the profession, that they cannot move from one province to another to practice their art when circumstances require them to do so, and I believe that this Bill when adopted will be a powerful lever towards raising the medical profession as high as a Dominion institution as it stands to-day as a provincial institution. I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that no body of men stands higher in the various provinces than the medical men. They are devoted to their profession and all their ambitions are for the advancement of that profession, and when the distinguished medical men of the various provinces are called to this council, I have no doubt that the rising medical men of the country will be induced to take a higher course and prosecute their studies in Europe where they can enjoy all the advantages given by the highest universities in the world, and the result will be a higher standard for the medical profession of the Dominion as a whole, which will place it on a par with that same profession in such countries as Germany, England and France. Let me add that the promoter of the Bill deserves well of the body to which he belongs and of which he is so distinguished an ornament, for the persistence he has shown in pressing this measure forward to its present stage.

The PRIME MINISTER. In view of certain remarks made a moment ago by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa), I think I ought to say to the House that he is labouring under a false impression when he thinks that the government have adopted this Bill. The government have done nothing of the kind. It is a public Bill, introduced by a private member, and the government have no policy with regard to it. But I may say that after having given a good deal of study to the matter, I have come to the conclusion that this is a measure which ought to be adopted. When its second reading was moved I noticed an objection made by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers), to the effect that it was an infringement of provincial rights and therefore unconstitutional. I gave that point some attention and it appears to me that, to remove this objection, I need only refer to section three which provides

3. The persons from time to time appointed or elected, or otherwise being, under the provisions of this Act, members of the Medical Council of Canada, are hereby constituted a corporation under the name of 'The Medical Council of Canada,' hereinafter called 'the council.'

This suffices to show that we have jurisdiction in the matter and can pass the Bill.

Therefore, the technical objection made by several of my hon. friends behind me that this measure is beyond the power of this parliament and belongs exclusively to the provinces, cannot stand. But the real objection, which was not expressed but ought to have been taken, and which to some extent has been advanced by hon. members, is that it deals with a class of subjects which come exclusively within the jurisdiction of the local legislature. The question therefore resolves itself into whether it is expedient for us or not to pass this proposed legislation, which certainly we have the technical right to do. My hon. friend says the whole question is not whether we have the technical right or not, but whether it is expedient to pass a Bill of this kind, even though we should have the power to do so, since it deals with a class of subjects which properly come within the powers of the provincial legislature.

I noticed the argument, the very strong argument, of my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). He said that we were removing the medical students from the control of the provinces and bringing them under the control of a corporation created by this parliament. This is a very fair question for debate. But, after all the only question is whether it is wise or unwise to pass such a measure as this. When the Bill was introduced, the point raised by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville might properly have been taken; and, if the Bill had remained as it was when introduced, I would have supported the argument of my hon. friend and would have said that we should not interfere with the status of the medical students and with the rights properly belonging to the provinces. But, with the Bill as it is now, with the amendments which have been made declaring in so many words that this Bill, shall not come into effect until it has been ratified by all the provinces, how can that contention be maintained? I am a staunch supporter of provincial rights, as is my hon. friend from Labelle. But I would be safe in saying that the provinces would never be interfered with if the Bills passed by this parliament had a rider attached to them that they must be ratified by the provinces. The hon. member for Labelle says that we are stultifying ourselves by passing a measure of this kind, by passing a law and leaving it inoperative until it is ratified by the provinces. In my estimation —and surely it must be clear to my hon. friend—there is no stultification of ourselves whatever. We have power to do a certain thing, but we say: We will not use that power absolutely, we will enact a law which we think ought to be passed, but will leave it to the provinces themselves to say whether they will be bound by it or not. But my hon. friend from Labelle evidently went further. Evidently he has something in his mind, which, knowing him as I do, did not surprise me. He says: This is the first step in the invasion of provincial rights in a more or less disguised way; suppose that next year legislation of this kind is introduced to incorporate lawyers of the Dominion. If any one were to introduce legislation of that kind, I would vote against it. I virtually gave the reason for that a moment ago when I said the question was whether it was wise or unwise to pass this Bill. I think it would be unwise to pass such a Bill relating to the bars of the several provinces. And the reason is obvious. The laws of the different provinces are different. There are no two provinces with the same laws. Therefore, it would not conduce to any good object to unite the bars which are to administer the laws. But the laws of the medical profession are the same everywhere. There is no difference in the teaching of medicine and the practice of the profession—and a noble profession it is—between one province and another. Therefore, I think it is conducive to the interest of mankind to have as few as possible of these corporate bodies which have laws against one another. Leaving the technical and theoretical question aside, my hon. friend knows that in this very city of Ottawa there is a rivalry between the practitioner in Hull and the practitioner in Ottawa. The man having a certificate from Ontario would not dare to go to the assistance of a man in Quebec, nor would one having a certificate from Quebec give advice to an unfortunate invalid in Ontario. If argument is needed to justify such a measure as this, I think it can be furnished by the contemplation of such a case—a case that is not merely hypothetical, but a matter of everyday reality. I am moved in this matter by considerations of the expediency of the Bill. But I would not support it without the amendment that has been made providing that the Bill shall come into effect only with the concurrence of the provinces. If even one province does not give its concurrence, then my hon. friend the promoter of the Bill says, the law shall remain inoperative. Under the circumstances, it appears to me that the danger which some of my hon. friends think they see does not really exist.

Moreover, I am influenced by another consideration, which I give to my friends and to the House at large. Aside from other considerations, I do not hesitate to say, as a member from the province of Quebec, that, in my opinion, we would be warranted in supporting the Bill by the fact that there is no province that would profit so much by this measure as the province of Quebec. In my province we furnish a larger proportion of professional men than other provinces. There are French groups in all the provinces of the Dominion, and young men educated in the province of Quebec would be able, if this measure were in force to practice their profession amongst those groups. I do

not care very much—and in this I share the view of my hon. friend from Labelle—for reciprocity with other countries, but I care a great deal for reciprocity among the provinces of the Dominion. This argument, apart from all others, in my opinion, would be enough to warrant members of the House, and especially those from the province of Quebec, in supporting this Bill.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It would not be necessary for me to add anything to what the right hon. gentleman (Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said, were it not for one statement made by my hon. friend from Labelle. The hon. gentleman said : If we wish to have peace in this country, let us respect each others rights. Well, I might add : If we wish to have peace in this country, for God's sake let us try to know each other better. I do not see what harm can come from scientific meetings among the members of the medical profession in this country. We do not take anything from the provinces by the Bill now under consideration, but simply provide machinery by which the provinces can, if they wish, form a body of medical men. If all the provinces do not agree, this body cannot be formed. My own opinion is that the province of Quebec will cheerfully agree to the Bill. I have reason to know that medical men of the highest standing in the city of Monreal—I speak of men of my own race—are in favour of this Bill, I am for the rights of the provinces, but I am also for the broader rights of this Dominion. There is no reason why Canadians should not work together wherever they can do so without invading each other's rights; and in this case, I do not think there is any invasion of rights or any danger of it. We must not exaggerate the rights of the provinces. My hon. friend from Labelle, who is a student of history, does not forget, I am sure, that it was the exaggeration of state rights in the United States which created their trouble. We must not exaggerate provincial rights. We are bound, after all, to live together here ; let us not be afraid, then, to meet each other face to face, especially on the ground of science. A French Canadian physician is quite able to hold his own against any physician of any other race. I, for one, am not afraid of this Bill, far from it. As the Prime Minister has remarked, when this Bill has gone into force, you will see French Canadian doctors practising their profession in the other provinces more freely than they are doing now.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill is being opposed by a certain number of gentlemen on this side of the House on the ground that it constitutes an infringement of what they call provincial rights. Now, I am one of those who do not believe in the cry of wolf, that provincial rights are being invaded. I think we ought to resist any attempt to invade them; but I certainly do not think that we ought to cry wolf when the wolf is not in sight. I think that remark applies to the present case. There is absolutely no attempt to invade provincial rights by this Bill; and I am sure if my hon. friends, instead of reading only one clause of the Bill had read it in its entirety and had construed each clause by the others, they would have perceived that this Bill is nothing more or less than an enactment by this parliament that constitutes an invitation to the provincial legislatures to co-operate with us fully to occupy a ground that neither alone can occupy completely. Now, my hon. friends talk of provincial legislatures having exclusive rights. The provincial legislatures and the federal parliament have exclusive rights, but there is a common ground that both can occupy. There is no question better settled in this country by those who have studied law, than that any provincial legislature may occupy a ground of legislation until such time as the Dominion parliament steps in and takes the place of the provincial legislature. Take the case of insolvency legislation, for instance. The point was settled beyond dispute by the Imperial Privy Council that the Ontario legislature had the right to legislate with respect to bankruptcy; but the Privy Council said : You have right to legislate with respect to bankruptcy until such times as the ground is taken up by the federal parliament ; only until then. So there is a common ground that both the legislature and the parliament may occupy.

Something was said about legislation by delegation. Now, about the time that the case of the Queen and Hodges was decided it is undoubted that there was some difference of opinion among the judges of this country as to whether a body could legislate by delegation. But there never was a time when there was any doubt that you could legislate by reference. Take a case that comes up here every day, a case well known to all, the jury system in a province. You have in the Criminal Code a clause which declares that the provincial jury system shall be applicable to criminal cases. If there is one thing we have a right to do, it is to legislate here with respect to criminal procedure. But we adopt provincial legislation with respect to the jury system and we make it our own. That is what is called legislation by reference, that is not legislation by delegation. Legislation by delegation is that which the leader of the opposition spoke of a moment ago, for instance, that with respect to municipalities. However, I do not propose to discuss this at great length, because it is a very easy matter to make a cheap display of knowledge in a matter of this sort.

When this Bill first came up the Department of Justice examined it closely to see

whether there was any attempt to encroach upon provincial rights, or whether the Bill was inter vires of the power of this parliament. As this is a matter of importance, and as no doubt an attempt will be made to create the impression that we are endeavouring to encroach on provincial rights, if the House will bear with me, I will state the conclusion I formed at the time the Bill came to the Department of Justice. If you will look at it carefully you will see that the whole scheme of the Bill is after all a scheme to incorporate a medical council for Canada, composed of representatives of the several provinces and universities, with power to issue certificates of medical qualification. Now, that is a general scheme. No effect is attached to these certificates by the Bill, but the object of the council is to have these qualifications recognized by the provinces to as to establish ultimately uniformity of qualification, and a general status for the profession. The attainment of this object is one of the purposes expressly stated in section 4. I draw attention to that section, it is one of the most important in the whole Bill. It is stated to be :

> The enactment, with the consent and at the instance of the medical councils of the various provinces of Canada, of such provincial legislation as is necessary to supplement the provisions of this Act, and to effect the foregoing purposes.

So you see this Bill has no effect at all until such times as this medical council—which you undoubtedly have a right to create—gets the powers that have to be conferred upon it by the provincial legislatures. It must be borne in mind that the provincial medical council continues to exist, and continues to issue certificates, as it does to-day, and it is only those who are looking for a broader ideal for that profession that will come under the operation of this medical council and get a certificate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Permit me to suggest, what I forgot to mention a moment ago, that in my own province, at least the legislature confers upon the medical council of the province the right to legislate, an illustration of the very thing which is attempted by this Bill, that is, legislation by reference.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. In addition to that, you have the provision in the section that has been amended to-night, which practically declares that this Bill shall have no force, shall not become operative, until such times as all the provinces of the Dominion have concurred, that is to say, until all the provinces of the Dominion, acting through their legislatures, shall have adopted this legislation, taken it up and adopted it and made it their own. Now, if we make this legislation dependent upon the action of the provincial legislatures, where is the encroachment on provincial rights ?

An attempt was made a moment ago to make a comparison between this legislation and the provision of the British North America Act, which has reference to uniformity of laws; and my hon. friend confused the matter by saying that the British North America Act provided for the unification of the bar. There is no reference of that sort in the British North America Act, there is no reference to the bar. But in this section 94, which is a special section, provision is made for a departure from the whole scheme of the British North America Act. The whole scheme of the British North America Act is that the legislature shall have exclusive control over laws affecting property and civil rights in the province. But section 94, which is a departure from that, provides that with respect to some of the provinces there can be uniformity of law. But that is not what we are attempting to do here at all. Now, to conclude what I said a moment ago, I will read the opinion I gave at the time the Bill came to the department for examination :

> The Bill is in effect a proposal carefully thought out constituting nothing more than an invitation to the provinces to legislate to adopt the qualifications to be established by the Dominion council. It is quite optional with each of the provinces whether it will accept this invitation or not, so long as any province does not legislate in the manner necessary to supplement the provisions of this Bill it cannot be in any wise affected by the Bill. It is certain that the proposal, in order to have any effective result as to any province requires joint legislation by the Dominion and the province. The Bill is an attempt perfectly constitutional and legal, I think, to give effect to a scheme which owing to what may be termed the defects of the federal system cannot come into operation except by joint action.

Mr. BELCOURT. I hope the House will pardon me if I trespass at this late hour by taking up a few moments in discussing one aspect of the Bill which has not been referred to at any great length before. Whilst I am prepared to support the Bill on the general and broad grounds so well given to the House by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and other hon. gentlemen who followed him, and whilst I agree entirely with those grounds as well as with the ground that this Bill is absolutely constitutional and within the power of this House to enact, I want to point out to some of my hon. friends from the province of Quebec that in looking at this question they are doing it exclusively from the point of view of some of the French Canadians of that province. I want to look at it from the point of view of the French Canadians in the province of Ontario, for whom I think I have some warrant to speak, as I am one of the two representatives of the French Canadians in the province of Ontario. I think I voice

the feeling of the 250,000 French Canadians in the province of Ontario, when I say that they are desirous of having medical men of their own tongue to minister to their wants in case of illness, and that this Bill is going to confer a great boon upon them. Much difficulty has been experienced in the past on many occasions in securing the aid of such medical men in the city of Ottawa, and the difficulty has not been confined to the city of Ottawa. It has been experienced all along the Ottawa river, and all along the boundary line between the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario. People living on either side of the boundary line have not been able to secure the services of medical gentlemen living on the opposite side. To my own knowledge for several years past a number of medical men have come to Ottawa from the province of Quebec with the intention of practising their profession. Because they were not sufficiently familiar with the English language they have found difficulty in passing the examination necessary before they are permitted to practice in this province, and these gentlemen after one or two unsuccessful attempts to pass this examination have gone back to the province of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is not a compliment. All the members of the medical profession in the province of Quebec speak both languages.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux). I may say that there are many who are able to speak both languages who would find difficulty in undergoing a technical examination in English. I do not think that in saying that I cast any reflection upon the medical gentlemen of the province of Quebec; or upon their scientific or literary attainments. The number of French Canadian doctors in the province of Ontario is altogether inadequate to the wants of the French Canadians who live in this province. In view of that fact, I hope that this Bill will be adopted

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain why I am compelled, as I am compelled, to vote in favour of the amendment. I regret exceedingly if the vote which I feel obliged to give on this occasion should be interpreted as being in any way hostile to any well-directed movement made in this country in favour of broadening our Canadianism. I appreciated very much the remarks made by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and by his colleagues, and I appreciate the motive of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Roddick). Referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) who spoke for the inhabitants of one end of the province of Quebec and also of the adjoining portion of the province of Ontario, I may say that I represent a constituency situated at the other end of the province of Quebec, which occupies towards the province of New Brunswick the same position that this portion of the province of Quebec occupies towards Ontario. I have come to the conclusion that under the circumstances we have not had produced either in this House, or before the special committee that was charged with the consideration of this Bill, an expression of opinion from the medical profession of the province of Quebec. I hold in my hand a memoir which was addressed to parliament by La Société Médicale de Quebec in which they raise very serious objections to this Bill, and in which they state that through a misunderstanding they were unable to have their views placed before the committee. They very reasonably ask that this Bill be deferred until next session for further consideration. If the object to be attained is one to bring together all the medical men from the various provinces, I think that nothing should be done which would be of a nature to cause any friction between the various provinces. I have no difficulty in understanding that the English provinces of the Dominion will immediately accept this Bill, but the position of the province of Quebec is very different from that of the English provinces. Quebec has an educational system of its own. Its universities guide its classical studies. This medical council will, should this Act go into force and be ratified as it may be by the provincial legislature, have the power to control the curriculum of studies in the various educational institutions in Quebec.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Absolutely none.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). I understand the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) to say absolutely none; but subsection (c) , clause 4, says that one of the purposes of the council is :

> The determination and fixing of the qualifications and conditions necessary for registration, including the courses of studies to be pursued, the examinations to be undergone, and generally the requisites for registration.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Registration, where ?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Under the authority of this medical council.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Exactly.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). But here is the position in which this matter will stand twelve months hence if this Bill shall go through the House unopposed to-night and which the English provinces will accept : Will the province of Quebec be placed at the bar of public opinion in this Dominion, because, in trying to protect its own educational interests, it refuses to accept this law ? I do not say it will, but I do not think it is fair to the French province of this Dominion to put it in that

position. Like every other member of this House, I would like to see science make more rapid progress even than the wonderful strides it has made lately, but I do not wish this to be done at the expense of the good understanding and good feeling which should prevail between the various provinces of this Dominion. We have the example of the neighbouring states. In the neigbouring states no federal authority has attempted to legislate in the matter of medical diplomas. That power rests exclusively with each state which is one of the rights now enjoyed by the provinces.

Mr. RODDICK. They are about arranging a scheme similar to ours, providing for a national council.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Well, the Americans are a very progressive people. If they have reached an arrangement of that kind in the United States, I do not say that it will not be reached in Canada, but my sincere conviction is that the immense majority of the medical practitioners in the province of Quebec are at this moment, and until they are convinced to the contrary, opposed to this Bill for the reason that the promoters have gone about it in the wrong way. They are trying to deal by federal authority with the question of education which is one of the sacred rights of the provinces, and for that reason, I consider it is my duty to vote in favour of the amendment.

House divided on the amendment.

YEAS :

Messieurs

Angers,	Gauvreau,
Bazinet,	Lavergne,
Bernier,	Lemieux,
Bourassa,	Malouin,
Bourbonnais,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Bureau,	Prefontaine,
Demers (Lévis).	Ross (Rimouski),
Demers (St. John),	Tobin.—16.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Loy,
Belcourt,	Mackie,
Bell,	MacLaren (Perth),
Blain,	McEwen,
Borden (Halifax),	McGowan,
Boyd,	McGugan,
Bruce,	McIntosh,
Calvert,	McLennan,
Calvin,	Martineau,
Campbell,	Meigs,
Carroll,	Morin,
Champagne,	Mulock,
Christie,	Oliver,
Clarke,	Parmelee,
Cochrane,	Paterson,
Cowan,	Puttee,
Davis,	Reid (Restigouche),
Earle,	Richardson,
Erb,	Roche (Marquette),
Farquharson,	Roddick,
Fielding,	Rosamond,
Fitzpatrick,	Ross (Ontario),
Flint,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Fraser,	Scott,
Galliher,	Sifton,
Gibson,	Sproule,
Gilmour,	Stewart,
Gourley,	Sutherland (Essex),
Henderson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Talbot,
Hyman,	Tarte,
Ingram,	Taylor,
Johnston (Cape Breton)	Thompson,
Kaulbach,	Tolmie,
Lancaster,	Tolton,
Lang,	Turgeon,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wade,
Logan,	Wilson.—76.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Securities Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

On motion of the Prime Minister, House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 9, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved :

That the provisions of rule 60 requiring twenty-four hours' notice of private Bills originating in the Senate before being considered by the committee of this House to which they are referred, be suspended for the remainder of the session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax) What is the particular reason for this ?

Mr. FLINT. A number of Bills usually come from the Senate at a late stage of the session, and if such a motion as this is not adopted, they cannot be considered at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty is that persons who may desire to be heard with regard to these Bills will have no opportunity of presenting their views before the committee. A case of that kind was brought to my notice this morning. A Bill is on the Order paper for the second reading to-night, and if this motion be adopted, it will go to the committee to-morrow morning, and it would be impossible to arrange that persons who wish to be heard with regard to that Bill should be present. However great may be the desire to close the session on a particular day, that must not be carried so far as to prevent those who are interested in these matters from being heard. I am as much desirous as any other gentleman to have our labours terminated at an early date, but we cannot do

that at the expense of denying these people the right to be heard. I can only assent to the motion on the understanding that sufficient time will be given to parties interested to place their views before the committee.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). I do not think that any injustice will be done to any person if this motion passes. If representations were made that the parties interested in a Bill desired to be heard, no committee would think of pressing that Bill forward under this rule if injustice were to be done. We sometimes forget in dealing with business of a public nature that these Bills of incorporation and other private Bills are of the utmost importance to those interested in them, and that every opportunity should be given to have them passed before prorogation. This is an ordinary motion which is made near the end of each session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not much in favour of suspending the rules of the House, except for very urgent reasons. This motion seems to have been usual in the past, and I shall not object to it at present, provided it is distinctly understood that it shall only apply to Bills which are not opposed, and that Bills which are opposed shall be suspended for a sufficient length of time to give reasonable facilities to those who desire to be heard in opposition.

Mr. FLINT. There can be no objection to that understanding.

Motion was agreed to.

THE MILLER CREEK CONCESSION.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inform the government, particularly the hon. Minister of the Interior, that I have received a further communication from the miners whose telegram I read in the House the other day, asking for a reply to the message which was then sent, respecting the Miller Creek concession. I would like the hon. minister to state whether any answer has been sent, and generally what the position of the matter is.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot say now. As the hon. gentleman knows, yesterday was a holiday, and it was impossible to get the records, the clerks being all away. I will have the matter looked up, and I shall be able to state to the hon. member this afternoon just how it stands.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to mention to the hon. Prime Minister that I have received a communication from the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Smith), inquiring as to two returns which he states had not been brought down when he left the House a few day ago. One was an order for copies of all tenders for the carrying of the mail from Hamilton to Guelph. He states further, that early in the session he moved for copies of the contracts with steamship companies receiving subsidies from the government, and that these had not been brought down when he left the House. He is anxious to have them brought down as soon as possible.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I now lay on the Table a return to the order which the hon. gentleman is asking for.

REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 134) respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons.—The Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I wish to move a few small changes in the Bill. There are two slight changes in section 8, to improve the wording, and to make the meaning clear. I have been furnished with a copy of the amendments suggested by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). The most of these amendments I see no objection to, but there is one which involves a radical change in the principle of appointment, and which we would have to debate. I would suggest that we first go through the Act and make the clerical amendments I suggest, after having carefully examined and revised the clauses. Then we will go back and take up my hon. friend's amendments one after the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will be all right, it being understood that we have the same rights exactly as if we had not gone through the Bill.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved that section 18 be amended by inserting after the word 'Canada' in the forty-fifth line, 'or a cheque for that amount accepted by such bank.' This is to make the Act accord with the change in the law by which a certified cheque may be accepted as deposit.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The sections 40, 41 and 42 provide for a man being placed on the list on polling day after he has taken the oath. I may say that that principle was not in the North-west Territories Representation Act, but an amendment was subsequently passed providing that that might be done. I do not think that it will work satisfactorily in the territories. Hon. gentlemen will agree with me that in a place like the Yukon, where there is a

large floating population, it is desirable that the list should be final, and that upon election day an election should not be capable of being influenced by a large number of persons who might come to the poll and simply take the oath. The original North-west Territories Representation Act did not make any such provision, but provided that the lists should be final.

In 1899 an amendment was passed, at whose instance I do not know, authorizing persons to vote on taking the oath upon election day. I know that at the last general election that was found to be unsatisfactory. Persons were unaware whether they had the right to vote or not and where they could vote, and, generally there was a lack of certainty about what the rights of the voters are which always arises when the list is not final. Parliament has decided many times that whatever disadvantages there may be about having a voters' list, one of the great advantages is that when it is made up and fairly revised, it is final.

Mr. INGRAM. How long before election day would the voters' list be considered to be final ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The list is made up pending the election, after the proclamation is issued; and, when the voters' list is completed as provided in the Act, it is final.

Mr. INGRAM. How many days before the election does the final revision take place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No change can be made later than two days before the election, according to the present Bill as it is drawn. In that it follows the provisions of the old North-west Territories Act. That is not a matter to which I am wedded. If it is desired to make it longer, I would have no objection. But I am quite clear in my mind that it is not at all desirable that after the list is made up, and on election day, persons would have the right to vote simply on taking an affidavit. For, in that case, you might as well have no voters' list at all. I regret to say that we cannot always depend, as much as we would like to do, upon the indisposition of persons whom we should be able to trust, to take an oath that is not true. So I will ask the committee to amend these sections. I furnished my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), with a copy of the amendment to section 41, but, as it did not seem to be very well drawn I have changed it slightly. It is as follows :—

In case any person whose name is on the list refuses to take either of the said oaths, erasing lines shall be drawn through his name on the voters' list and the words 'refused to be sworn' written thereafter, and such person whose name is so erased shall not be permitted to vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It would be better to say 'shall not be permitted to vote at said election,' to make it perfectly clear that it does not apply to any subsequent election.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All right.

Amendment agreed to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that section 42 be amended to read as follows :—

Every voter shall be entitled to vote whose name is on the voters' list and has not been erased therefrom in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this Act.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) The territory covered by this Bill is a very large one. How is it possible for the returning officer to get correct lists if the final corrections in the list are made only two days before the election ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The system was worked out in the North-west Territories with especial reference to the fact that there is an enumerator for each polling division. The list is not necessarily sent back to the returning officer for the whole constituency and by him returned to the deputy returning officer, but is made up by the enumerator for each polling subdivision.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. I move to amend section 15, by adding the following subsection :

At least fifty copies of the said notice shall also be published by proclamation at least two weeks before the nomination posted up in conspicuous places throughout the territory at sufficient distances from each other to ensure notice to all parts of the said electoral district.

I do not know whether the hon. minister is willing to agree to the proposed amendment. If he is, I shall not waste the time of the House in discussing it, but if not, I will say a few words.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection to the principle at all. I would just say in reference to this amendment, that the Bill was carefully gone through by Mr. Ross, the commissioner, when he was here, and there were a number of changes made to suit the local circumstances of the case. Mr. Ross assured me that he was perfectly satisfied with it after he had revised it. The question of the publication of the notice, I think, was sufficiently considered, and he was satisfied that the provision was all right. The hon. gentleman will notice that there is a change made in the usual method, by providing that notice shall be published in the newspapers, and I presume that Mr. Ross thought that would be quite sufficient. I have not the least objection to the hon. gentleman's suggestion if he thinks it will be safer to have fifty notices posted up.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think it would be necessary, for the reason that without this

amendment nobody in the district would have any chance of knowing anything about the election going on, unless he saw the notice in one of the daily newspapers published at Dawson, or in the daily newspaper published at White Horse. If he did not see it in the newspaper published at White Horse or Dawson, he would have no opportunity of knowing that an election was about to be held, and I am inclined to think, in view of what the hon. minister has said, that he did not think of that fact, and as the hon. minister sees no objection to the amendment, I think it ought to be adopted.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think it is hardly safe to put in the words 'in all parts,' because the electoral district is the whole Yukon district. It would be absolutely impossible to get these notices into all parts, because there are inaccessible parts, but, the hon. gentleman might make it more general, and use these words : 'to ensure notice generally throughout the said electoral district.'

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). That would be better, because it would be a hard matter to have these notices distributed throughout that country.

Mr. LANCASTER. It might be a very hard matter, as the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Ross) suggests, but it would also be a very hard matter if the voters in these districts should not get notice. They are the people who elect the representatives. Of course, I do not think you would be bound to post notices in the wilderness.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Suppose you say : 'to ensure notice generally through the said electoral district'?

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). How would it do to say that these notices should be put up at the post offices ? Surely there would be a post office wherever there would be any number of people to vote. Suppose they were sent to the postmasters, and the postmasters were ordered to put them up.

Mr. LANCASTER. The objection to that would be that the postmasters might not do it. This is a distribution of responsibility which is very unsafe. I think that the hon. minister will agree with me that we are right in keeping the responsibility confined to as few people as possible, because the moment we distribute the responsibility we lose the benefit of the provision. The postmasters might not put them up, or they might not put them up in sufficient time to give the necessary notice. If the hon. minister thinks the language I propose a little too strong, I would suggest that we use these words : 'to ensure notice to all parts of the said electoral district where there are voters.' Wherever there are voters they should have a chance to know that an election is about to be held.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That will do ; but I want to make sure that we are not putting in a provision that would be impracticable. Suppose there were ten or twenty voters who had gone on an expedition 500 miles away to an inaccessible part, you would then run the risk of having the election declared void if it were brought before the court. What we should do is to use words that the court will give a construction to that we want it to give. We want the court, if this comes up for construction, to say that the notice must have been put up bona fide, so as to give what we all consider to be proper notice. We ought not to use any words which will compel the court to hold something which will be contrary to common sense. Suppose we say : 'At sufficient distance from each other to ensure general and sufficient notice throughout the said electoral district.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would do.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. With that, I will agree to the amendment. Perhaps we had better go through the amendments and discuss them before changing the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. Perhaps I had better insert these words suggested by the hon. minister : 'To ensure general and sufficient notice throughout the said electoral district.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think before changing the Bill we had better discuss the various amendments, and we can then come back and change the sections that we decide to amend.

Mr. LANCASTER. And I also propose to amend section 16, by adding the following words : 'and shall give the same notice on the day fixed for such later nomination in the newspapers, and by proclamation, as is required by section 15 of this Act.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is no objection to that ; but I am doubtful about the next one.

Mr. LANCASTER. I propose that section 17 shall be amended by striking out the word 'four,' in the third line of said section, and inserting instead thereof the word 'twenty-five.'

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think that it would be well to make it twenty-five. Twenty-five is the number provided for in the general Act. The hon. gentleman has not lived in a sparsely settled district. I have seen cases, for instance in Manitoba, where a candidate came very nearly not getting his nomination paper in because he had very great difficulty getting a sufficient number of voters to sign it on the last day. I remember once being very nearly not being able to get my own nomination paper signed. It was left until the last two or three days. I was away, and my agent was away, and it was very difficult. It was a rural district ; there were no towns in the district, and a man had to

drive from one farmer's house to another getting their signatures. It was a tremendous job, and took two days, and we just barely got the nomination paper signed in time. In a sparsely settled district the number should not be placed too high. I have no objection to having it placed at fifteen.

Mr. LANCASTER. We had better say 15. Four is so few that it is hardly a proper nomination.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Make it 15.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. I move to amend section 25 by adding at the end thereof :

Each polling division shall contain not less than 100 and not more than 200 qualified voters.

There is nothing in the Bill which says what shall be the number of voters in each polling place, and while I do not pretend to say that the number in the amendment is the most desirable number, yet I think a maximum and a minimum should be provided.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The idea is quite right, but I think that the minimum limit mentioned by the hon. gentleman is too high. There may be groups of miners at a distance where it would be necessary to have a polling place, and perhaps if the minimum were fixed at 25 it would meet the case. Of course in a closely settled place like Dawson city, the maximum might be put at 200 or even 300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) What is the minimum in the General Election Act ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. 200, but 400 or 500 could vote quite easily in a day in a polling place.

Mr. LANCASTER. Probably the minister has not been scrutineer so often as I have, and I know that it takes a good while to count 200 votes. If there is any delay because of objection to the voters, or because of swearing them, there is difficulty in polling even 200 in the one booth.

Mr. INGRAM. On general principles I am in favour of the maximum being 400 or 500 instead of 200, because it saves expense, and under the present law we have too many polling booths throughout the country. In Dawson city the maximum might be 300, but in other districts in such a country as that you might not have more than 15 who could vote at the one polling place, and I would certainly not be in favour of disfranchising them. Perhaps a provision could be made that in sparsely settled districts the minimum would be so much, and in thickly populated districts so much.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would be hardly desirable to hold a poll unless you have at least 25 voters. I have not been a scrutineer perhaps so often as my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster), but I have been around polling booths since I was 15 years old, and I have never yet seen a case where a voter could not vote if he was there to vote.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. It must be remembered that if there are 300 voters' names on the list, probably not more than 220 will vote.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will make the minimum 25, and the maximum 200.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. I beg to move to amend section 26 by adding the following subsection.

The proclamation of the granting of such poll shall be published for at least two weeks preceding the taking of such poll, in the newspapers and by posting up as provided by section 15 of this Act.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is all right.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. I beg to move to amend section 27 :

By inserting after the word 'election' in the third line, the words 'and in twelve other of the most conspicuous polling places in each polling division.'

There should be a posting up at some other places than at the polling booth.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Say four places instead of twelve.

Mr. LANCASTER. Very well.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. The amendments which I propose to move now, more or less stand or fall together. The principle of the Act without the amendment which I shall move is that the returning officer shall appoint the enumerator, and that enumerator shall make out the voters' list. I submit that we ought to try to get more in accordance with what has been found to work very well in the rest of the Dominion, and to have a more responsible person in charge of these lists. The returning officer in any other part of Canada takes the poll. He begins at the beginning of an election and his work is done at the end of the election, and he returns a certain person as elected. Here he is entrusted with a much wider duty, one that is performed in the rest of Canada by a judge ; that is, the duty of deciding who shall be qualified to vote at an election. I submit that we ought not to depart in the Yukon from the practice which we have found to be very satisfactory in the rest of Canada, of entrusting to a person like a judge, having the responsibility, the ability and the legal knowledge necessary, the control of the voters' lists. Therefore, I am moving to strike out section 28, which provides that the Governor in Council may appoint enumerators to make lists of the electors, and to enact the following :

The Chief Justice of the said Territory shall each year before the first day of August appoint under his hand a competent and reliable person or persons to be enumerator or enumerators for all polling divisions of such electoral district, and such Chief Justice shall see that no polling division is omitted to be included in some one of such appointments.

I presume that the Chief Justice would select as enumerators municipal officers or people whom he would know to be competent and reliable. I do not suppose that the Governor in Council is the only body that can properly select the enumerators. On the contrary, I would think that the resident Chief Justice of the territory would be the most satisfactory person to everybody concerned. In Ontario, and I presume in Quebec and the other provinces, we have municipal clerks to perform this duty as a matter of course. As there are not yet municipal clerks in the Yukon, I cannot suggest them ; but I think that the Chief Justice of the Territory, for the reasons I have stated, would be the best person to have control of the selection of the enumerators and the making-up of the voters' lists. The other amendments, as I have said, will not be necessary if this amendment is not made, and therefore I need not discuss them until it is decided upon, unless the hon. minister prefers that I should do so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The government have no objection at all to the principle that the Chief Justice or the senior Judge of the Territory shall appoint the enumerators. We do not desire to retain that power in our hands. Therefore, so far as the principle of the amendment is concerned, we concede it at once. But I do not think my hon. friend is correct in saying that his other amendments depend on this one. I think it is the other way. My hon. friend wants this change made so that the making-up of the list shall be taken out of the hands of the government and put into the hands of an independent tribunal. That being the case, he does not require the same precautions respecting the making-up of the list. In the old North-west Territories Act, which my hon. friend will remember was passed by his friends, and under which we laboured at some disadvantage for a number of years, the Governor in Council appointed the enumerator to make the lists, and he required no affidavit, no evidence, and there was no appeal of any kind whatever from his decisions.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is as this Bill is without this amendment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That was the most remarkable Act ever passed in Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. We have that in Ontario.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No, you have a revising officer, and you have a right of appeal.

Mr. INGRAM. Not for a list of this character. The hon. minister is referring to the old form of municipal lists ; but we also have a registration of voters, largely on this line, in cities and towns.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under the old North-west Territories Act, which in a general way we are following in this Bill, the Governor in Council appointed the enumerators, and there was no revision. I admit that that is not a fair position for any political party to occupy ; and for that reason I do not think my hon. friend is unreasonable in asking that a judicial officer like the Chief Justice or the senior Judge of the Territory should appoint the enumerators. But I wish to point out to my hon. friend that in the clause he has drawn he has followed the idea that the lists are to be made up every year, while the scheme of the Act is that the lists should only be made up for an election and I do not want to depart from that. I am content to accept my hon. friend's suggestion ; but I would not be satisfied that we had the provisions in a satisfactory, workable shape, by just drawing them here hurriedly.

Mr. INGRAM. Let me make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman. In the Ontario Registration Act, it is provided that seven days after the dissolution of parliament the registrars shall be called for the purpose of preparing a list of those entitled to register. In this Bill it could be provided that the registration should take place within seven days after the issue of the writ or at some other specified time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is exactly what the scheme of the Act is at present. This section provides that the lists shall be made up immediately after the issue of the writ.

I will accept my hon. friend's suggestion that the Chief Justice or senior judge should designate the enumerators, but I think we should retain the scheme of this Act and provide that he should designate the enumerators within a certain number of days, and be notified to do so at the same time that the writ is sent to the returning officer.

Mr. INGRAM. I am satisfied to accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion. His idea is that the Chief Justice or senior judge should be appointed to designate the enumerators instead of the Governor in Council.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If we agree on that, I presume my hon. friend will not insist on the subsequent amendment requiring an affidavit for qualification.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think I ought to insist on that because the Chief Justice ought to have some rule on which he is to proceed. We should define what sort of evidence he must take. In other provinces there must be a declaration or personal attendance and swearing. There should be some rule of evidence to guide the Chief Justice and the enumerators in the matter. There is one thing I do not understand. How is the hon.

minister going to fix the day for doing this? If you wait until the writ is issued, you will never have time enough to properly register these people. There is this difference between my proposition and the hon. minister's. He begins to count from a date unknown. He begins to count back from the election, while I am trying to fix some day before the election and do everything from that time forward, and if there should be a little time between the completion of the lists and polling day that will not do any harm. But if you begin so many days from the day of polling, and should not be able to get through with the work by polling day you will have chaos and trouble. I am glad the hon. minister accepts my suggestion that the Chief Justice should appoint the enumerators, but I would like to know when the Chief Justice will begin to do that. Would it not be well for him to do it on the first of August this year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We cannot work that.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Chief Justice should know when he has to appoint these enumerators, and unless we fix a special time, how is he to know it ?

Mr. GOURLEY. How would it do to send a notice to the senior judge, immediately on sending the writs to the returning officer, and provide that he should immediately commence having the lists made up, and have them completed within say three months of the receipt of such notice. That would be fixing a definite date at which the list would be completed. In your writ you could say that the nomination would take place a fortnight or a month after the completion of the lists. That would give ample opportunity for the lists to be properly completed. You could provide that the Chief Justice, say three months from the time he gets his notice, shall have the list completed, and then in the writ fix the date of nomination one month after the lists are completed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We have to do one of two things. We have to decide on an annual list or a list for the election. There is no middle course. We must have the one thing or the other. I think the committee will admit that it would be quite unnecessary and useless to have an annual list. The hon. gentleman knows from experience under the late Dominion Franchise Act that when people did not think there was going to be an election they did not register, and some times the elections came on when the lists were very imperfect. The proper principle is to have the lists made up for the election. The one thing we have to decide is what shall be the period when the judge shall appoint enumerators who will set to work and make up the lists.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention of the government to have the elections in the Yukon on the same day as the general elections throughout the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The general elections, certainly.

Mr. INGRAM. I was going to suggest a way out of the difficulty if the government did not intend doing that. If the general elections in the Yukon would take place at a certain time after the general elections in the Dominion, the lists could then be prepared, because every one would know that the elections would take place three, or six months after the general elections in the Dominion. That would do away with the expense of the annual lists and give ample time for making up the list before the elections, and no advantage would accrue to either party other than that which of course falls, especially in a district like the Yukon, to the party elected to power.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The trouble is that that does not get over the difficulty. The Election Act should provide for the different contingencies that may arise. We wish to provide machinery for holding the first election; and, in case the member who is elected should unfortunately die, we want it in such shape that we can hold another election. We want to get back to the same point and decide what should initiate proceedings, and I think the initiation of proceedings must be the issue of the writ. The Governor in Council must decide when the writ shall issue, and we can work out the rest of it very simply by providing that when the writ is issued, notice shall be sent to the Chief Justice and he shall order that the lists shall be made up.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the minister will say that they will issue the writ in time for these things to be done, that is a good way to fix the date. But you will have to issue the writ a good while before the election.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will submit the draft to my hon. friend. We cannot make the amendment this morning, because I must have the law clerk examine the draft and see that the duties dovetail in correctly.

Mr. LANCASTER. In the next section, No. 29, I move in amendment that the word 'immediately' be struck out. And the words 'within thirty days' be inserted instead thereof. The word 'immediately' seemed to me too wide; it is construed in all kinds of ways by judges and others. The enumerator, to do his work properly, should be limited to a certain time. He can do it the next day, if he wishes, but this provides a limit of thirty days. He might think that 'immediately' in the Yukon would mean two or three months.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR I do not see any objection to the amendment.

Mr. LANCASTER. I move that this section, No. 29, be amended by adding the following subsection :

(a) In the compilation of such list the enumerator may only enter therein the names of such person or persons as appear upon the last revised list or shall by statutory declaration filed with him be declared, by such person or some agent having a personal knowledge of the facts declared to, to possess the qualifications necessary to entitle him to vote under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. GERMAN. I do not think that 'the last revised list' should have anything to do with it. In a constituency such as this, where the people are shifting continually, the last revised list will have the names of a great many people who have left the district; and, in order to get their names off it will be necessary to prove that they have left. There should be an absolutely new list for each election.

Mr. LANCASTER. I might explain that I intend to propose amendments later on which will allow striking names off the list. The reason I have worded it in the way I have is this—if a man knows that he was on the list last year, and is still a resident, he would not unnaturally suppose that he is still on the list. And so, even in the absence of his own declaration or in the absence of some agent, it would not be wrong for the officer to leave his name there. I propose to make provision that if his name should be struck off, it can be done on application to the Chief Justice.

Mr. GERMAN. I have had a good deal to do with the revision of the voters' list, and my experience is that it is a good deal more difficult to get names off than to get them on. If we had a system of registration, we could do as they do throughout the whole of the United States. There, when an election is to be held, everybody has to register irrespective of whether his name was on the voters' list or not. And no matter who a man may be, even if he is the greatest millionaire in the country, if he is a congressman or senator, he must register if he wishes to vote. In the Yukon, we should adopt a system similar to that, and the voters' list should be made up absolutely new.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to suggest to the minister and my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) that, perhaps, it would be better to word that section in some such way as this : 'Such enumerator, upon his appointment, and having first taken the oath of office shall, immediately thereafter proceed to compile and within thirty days shall complete'—and so on. To leave the word 'compile' alone might possibly create a little uncertainty.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have no objection.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is what my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) intended, I think.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But, perhaps it expresses it a little more distinctly.

Mr. GOURLEY. I think that thirty days is too short. In a big district like the Yukon, it should be at least ninety days. Let the compilation begin immediately, and be finished within ninety days.

Mr. INGRAM. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gourley) must not forget that the intention of that Act is that each polling subdivision shall have an enumerator whose duty it shall be to prepare the list for the polling subdivision.

Mr. GOURLEY. But some of the residents may be two hundred miles away.

Mr. INGRAM. It does not make any differenc if they are two thousand miles away. A polling division is to contain not less than twenty-five or more than two hundred electors. The enumerator has thirty days within which to make the list, and it does not make any difference if the constituency stretches for ten thousand miles beyond the limits of the polling subdivisions—the enumerator has only to do with his own part of it. We must avoid the mistake we are making in Ontario where we have the registration system in our cities and county towns. We have not sufficient time in Ontario for the registration, and that is the curse of the system. We want to have the lists in the Yukon completed a sufficiently long time before the election for the people to know who have votes and who have not. That, I take it, is the object desired by the leader of the opposition and the member for Lancaster and Niagara.

Mr. GOURLEY. The objection I raise had nothing to do with the size of the constituency, but with the size of the polling division. Have a clause, providing, that not less than thirty or sixty days after your lists are completed, the writs are to be issued and the election take place. But I would say two months. What my learned friend says is very just, that in a town or small district in Ontario, thirty days would be enough. But no matter whether there is an enumerator appointed for every electoral district in the Yukon or not, I fancy many electoral districts will be more than 200 miles in extent. I have lived in the North-west, and I know that electors may be 50 or 100 miles apart; and how is an enumerator to make up his list and give people an opportunity, in thirty days to come to the court ? Half of them would never know there was an enumerator appointed, and half of them would never know it was their duty to go to that enumerator within thirty days. You want sixty or ninety days.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is quite immaterial whether we send the writs to the returning officer and at the same time send a notice to the judge, or whether you send a notice to the judge and two

months after send the writs to the returning officer.

Mr. GOURLEY. It ought to be 60 days anyhow.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not see how we can work these other amendments respecting an appeal.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister means that there would not be time for the appeals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR There would not be time, it would be wholly impossible. We give you all the protection we can ; we give you the appointment of the enumerator by the chief justice, and then we give the protection that nobody can go on the list unless there is an affidavit filed.

Mr. LANCASTER. In section 30, the amendment I propose would be all right. It does not deal with the appeal, but it makes the chief justice the custodian of the lists. My amendment to section 30 requires the enumerator to have ten days after completing such list instead of retaining them to deliver them to the chief justice. So the chief justice is the custodian.

Mr. INGRAM. As it is now, the list must be completed eight days before polling day. The hon. gentleman thinks that is not long enough, and that the time should be longer between the completion of the list and the polling. I think so to.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. How many days would you suggest ?

Mr. INGRAM. I should think 30 days at least would be best in that country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. You are not going to get much by that unless you have a general revision.

Mr. INGRAM. Only this. If you crowd the work of completing the list, if the time is too short, then you are working at a disadvantage. But if you would have ample time, 30 days will be long enough. In Ontario we have not ample time, the work is crowded. There is much time devoted to the preparation of the lists that both parties would rather use in some other way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no objection to the period between the completion of the list and the election being made longer than two days. I think perhaps it might be desirable that the lists should be completed and everybody should know who had a right to vote, for a longer period than two days. But it is to be remembered that the enumerator appointed by the chief justice shall both make up and revise the list. So there is no object in having a longer period of time. The object in having a longer period of time in other places is to permit that revision to take place. But in this case it is the enumerator appointed by the chief justice who revises the lists as well as makes them up ; and for that purpose six days or ten days would be just as good as a hundred days. But we will say ten days.

Mr. GOURLEY. No matter whether the enumerator makes up the list or not, every man in the electoral district wants to know of it, and wants to have time to get there. The elector must come before the enumerator and show that he has a right to vote. Surely the enumerator would not be permitted to sit down in 24 hours and write out the names of those that he thinks ought to be on. People residing in that electoral district must know that that man has power to make up the list, and they must have ample time to go there and give information that they are within the district and entitled to vote. Supposing the enumerator was appoined at Ottawa to make up the lists, you do not propose that he should sit down and write out the names, and sign the list, and say that is enough. People who are interested must have time to go to the enumerator and show that they have a right to be on that list. There should be at least 30 days allowed, from the time of the appointment of the enumerator in any electoral district before he proceeds to make up his list.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman explain section 29 ? That is the point of difference. It says that the enumerator, upon his appointment, having first taken the oath of office, should immediately after compile the list of persons qualified as electors to vote. It does not say whether he shall have one day, or two days, or how many days.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think perhaps the list ought to be completed not less than a week before the election. I would say six days, if we can agree on that. I am not sure whether what my hon. friend suggests is in the Act or not, but I think provision should be made for a notice to be issued by the enumerator.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman speaks of a week ; but section 30 provides for eight days, that the list shall be completed eight days before polling day.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is the preliminary list. Under section 31 the enumerator has but two days before the election to revise and add to. I would agree that the list should be finally revised at least six days before the election.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be necessary then to amend section 30 as well, and say fifteen days there, and seven days in section 31 ? If there is any appeal, I should think that ought to be a fair length of time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All right.

Mr. GOURLEY. Do I understand the minister to say he thinks it is right that

when an enumerator is appointed by judicial authority some notice should be posted by him in the district showing when the revision took place ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We provide that upon the receipt of his instructions the enumerator shall publish the notice.

Mr. GOURLEY. Then, further, I think there ought to be a time from the publication of that notice to the time when the list shall be finally completed in order that he will know. I think there should be twenty or thirty days.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That will be required to be published at a certain time. We can now insert the amendments which have now been made up to that proposed to be made to section 28, which will have to be redrawn.

Mr. LANCASTER. We agreed to the amendments up to section 29, but not to the amendment to 28.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario). I want to ask the hon. minister whether we are likely to have representatives from the Yukon at the next session of this House ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes, certainly, that is the intention. I will have an amendment drawn to cover the spirit and intention of the hon. gentleman's amendment to section 28. I will have the law clerk go through the Bill and draw a provision to cover the notice to be issued by the enumerator. I will have the changes typewritten and show them to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster), and we will take the Bill back into committee at a later time to-day. We want to get the Bill through and send it to the Senate if possible.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 15 be amended by adding the following subsection (e):

(e) At least fifty copies of the said notice shall also be published by proclamation at least two weeks before the nomination posted up in conspicuous places throughout the territory at sufficient distances from each other to ensure general and sufficient notice throughout the said electoral district.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 16 be amended by adding the following words ' and shall give the same notice on the day fixed for such later nomination in the newspapers and by proclamation as is required by section 15 of this Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 17 be amended by striking out the word ' four ' in the third line of such section and inserting instead thereof the words ' fifteen.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 25 be amended by adding at the end thereof the words ' each such polling division shall include not more than two hundred and not less than twenty-five qualified voters.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 26 be amended by adding the following subsection thereto :

(a) A proclamation of the granting of such poll shall be published for at least two weeks immediately preceding the taking of such poll in the newspapers and by posting up as provided in section 15 of this Act.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 27 be amended by inserting after the word ' election ' in the third line of such section ' and in four other of the most conspicuous places in each polling division.'

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER moved :

That section 29 be amended by striking out the word ' compile ' in the third line thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words ' proceed to compile and within thirty days shall complete ' and by adding the following subsection :

(a) In the compilation of such list the enumerator may only enter therein the names of such person or persons as appear upon the last revised list or shall by statutory declaration file with him be declared, by such person or some agent having a personal knowledge of the facts declared to, to possess the qualifications necessary to entitle him to vote under the provisions of this Act.

Mr. GERMAN. I understand that part of the amendment suggests that those names which appear on the last revised list can, pro forma, go on the new list. It is a decidedly bad clause to have there.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It does not say that.

Mr. GERMAN. It says that in making the list the names found on the last revised list may be put on.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is a restrictive clause on the powers of the enumerator. It says that he cannot put anybody there who is not on the last revised list.

Mr. GERMAN. The returning officer, if he has any right to look to the last revised list at all, will take the names of the last revised list and put them on the new list. The enumerator will take a list four years old, and while probably there will not be a man in the locality whose name is on the list, he will take the names on the last revised list and put them on the new list. It will have a most disastrous result to the people in the locality. In appeals it would take not only thirty days, but it would take three months to go through the list of appeals that would be put in against a list made up in that way. If the enumerator

is permitted to take this list, the result which I have pointed out will follow. Let him make an absolutely new list without any reference to the old list at all. Let every man who is entitled to vote go in and register under the provisions of the Act. Then you will have an up-to-date list. But if the enumerator has the right to look at the old list you will have innumerable difficulties arising, which will be almost insurmountable in a sparsely settled country.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is something in what the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) has said so far as the practical aspect of the question is concerned.

Mr. GERMAN. You would find a large number of names on the last revised rolls which would have the right to go on the new revised rolls. I would impress on the minister and the House that if you do this you will find an exceedingly large number of names on the last revised roll who have no right to go on the new roll, and the officer can and likely will put them on the new roll, and some one has got to go to the trouble of getting them struck off. My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has been like myself, through the mill endeavouring to get names struck off, and he knows that it is a difficult thing to do. Give every facility for registering and let every man register without any reference to the old list.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a good deal in what my hon. friend (Mr. German) has said, but there are two sides to the question. I appreciate the difficulties that may arise if you leave this clause in, but if you have to face the situation that as a great many of these men will live in parts of the country that are remote from any enumerator—unless you should appoint a whole army of enumerators—then if you do not have a clause of this kind a considerable number of persons will be disfranchised. Would it be possible to so frame the clause that the enumerator can use the old list in some way as a basis and exercise his own judgment with regard to it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. He can do that under this clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Possibly he can. Perhaps the best course would be for the minister to consider all the suggestions and give us his own views later on in the day.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I would feel disposed to leave out the words 'last revised assessment roll.' I would not in any other part of the country, but I think the number disqualified from the last revised assessment roll will be very small here. The tendency of the enumerator as the simplest way to discharge his duty would be to put on nearly every one who was on the old list, which would be very unsatisfactory. We will let the matter stand until the Bill comes up again.

Progress reported.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

NATURALIZATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 154) to amend the Naturalization Act (the Prime Minister) read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The only object of this Bill is to provide that a record shall be kept in the Department of the Secretary of State at Ottawa of all naturalization papers which are granted in Canada. As a rule, naturalization papers are easily obtained and easily lost, and no list is kept of them. Certificates are granted by the courts of the different provinces which are authorized to grant naturalization papers, and the Bill provides that the clerks of those courts shall be required to send lists of all these papers to the Department of the Secretary of State, where access may be had to them at all times.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As the preparation of some of these lists extending back over a considerable number of years would involve considerable labour to the officers of the courts whose duty it is to prepare them, would it not be advisable to provide what fees shall be paid to these officers ?

The PRIME MINISTER. We have thought of that. It would not be possible at present to form an accurate idea of what it would cost; but if there is money to be disbursed, we think it can be taken from the fund provided for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand it is a matter which is to be taken into consideration ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 119) further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—The Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The leader of the opposition has given notice of a couple of amendments. The first is that ordinances passed by the Governor in Council should not remain in force longer than the end of the next ensuing session unless approved by resolution of both Houses of parliament. I can see no special objection to the principle of that amendment, and am quite prepared to accept it.

My hon. friend has also given notice of another amendment, but which is really an amendment to the Dominion Lands Act. I presume what he desires is practically to limit the operation of the regulations and ordinances relating to mining under the Dominion Lands Act in the same way as the amendment I have just referred to limits ordinances applicable to the Yukon passed by the Governor in Council. We might insert a clause which would have the effect of operating this restriction as regards the Yukon Territory, but could hardly pass it in this Bill as of general application. If the hon. gentleman will accept my suggestion, I am satisfied.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the hon. gentleman suggests is perfectly relevant as regards this Bill, though we have ample precedents in the past, even under this administration, for introducing sections of somewhat general application in measures of more limited application. As the territory of the Yukon is altogether the subject of this Bill, I would be disposed to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman and have the second amendment limited in its operation to the Yukon Territory.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Then, we will accept the first as drawn. The best way, I think, to reach the object of the second amendment would be to insert a new section as section 5 of this Bill, and I beg to submit one which I have rather hurriedly drawn :

Every regulation made by the Governor in Council, under section 5 of the Dominion Lands Act, chapter 54 of the revised statutes of Canada as amended, applicable to the Yukon Territory, shall remain in force until the day immediately succeeding the day of prorogation.

Then we may continue with the rest of the amendment as proposed by my hon. friend. With regard to section 3, considered in connection with the typewritten amendments, of which I furnished the hon. gentleman a copy, in line 38 of the Bill, section 3, it will be seen that the words 'or commissioners in council' are found. Those words were put in when the original Bill was drawn by the late Minister of Justice, because under this section there was a restriction of the power to make ordinances, preventing the commissioner in council imposing taxes. This was done because the commissioners in council were not a body representing the people, but an appointed body. Now, however, they are a representative body, to the extent that half their members are representatives, and under section 2 they have the same powers as the assembly of the North-west Territories. I think, therefore, it would be well to strike out the latter part of the amendment at first proposed. This section will apply only to Acts by the Governor in Council ; and leave off the last section of the typewritten amendment which relates to the power of the commissioner in council. So, I will ask my hon. friend to follow me as I read the section as it would be :

Section 8 of the said Act, as that section is enacted by section 2 of chapter 11 of the statutes of 1899, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

'8. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Governor in Council may make ordinances for the peace, order, and good government of the territory, and of His Majesty's subjects and others therein ; but no ordinance made by the Governor in Council shall—

'(a.) for the enforcement of any ordinance, impose any penalty exceeding five hundred dollars ;

'(b) alter or repeal the punishment provided in any Act of the parliament of Canada in force in the territory for any offence ;

'(c.) appropriate any public land or other property of Canada without authority of parliament, or impose any duty of customs or any excise.'

Nor shall any tax be imposed except as under this Act provided.

Provided always that the Governor in Council may make ordinances.

(a) Imposing a tax or royalty upon gold and silver the output of the mines in the territory.

(b) Prescribing and regulating the place and manner of collection of such tax or royalty and the method of securing and enforcing the payment thereof.

(c) Provide for the confiscation and forfeiture of gold and silver upon which such tax or royalty has not been paid, as well as for the confiscation and forfeiture of any vessel, vehicle, car or other receptacle containing the same or used or intended to be used for the transportation thereof ; and,

(d) Giving to any officer of the Crown, in respect of searches, examinations and other proceedings for the enforcement of the provisions of any such ordinances, such powers, rights, privileges and protection as the Governor in Council, may think necessary or desirable in that behalf.

Thus, the commissioner in council's authority will come under section 2, exclusively, while the Governor in Council's authority will come under section 3, exclusively, and there will be no chance of confusion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am disposed to think that I would not suggest any further amendment, but I would like time for consideration. I would ask the hon. gentleman to let the matter stand over until this evening. Meantime, I will look the amendment over, and if I have any suggestion to offer, I will have it ready then.

Progress reported.

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 162) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.

On section 1,

Mr. BOYD. Before that clause is adopted, I have a few remarks which I wish to make and some amendments to the Bill to suggest, which amendments I may explain now, and they can be dealt with more particularly as we take up the sections to

which they relate. But the first complaint that we have to make with regard to this Bill is that the very important amendments proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce come before us so late in the session that it is almost impossible properly to discuss them. Within a few days of the beginning of the session, I drew the attention of the government to this very important measure. Yet it is not until now, within four or five days of the close of this session, that this measure, which is the most important on the statute-book in its effects upon the interests of the farmers of the Northwest, really comes before us for discussion. Now, as to amendments to the Bill, I would first draw attention to a complaint which is made in Manitoba owing to the fact that under the present law interior elevators, that is the elevator at Winnipeg and the elvator at Emerson, are permitted to mix the different grades of wheat for the purpose of raising the standard of the wheat they happen to have on hand. Under the old law, as I understand it, mixing was permitted at Fort William, but the law was amended in 1890 so as to permit mixing at Emerson and Winnipeg. It is claimed by many engaged in the grain business that this results detrimentally to the quality and grade of the wheat that is being exported, as it permits those engaged in that business to use scoured wheat in the mixing, and pass it off for a higher grade. This is said to be a disadvantage to those from whom the wheat is bought. I have some correspondence here with regard to the matter, which I shall probably lay before the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), as I see that under this Act the administration of the law is put in charge of his department—and I may say in passing, that I am pleased with that change. There is another question with regard to what are known as the small warehouses. It is claimed that men who wish to have these small warehouses are practically debarred from doing so by that provision of the law which compels them to keep these warehouses open and keep men to look after them. Owing to the small quantity of grain that can be put through these warehouses, the expense is prohibitory.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I would like to ask him a question. I suppose that what he refers to as 'small warehouses' are what are termed 'flat warehouses' in the Bill?

This has been the experience in the past regarding those warehouses. It has been claimed that while the amended Act of 1890 permitted those warehouses, it was impossible to use them, owing to the fact that they could not be made profitable.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Does my hon. friend mean that the Act prevents the buyer from owning flat warehouses and storing his own grain? The Act requires that flat warehouses should only be used for storing purposes.

Mr. BOYD. The objection is that a man who owns one of those small flat warehouses is compelled to keep a man there to operate it, and that it is impossible for him to make it profitable. Another amendment I propose to move is that the price of wheat at Fort William should be posted once or twice a day at the stations where there is an agent and where the grain is shipped. In that way the public is made aware of the price of grain in Fort William. I may say for the benefit of the minister that in the state of Dakota and part of Minnesota a rule such as this, I understand, has been in existence for some years, and has given great satisfaction, namely, that the price of wheat at Fort William, the grades of wheat as under this Act, is telegraphed once or twice a day over the lines and posted on the blackboards or in some conspicuous place in the stations along the line.

There is another matter I will mention. It has been suggested to me by people who are deeply interested in regard to this Act, that sub-inspectors should be appointed throughout Manitoba and the territories at the large shipping points. It is claimed that men could be found who would be capable and qualified to inspect wheat at shipping points. Of course their inspection would be subject to revision at Fort William or Winnipeg if that was thought proper. But many do not approve of having their wheat subject to inspection at Winnipeg. in view of the enormous amount of wheat that has to be inspected at Winnipeg. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to read a letter from a gentleman who may perhaps be considered as opposed to the present Act, and as one of the agitators. I want to place it on 'Hansard' so that the Minister of Trade and Commerce may be able at any time to refer to it. It is rather lengthy, and it may be tiresome to some hon. gentlemen who are not interested in the matter, but I think it important that it should be published so that the minister may be able to refer to it. The gentleman who writes this letter is not known to me, the letter is addressed to myself:

Winnipeg, April 9, 1902.

N. Boyd, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—At a meeting some time ago of the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange, a resolution was pased asking the Dominion parliament to change the Inspection Act so as to do away with the dual inspection at Fort William and make Winnipeg inspection final.

Such an action would be very injurious to the quality of Manitoba grain and would make it in worse repute than it is at the present time and every one knows it is bad enough now, to prove this all I have to do is to quote an interview one of the newspaper reporters had with Mr. G. R. Crowe, manager of the Northern Elevator Company, in which he said, 'Mani-

toba No. 1 Northern is selling at three cents per bushel lower than Duluth No. 1 Northern in New York.' What Mr. Crowe said was true, but why should it be when the requirements as to weight, quality, &c., are the same for Manitoba No. 1 Northern as for Duluth No. 1 Northern? The reason for the difference is that 'The Manitoba Inspection Act' has been formed and manipulated to suit the tastes of the monopolistic elevator companies who own the mixing elevators and whose members have ruled the grain exchange and consequently had resolutions passed which the government acted on, and the outcome is that the quality of our graded wheat has deteriorated to such an extent that it will not command the same price that Duluth wheat of the same grade will in the worlds markets, the reason of the deterioration is that the most vicious and illegal mixing of scoured, dried and low grade wheat has taken place in the high grades by the interior mixing elevators, and the Act (which was framed at the dictates of Mr. C. N. Bell, secretary of the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange), practically ties the hands of the inspectors so that they cannot stop it. True, the Act gives the inspectors instructions re mixing elevators but gives them no protection in any way when appeals are made to the Survey Board, the duty of the Survey Board is to grade wheat according to the Act, and if the inspector has lowered the grade out of the mixing elevators on account of it not being up to the average, he loses every time. Manitoba wheat should command a premium over Duluth wheat instead of selling at three cents lower, The reason for this is that Manitoba No. 1 Northern is comprised of practically all 'Red Fyfe' wheat while Duluth No. 1 Northern contains a great deal of 'Blue Stem' wheat, Red Fyfe' is a much stronger and better wheat than 'Blue Stem.'

About three years ago the Grain Exchange passed a resolution asking the Dominion parliament to stop the mixing of Manitoba wheat and also asking that the inspection be done at Winnipeg with inspectors at Fort William to check and correct mistakes. In June, 1899, I attended a meeting of the agricultural committee in reference to the Inspection Act, and at that meeting the present Inspection Act was keenly opposed by the following:—Messrs. McFee, McBean & Quintal, of Montreal; Cummings, of Lyn; Richardson, of Kingston; Meldrum of Peterboro, Flavelle, of Lindsay; Kemp, McLaughlin, Spink & Watts, of Toronto, and Bailey of Hamilton, all protested against having the inspection done at Winnipeg which was over 400 miles from Fort William (the storage point) and all demanded that if the mixing was stopped at Fort William, &c., that it should also be stopped in the interior mixing elevators at Winnipeg and Emerson. Mr. C. N. Bell demanded that the interior mixing be allowed and stated that he was acting under instructions from the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, the Dominion parliament shut their ears to all but Mr. Bell, shut their eyes as to what would be in the best interests of the Manitoba agriculturists and at the dictation of Mr. Bell (not on the resolution of the Grain Exchange which asked that all mixing be stopped) had the present obnoxious Inspection Act passed. After returning home, the president of the Winnipeg Grain and Produce Exchange told me that Mr. C. N. Bell's instructions were to have the mixing stopped everywhere and that he had no instructions whatever to ask to have it allowed at interior mixing elevators, this proves that Mr. Bell was wrong when he said he was acting for the Grain Exchange, instead of acting according to the Grain Exchanges instructions he acted the very opposite and his fighting for the mixing at Winnipeg and Emerson proves that he was working in the interests of the elevator monopolists.

The present Inspection Act has been in effect for over two years and a half and has proven itself to be very injurious to the farmers. It has allowed the elevator monopolists to illegally and viciously mix and ruin the quality of graded wheat and thus allows the elevator owners to buy at under value (they have done so to an unreasonable extent for several months past).

We need a change in the Inspection Act, but not in the way the Grain Exchange ask. Who ever heard of any civilized country allowing wheat to be graded at over 400 miles from the storage point, yet this is what has been done in Winnipeg for over two years, any one who knows anything about wheat knows that the condition of wheat often changes while a car is going less than 100 miles, during the month of September a great many farmers thresh direct from the stook and load at once into cars, as wheat does not sweat in the stook. I have several times seen cars pass Winnipeg in which the wheat was sweating and which the inspector graded 'tough,' but which on its arrival at Fort William was past the sweating stage and quite dry, consequently graded straight. Again during hot weather in summer I have seen wheat which was in good condition and graded straight in Winnipeg arrive in Fort William very much heated and the inspector refused to grade it straight. This proves the inspection should be done at Fort William instead of at Winnipeg.

The Canadian Pacific Railway refuse to hold cars in Winnipeg so that they can be sampled in daylight, and in some cases a train will come in and leave again in such a short time that the samplers have not time to thoroughly examine the cars they are sampling, as every one knows not even the most expert grainman can tell the grade of wheat by lamplight, so how can the samplers tell whether the cars are plugged with low grade wheat or not when they are forced to rush through and sample at night. Under the old Inspection Act all cars were held on track at Fort William for daylight sampling so that the samplers could find almost without exception all cars that were plugged and the inspector punished the dishonest shipper by lowering the grade down to the poorest quality that could be found in the car. Under the present Inspection Act plugged cars cannot help but pass the samplers very often as they are forced to sample at night. The consequence of this is to further lower the quality of our wheat and again proves the inspection should be done at Fort William intead of at Winnipeg.

Another proof and the most forcible one is that I have known of a lot of cases where the inspector at Fort William refused to allow the cars to be unloaded at Fort William on the inspection certificate that had been issued at Winnipeg and the inspector at Winnipeg was forced to ask for the return of the certificate and replace it with a new one, sometimes the grade was raised but very often it was lowered. This again proves that Winnipeg is not the right place at which to inspect grain but that it should be inspected at Fort William.

In face of all the rankness of the Inspection Act, the Grain Exchange or rather the elevator monopolists who rule the exchange and use it as a blind, again have the nerve to ask the Dominion parliament to change the Act and make

things worse than they are now. Why do they do it? Simply to further their own ends and get the farmers more under their control (if such a thing were possible).

Certainly change the Inspection Act, by all means, do away with Winnipeg inspection and have it done at Fort William, either allow mixing at Fort William or do away with it at Winnipeg, Emerson, &c. What is the difference between mixing at Winnipeg or Emerson and Fort William? Only this, at Fort William it is impossible for shippers to mix illegally, as the inspector knows the composition of the mixture, while at Winnipeg or Emerson I have known of scoured wheat being illegally mixed into No. 1 Hard. If it is injurious to mix at Fort William, it is more so at Winnipeg or Emerson. It is wonderful how the members of the Northern Elevator Company can change their views. On August 20, 1892, a letter was written to the Commissioner of Inland Revenue in which the signers stated as follows:—'We hold it would be a very great injustice to the great bulk of the shippers and practically all of the producers of grain in this province and territories, to confine the cleaning, mixing, &c., of grain to a few parties now having such elevator facilities in the interior, and who can concentrate their grain at inland points and ships to terminal elevators,' this letter was signed by N. Bawlf, H. Crowe & Co., S. P. Clark & Co., and others, members of the three firms mentioned are now members of the Northern Elevator Company, in 1892, they claimed it was injurious to the farmers to stop mixing, but in 1899 when they owned their own mixing and scouring elevators they thought it was all right seeing they were going to get the profit out of the mixing and hinder others, in other words nothing could suit them better as it gave them the monopoly of the mixing, what they said in 1892 was quite true and at the present time it is also true but in a greater degree as crops are much larger. Either stop the vicious mixing at Winnipeg, &c., or allow it at Fort William, &c.

Another vicious thing in the Inspection Act was the doing away with the No. 2 Hard grade at the request and manipulations of the monopolists who have ruled the Grain Exchange. This was a crime which has cost the farmers of Manitoba an enormous sum of money. Under the old Act, No. 2 Hard always sold as high as No. 1 Northern, and at most times one cent higher than No. 1 Northern. In order to further bleed the farmer and allow more profitable mixing it was done away with, the owners of the interior mixing elevators are the very heavy gainers and the farmers are the very heavy losers. The consequence of doing away with the No. 2 Hard grade means that a large quantity of wheat that would grade No. 2 Hard (if there was such a grade) now grades No. 2 Northern and instead of getting No. 1 Northern price or one cent per bushel higher they are now forced to take four cents per bushel lower than No. 1 Northern price. Under the old Act, No. 2 Hard had to weigh 58 pounds to the measured bushel and No. 1 Northern 60 pounds, but under the rottenness of the present Act No. 2 Hard is cut out and No. 1 Northern must still weigh the 60 pounds, the consequence is that any No. 2 Hard that does not quite weigh 60 pounds cannot get into the No. 1 Northern grade and must go into the No. 2 Northern. To show what enormous profits the interior mixing elevators can make out of this part of the Act would say that No. 2 Northern (would be No. 2 Hard if there was such a grade) weighing 59¾ pounds, can be mixed with No. 1 Northern weighing 60¼ pounds, equal quantities of each and the mixture will grade No. 1 Northern, this is 'pie' for the mixers but 'dirt' for the farmers, as it injures the quality of our graded wheat and forces values lower than they should be. This shows that it is a great mistake of the government to follow the advice of the Grain Exchange. I hope they will soon commence to legislate for the people instead of the Grain Exchange which is run by monopolists. The parliament should at once reinstate the No. 2 Hard grade.

How long does the Dominion parliament intend to legislate for the monopolists at the expense of the people? When will they awake and find out they are injuring our country? Surely they do not think people are blind when they legislate at the request of the elevator monopolists through the name of the Grain Exchange? Can they not read the Winnipeg papers and see that the 'Inspection Act' and 'Grain Act' are driving people away from Manitoba and have made the farmers slaves to the elevator monopolists?

I hope you will succeed in getting the people of Manitoba justice at this session of parliament.

Truly yours,

THOS. COULTER.

P.S.—Mostly all the elevator owners of Manitoba pay the same price at nearly, if not all places where the same rate of freight covers, according to this arrangement at most places in Manitoba and the territories, the farmers have been bled of from 7 to 10 cents per bushel for a greater part of this season. The Inspection Act and Grain Act have aided the 'gang' in this nefarious work. Is this a 'combine' in the legal sense of the word? If not, please let me know what a 'combine' is.

C.

That letter is signed by Mr. Coulter. As I say, I am not here to support or to verify this letter. I am merely placing it on 'Hansard' so that the Minister of Trade and Commerce may have before him the views of those who are opposed to the present Act. I think the minister will agree with me that it is a very difficult thing for a fair and proper inspection to be made of some hundreds of cars passing Winnipeg at night, under the system of samplers going on board and bringing the samples of wheat up to the inspector to be inspected. If that practice is to be continued the men who take these samples out of these cars are equally as responsible—and I do not know but that they are even more responsible—as the man who is inspecting the wheat, because the matter rests entirely with these men as to how this grading might be done. Let me give you an instance of what occurred in the town of Carberry. Several hundred cars of wheat had been shipped in the early part of the season, and I think there was not one car of No. 1 hard, and only a very few cars of No. 1 Northern, which had passed out of that town during that time. We thought it very strange and after considerable effort three cars were procured in the one day, and of these first three cars that were shipped out by the farmers themselves, two went No. 1 hard, and one went No. 1 Northern; proving as we believed very conclusively that there was some mixing or something going on either

by the dealers at Carberry or at Winnipeg. In the case of these three cars which seemed a very peculiar thing, all of the dealers concluded that one particular car would go No. 1 hard and that the other two cars would go No. 1 Northern, but strange to say the car that they supposed would go No. 1 hard, went No. 1 Northern, and the other two cars went No. 1 hard. When the return came back from Winnipeg the grainmen said : There you see our position ; it is impossible for us to inspect this wheat for the reasons that when we decide on what we think is No. 1 hard we invariably get upset by the inspector in Winnipeg. That is one of the reasons why I think that we should have sub-inspectors at those larger interior points. I think a sub-inspector could inspect at a point where there would be 100,000 bushels of wheat or 200,000 bushels, and that he could pass along to one or two other stations and do the inspecting there. That would stop a great deal of this scheming and sharp practice that has been perpetrated for some time past. I shall give another practical instance of what has occurred this last season. Take the town of Douglas, where there was a Mr. Greenwood, who is outside of the present grain exchange, buying wheat. On a certain day there was a difference of 10 cents a bushel on wheat, paid by the same firm at the town of Douglas and at the town of Sydney, which is 40 or 50 miles nearer the market. At Sydney the firm that was there opposing Mr. Greenwood was paying 10 cents less per bushel for wheat for the same grade of No. 1 Northern than they were paying at Douglas. There is something wrong when people can be treated like that. I am not here for the purpose of trying to gain the slightest political advantage in this matter. I am simply here to offer suggestions which I believe will enable the government at the present time, or as soon as possible to make that Grain Act as perfect as it can be made. There is another matter which I would like to mention with regard to this question and it is this : In the existing Act there is a certain dockage allowed. Those who buy wheat seem to have the privilege under the present Act, of taxing the wheat to a certain extent.

I will give an experience that I myself had. I shipped one car of wheat to Fort William and had something over 600 bushels of wheat in it. The dockage by the government weigher was, I think, 46 pounds; that is about three quarters of one bushel. I sold 800 bushels of wheat to a merchant in Carberry and he took out 32 bushels, or 4 bushels to the hundred weight, and this was the same wheat. Well, if he had given back the dockage it would not have amounted to so much, but he gave back only 14 bushels and kept 18. I said: If you take this wheat out, you should give it back. He said: No, under the Act, we keep it for dockage. If they take anything from you in the way of dockage, they should give it back to you. If you take any other produce to market, such as cheese or butter, and there is anything wrong with it which results in them taking dockage, they do not keep a certain amount from you. I do not think it was the intention of the framers of this Act that this should take place, and I propose to move an amendment in regard to it. I think I have said sufficient at present to show the way I feel in regard to it. I believe that if cars were given to the farmers, and if loading platforms were erected, the trouble would be overcome, because those engaged in the grain business would understand that they cannot force us to pass our grain through their elevators, and that while we are prepared to do business with them as long as they act fairly, if they do not treat us properly we can ship our own grain by our own cars. I see in the Act these words: 'without undue delay.' It is not my wish to be harsh or unfair with the railway companies, but I would like some of the lawyers in the House to tell me exactly what those words mean. I suppose they would mean a reasonable time, and if so, I am not going to raise any very serious objection.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that this Bill was not placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen earlier. I may say that I placed it before the House as soon as I, myself, was fully in possession of the amendments which I have been led to believe were desired by a large majority of the members of this House who are more intimately acquainted with this matter than I myself am. I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Boyd), that, if I followed him correctly, a great many of the remarks that he has just made, and in particular the letter which he has just read to the committee, do not apply to the Manitoba Grain Act, but to the Inspection Act. Am I correct in that ?

Mr. BOYD. I do not know.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. We are now dealing with the question of amendments of the Grain Act, and I think a great deal of what he said refers to the Inspection Act, which is a different Act. Is that not so ?

Mr. BOYD. I do not so understand it. It may be possible in regard to the letter, but, perhaps the writer is finding fault with both Acts.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It is more particularly the Inspection Act of which he complains, which is a separate Act, and which we are not proposing to deal with in this Bill at all. Of course, I am aware that in bringing down anything of this kind at this stage of the session it is practically impossible to consider more than is now before us with any degree of profit. An immense number

of suggestions may be made, many of them very proper and very desirable, but ones that we can hardly consider now. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that we take up each particular amendment that is proposed, and if the committee considers that that particular amendment is likely to be useful, we can pass that and I will take careful note of what my hon. friends on either side of the House suggest as to future improvements, but I would be rather chary about making any material alterations in the Act without due consideration. Of course, the Grain Inspection Act and Grain Act have only been very recently put under the charge of the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I have not yet been able to acquaint myself as well as I could wish with the practical working of these Acts. We have a commissioner engaged in dealing with these questions. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) himself knows that the circumstances which occurred last autumn were very exceptional. There was not only a vastly larger crop than ever before, but owing to certain climatic conditions, I believe that the time for moving the crop was very much shortened. I think I am correct in saying that there was scarcely more than half the time to handle double the crop, and I think under those circumstances there was much greater difficulty on the part of the railway company in meeting the demands of the inhabitants than would have occurred under ordinary conditions. But, I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me that the best we can do at present is to consider each one of these amendments that is proposed on its merits and by itself. I, myself, have a perfectly open mind. All I desire is, as far as we can, to improve the Act for the benefit of all concerned, and I can assure the hon. gentleman and all other hon. gentlemen who are specially concerned in the matter that I will take very careful note of any suggestions that they may have to offer. I am not in a position to say that I can accept at an hour's notice important amendments even if they appear to me to be very desirable. These things require to be very carefully considered before we can put them on the statute-book, but I will be glad if we should confine ourselves, as much as may be, to the particular subject of the Grain Act, leaving the Inspection Act to be considered hereafter, and if we should confine ourselves to the special questions which are brought up in the amendments which I have now the honour of submitting to the committee.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). In the early part of the session there were a number of petitions presented to the House from municipal councils in the province of Manitoba praying for amendments to the Grain Act. I think the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. McCreary) presented some of them. I know I had the pleasure of presenting a number. Are any of these amendments proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) adopting the line of the amendments suggested by these memorials presented to the government ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. As I understand, these amendments are the result of a comparison with, and compilation of the various petitions and letters sent to us suggesting amendments.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has said, he is put in the position of having to consider a subject which until lately was in charge of the Department of Inland Revenue, and it is, as hon. gentlemen from the North-west Territories will all agree, almost impossible for a person who is not personally acquainted with the conditions of the grain trade to familiarize himself with the complicated working of the Inspection Act and the Grain Act. In fact, it is difficult to get two persons who are well acquainted with the workings of the grain trade to agree to what the law should be. There are two Acts which cover the transaction of the business—the Inspection Act and the Grain Act. The functions of the two Acts are very different. The Inspection Act provides the way in which the grades of wheat shall be fixed. The Grain Act consists of a series of regulations affecting the handling of the wheat by the buyer and the seller ; the storage of the wheat; the conduct of warehousemen, and a variety of regulations for the purpose of protecting the producers and enabling them to get the fair value of their grain. Hon. members who were here in 1899, when the Inspection Act was revised, will remember that it was referred to a special committee, and no piece of legislation which has been passed by this House since I have been a member of it, received more thorough and more anxious consideration in every clause and every line than that Act. Sir Henry Joly was then Minister of Inland Revenue, and besides having the departmental duty of looking specially after the matter, he took a very warm personal interest in it. He attended the sittings of the committee; nearly all the North-west members also attended; persons interested in the matter on both sides, men in favour of independent buying, persons representing the farming interest, the millers, and the grain dealers, were all at different times before the committee; and every provision in that Bill was worked out with as great care as any committee of this House is capable of giving to any Bill. I do not mean by that to suggest that the Bill is perfect—far from it; but I venture to say that it has worked as well as could possibly be expected, after all the difficult and changing circumstances which it has had to meet.

There are two special matters to which my hon. friend has referred, which require

a moment's attention at least. One is the objection which I have not heard to-day for the first time. I presume it has come to my hon. friend in the same way that it has come to me. It is that in elevators that are known in the North-west—not as public elevators, but storing elevators, there is an amount of mixing done which is detrimental to the reputation of the North-west wheat. That, I understand, is the objection of my hon. friend. Am I correct?

Mr. BOYD. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The general principle of the Inspection Act is that a man in his own elevator in the interior of the country may mix as he likes, but that when he puts his wheat into what is called the terminal or public elevator, it is graded, and it cannot be mixed, nor can the grading be deteriorated by any mixing that takes place after it passes into the hands of the inspector. It was suggested at the time the Act was passed, that possibly there might be elevators used for storing purposes in the interior of the country, and that in these storing elevators, where the wheat does not pass through the hands of an inspector, and therefore is not graded at all in the sense understood in the Inspection Act, that might possibly take place which my hon. friend and other people say to some extent does take place. I have heard, as my hon. friend has, that it does take place, and section 13 of the Inspection Act of 1899 was adopted for the purpose of correcting that. If what my hon. friend states and what I have heard from other quarters is true, it simply means that this clause has not been acted upon. I cannot myself imagine any method which the hon. gentleman could now suggest which would be any more effective than this clause. If you are going to provide a remedy by legislation, you must put it into the hands of somebody to decide whether the complaint is founded on fact or not; because it is a question of fact. You have the right under the Act to bring the matter to the attention of the inspector, and he is required to make an investigation; and if he does not do so in a satisfactory manner, you can take the complaint before the minister himself, and have it fairly and fully investigated. I do not think the committee which had this subject under consideration could have devised any better plan than the plan provided in the Act; and if that weapon is not being employed, I think the fault lies with those who have knowledge of the fact, and who do not take the necessary steps to remedy the evil complained of. I may say, however, that in as much as the matter is now drawn to the attention of the minister, the facts might justify him in having a careful examination made as to whether the elevator in Winnipeg has been guilty of the violation of the principle of the Act.

Then, my hon. friend referred to a desire on the part of some people that there should be a change in the system of inspection so as to provide for the appointment of sub-inspectors throughout the country, instead of allowing the inspection to take place in Winnipeg, by having all the wheat pass through the hands of the chief inspector. That subject was also considered in 1899 at the time the Act was passed, and a good many statements and opinions in regard to it have been brought before me from time to time; but I am bound to say that up to the present time I have never known a case to be made out showing that the producer would derive any special benefit from a change in the system. I do not say that he would not, but I cannot declare myself positively as convinced either one way or the other. There has not been any sufficiently strong case made out to convince me that any substantial benefit would result from such a change. At present the wheat goes to the yard. A sample is taken from the car to the office of the chief inspector, and by that sample the grade is determined. My hon. friend refers to a case in which, when the dealers shipped the wheat, it went as one grade, and when the farmer shipped it, it went as a lower grade. I do not know how this particular fact is established, but I do not think that there has been any deliberate fraud on the part of the chief inspector. If there be a suggestion of any fraud or dishonesty on his part, it would be the immediate duty of the government to take every possible means of having a most thorough investigation. I have never, during the time I have to do with the question, in one way or another, heard the slightest suggestion made by any one that there was any doubt whatever of the complete integrity of the chief inspector, Mr. Horne. I have not the honour of his personal acquaintance, but have never heard any but the highest opinions expressed regarding him, and I have not the slightest doubt that his integrity is above suspicion. It is possible, however, that in the handling of a thousand cars of wheat, a number of the cars might be transposed by mistake and mixed up together, but that would not be the only possible way in which I think such a mistake could occur, as to have wheat of the same quality shipped by two different parties graded differently.

I think that on the whole my hon. friend will agree that, considering all the difficulties attending the inspection of wheat, there is not very much fault to find with the result of the inspection system. But the result of the inspection system and the result of the shipping system, are two different things altogether. My hon. friend says that at Douglas last year, where there was an independent buyer, he was able to pay 10 cents a bushel more than did the buyers who represented the elevator people. I have heard a similar statement made with regard to other places, and I am free to say that the facts show distinctly that there was a most remarkable difference in

the prices, to say the least, which were offered those representing the elevator owners and the independent buyers who have no connection with that combine.

The amendments which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce is proposing, are intended to meet that difficulty. If I have any understanding at all of the difficulty, it consists of two main things. First, there is the shortage of cars, and legislation of this character will not increase the supply of cars, but we have succeeded in another way in making it certain that there will be a very largely augmented supply during next year. A very large sum is being devoted by the Canadian Pacific Railway to the procuring of rolling stock for their operations during next year, and we may look with some degree of confidence to a great deal of relief in that respect. But the position of the farmers, which we are trying to remedy by this Bill, is this. The disadvantage under which the farmer suffered was that the elevator people knew that the farmer was not in a position to handle his grain except through them. The shortage of cars largely prevented the farmers from being able to ship independently. That was the result of a combination of circumstances. It is alleged that the wheat buyer would not pay what the wheat was worth. The wheat buyers, of course, do not admit this, and it is not necessary for us to say what we think about it. But we all deplore the fact that, for a considerable portion of the season at least, the men who raised the wheat did not get its full value, and what we are really trying to do in this Bill is to put the farmer in as independent a position as possible, so far as the wheat buyer is concerned. We give him the right to put up a flat warehouse if he chooses, and a loaded platform, or to ship from the track, and make the company furnish him with cars if he wants them. That is about all that this House, with the information it has, can do to put the farmers in a position to say to the grain buyers: We are independent and we can deal with you on equal terms; if you will not give us the full value of the wheat, we will deal with it ourselves. If my hon. friend will look through the amendments, he will find that they are carefully drawn for the purpose of bringing about that result.

In so far as the suggestions respecting the amendments to the Inspection Act are concerned, every member of the committee will agree that a radical change in the system of inspecting wheat could not be made in any other way than by bringing in a measure at the very beginning of the session, getting the very best committee that could be appointed to deal with it, and giving the matter the most careful and protracted consideration.

I am quite confident that as we go through the clauses, it will be seen that they have been carefully drawn for the purpose of bringing about the results we all have in view. There was a suggestion made by my hon. friend respecting the posting of the prices of wheat. I do not know that any objection can be raised to that. I do not know to what extent it would be an advantage. It might in many ways be an advantage to the farmers to know what wheat was worth at Fort William; and if that suggestion would work to the advantage to the producer of wheat, I see no reason why it should not be adopted.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is to pay the expense of getting the quotations and posting them two or three times a week all over the territories? It will be quite a heavy expense to get those telegrams from all the stations along the different lines of railway, and I do not think it is necessary. The farmers get the daily papers and mail and know pretty well the prices of grain in Winnipeg, and why should we put the dealers to the heavy expense of getting these telegrams and posting them up?

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Do not the local dealers already every day have the prices telegraphed them by their head firms, and could they not be compelled to have them posted up publicly?

Mr. CAMPBELL. At some of the principal points, no doubt they do, but I do not suppose that in all the points they get those telegrams daily. I do not see how you could force the dealers to put up information which they get for their own private use.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me that, if the assertion is true, that a difference of as much as 10 cents a bushel in the price of wheat exists between stations where there is competition and stations where there is no competition, then, in the interest of the great public of the North-west Territories, in the interest of the men who have gone into that country to indure its hardships and open it up to industry, the government would be quite justified in incurring whatever expense is necessary to carry out a plan that would afford them protection. And it seems to me that the suggestion that at all the stations where wheat is bought the prices ruling at Winnipeg shall be posted is one that is in the public interest. It might not serve the interest of buyers who wish to buy wheat 10 cents cheaper at one station than at another, but it would be in the interest of the farmer. We are trying to induce settlers to go into the country, and the men who go there at our instance are, in a sense, our wards, and we are their guardians. If these men are liable to be made a prey of by monopolists, and if giving them information will enable them to judge whether they are being dealt fairly with or not and whether they are receiving day by day the prices they ought to receive, I think that information ought to be afforded them.

Mr. BOYD. In reply to some of the remarks of the Minister of the Interior, I may say that, as is known to hon. members, I was not in the House when these Acts were passed. Before I returned, the present Grain Act and the Inspection Act so far as it relates to grain, were passed. If, as has been stated by the Minister of the Interior, I have confused the two Acts or misunderstood them, it is a misunderstanding or confusion that prevails generally among the farmers throughout the country. This is one of the reasons that makes it all the more unfortunate that this Bill should be brought before us so late in the session. Had it been brought forward earlier, we could have proposed such amendments to the Inspection Act as would have removed the disability under which we labour. My hon. friend from West York seems to feel keenly the question of expense, and asks who is to pay for procuring and disseminating the information as to the prices of wheat. I think the hon. gentleman need not worry; for, if the fees now charged under the Inspection Act are not sufficient for this purpose, a few cents added to these fees will fully cover the outlay, and the farmers, upon whom the burden will rest, will not object to the additional expense for such a purpose. The information will enable us to show these people what they are actually taking out of the farmers. If we know what the different grades of wheat are bringing at Fort William, and the freight, it is easy to know what price the grain men can afford to pay.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would suggest that it would be better to take up each clause in turn and not go into a general discussion at this stage of the session, of the Inspection Act, with which the Grain Act has nothing at all to do. I have taken careful note of the hon. gentleman's suggestion as to telegraphing the prices of wheat and would like to make some further inquiry about it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) will admit, the only way in which that could be worked out would be by a section requiring the railway station agent to post up the prices.

Mr. BOYD. I may say that I intended to propose an amendment to clause 8 of section 42, in the second line, between the words 'agent' and 'and,' by inserting the following words :

At each station where there is a railway agent and where grain is shipped under such agent a suitable black board shall be kept, on which the prices of the several grades of wheat offered for sale under this Act shall be plainly written daily at 9 a.m. and 1 p.m.

Hon. Mr. ROSS. I may say that we have an arrangement under which daily reports from the three fishing stations in the three maritime provinces are received daily and are published in Halifax at the expense of the government. Something to the same effect might be done in this instance.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would suggest that, following the ordinary rules of the Committee of the Whole, we should take up one clause and consider it. We shall make no progress if we traverse the whole Grain Act and Inspection Act. But there will be every opportunity to consider amendments if we take up one section at a time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) was merely giving the Minister of Trade and Commerce notice of what was to come.

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I wish to move an amendment to this by inserting the word 'first' after the word 'six,' making it read 'the six first standard grades of wheat.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Referring for a moment to the first section of the Act, it seems to be an unusual mode of legislation to say that the expression 'Minister of Inland Revenue' should mean 'Minister of Trade and Commerce.' I do not see the object of it.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. In the Manitoba Grain Act the Minister of Inland Revenue had charge of this matter, and within a few months it has been transferred by special statute to the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would like to suggest another amendment. The Agricultural Committee of the Manitoba legislature had an investigation into this Act at the last session of parliament and were going to memorialize this parliament in reference to certain amendments. But unfortunately those amendments were brought down on the last day of the session and they were talked out, and I presume the memorial never reached the government. One of the proposed amendments was to subsection 3, to make it more definite. It was to insert after the word 'forward' in the second line thereof, the words 'to the order of the owner thereof when requested to do so by him.' Also to strike out the words 'without delay' from the fourteenth line of the same subsection and to substitute therefor the words 'within twenty-four hours.' 'Without delay' seemed to them a rather indefinite term.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I am sorry that this matter was delayed to the present time. If the hon. gentleman will write out his amendments and forward them to me I will have them examined. But I am rather reluctant, unless for very strong cause, and because it would probably imperil the passage of the Bill to embark on a discussion of more than the amendments that are now suggested. If the hon. gentleman thinks that the proposals

that are made are to the general advantage I would suggest to him that it would be better to confine ourselves to these than to run the risk of losing them all. We all know that there is considerable risk in taking up absolutely new questions and inserting them in sections which are not now before us without an opportunity to compare them with the other portions of the Bill. I do not say that his suggestions are not all right, but I would like to have a little time to consider them.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I explained to the committee that the changes proposed to be made are chiefly these: At present ten farmers are required to apply, the present amendment reduces the ten to one. It strikes out the last clause which provides that in the case of each additional warehouse the applicants desirous of erecting it should be liable to pay rental of 6 per cent interest on the value of the land taken, such land to be determined and fixed by commissioners, and should be liable to pay the cost of constructing the necessary sidings. That portion is struck out. Now I observe that an addition has been made here. In the original clause of the Act of 1900 a flat warehouse covered with metal is provided. The words 'covered with metal' are omitted. Those words I think ought to be inserted again, and I move that they be inserted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would like to remark that in the Bill of 1900 the erection of a flat warehouse was surrounded with so many restrictions that it was found that people were not ready to build them. It was thought better simply to state that they might build a flat warehouse and that all those details in connection with it should be left to the discretion of the warehouse commissioner; that it was quite unnecessary to define what the building should be, inasmuch as it was largely in the hands of the warehouse commissioner and the railway committee. I do not suppose that at this date and age they would think of anything else but a metal roof, even in view of the insurance. We considered it was not necessary to enter into any minute description of the building.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Strong objection was taken to the omission of those words, and I think the objection was well taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no objection to their being replaced, I do not suppose it matters much.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The railway companies object very strongly to the omission of the words 'covered with metal' on the ground that it affects the insurance on everything surrounding.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Mr. SCOTT. I would point out that the railway companies do not cover with metal all the buildings which they place on their own property. It is perfectly true that in most cases, where these flat warehouses are erected in proximity to other buildings, it would be no doubt wise to have a provision in the Act that they should be covered with metal, but I think this may be safely left in the hands of the commissioner. There will doubtless be cases where warehouses will be located hundreds of yards away from any other building, and in such cases it would not be necessary to enforce the provision that the buildings should be covered with metal. I think it may be safely left to the discretion of the commissioner.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I sympathize to some extent with what my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) says, but it must be remembered that we are practically letting down the bars and giving the greatest possible facility for the construction of flat warehouses. We are not providing in this Bill that a flat warehouse shall be of any particular capacity. A warehouse may only have a capacity of 1,000 bushels. Even if a warehouse should be put up 300 or 600 feet away from another elevator, next day a man might come along and apply for a site near the same place for the erection of an elevator that will cost $10,000 or $15,000. If you have two or three little flat warehouses, frame, and not covered with metal, you raise a difficulty at once. You raise a dispute, you have reference to the commissioner and there is a question as to whether this man shall be compelled to cover his warehouse with metal or not. It seems to me that the simplest way is to provide that the flat warehouse must be covered with metal, and there will be no difficulty about it. If it were going to cost sufficient to impose any restriction on the erection of flat warehouses I would not suggest it, but it is a trifling matter in the case of a small warehouse, and it is well understood to be in the general interest that it should be done.

Mr. BOYD. I do not see any objection to that provision and I believe that on the whole it possibly will be in the interest of the farmers that a flat warehouse should be so covered as it affects the rate of insurance and other matters. I would like to have the hon. minister's interpretation of the Act as to this question: Must a man who owns one of these small warehouses keep it open for the use of the public?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not very familiar with the working of the Act, but if my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) will look at subsections 4, 5 and 6 of section 41, he will see that it rather looks as if the owner will require to keep his warehouse open.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not see anything making it absolutely imperative in this clause.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, it does not say so in so many words.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. And I think if the hon. gentleman will look at section 8 he will see that we are removing a restriction on the buying and selling of grain which will probably obviate any practical difficulty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That, of course, permits the use of it for his own grain, but is not the effect of subsections 4, 5, 6, that he must keep it open for business by other persons ? I do not know whether it is the best policy that he should be obliged to keep it open or not ; I am not speaking of the question of policy but merely as to the effect of this section.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. On the question of construction. That, of course, is more a legal question, but, reading it cursorily, I should hardly think that he could be compelled to keep a man there all the time.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Subsection 4 of section 41 of the Act says :

> The owner of any such warehouse shall on the application of any farmer undertaking to ship a car load of grain, allot such farmer a binn in such warehouse as soon as one is available.

He is bound to permit his warehouse to be used for the purpose of shipping, but there is nothing in the Act that compels him to keep a man there. It is an obligation which could not be placed upon anybody by implication. It would have to be clear and specific.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think that is right, but if the farmer goes to him at his house he will be obliged to go down to the warehouse and allow him to put his grain in.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The elevator man will have to take the consequences.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The elevator man will have to go and open up his warehouse and let the farmer put his grain in, because the statute says so.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I remember that when the first Act was passed the commissioner reported upon the question, and after investigating it he was imbued with the idea that the warehouse should not be used by a buyer ; that is to say, that the owner should not buy wheat himself and therefore the principle was embodied in the Act that flat warehouses should simply be a means of shipping, but the experience of the community there is against it. They seem to require that you should allow a small independent buyer to have a flat warehouse to buy grain and increase the competition on the market.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I take it that practically these warehouses would not be in use for more than two months or thereabouts. Would not that be the practical result ? It is in the autumn when the grain is threshed and prior to the close of navigation that these things will be of real use to the farmers. As matters now stand I think by removing the restrictions on the purchase and sale of grain we will make it very much to the interest of the proprietor of the flat warehouse to be anxious to receive anything he can get.

Mr. BOYD. I know that it was frequently said by those interested in building these small warehouses that that was one of the reasons why they did not take advantage of the Act.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. The objection was, that, not being able to buy grain, they could not get the profit of buying. They could only make a storage charge for the wheat which they received and the small quantity which a flat warehouse held did not pay. But now, the owner is enabled to make a profit by buying grain and I do not think there is any difficulty about that.

Mr. BOYD. I am prepared to let it pass on the strength of the legal interpretation we have had and to take our chance of the future interpretation of the court if necessity demands it.

Mr. DAVIS. There is a suggestion which I would like to make. I see by this Act that you are confined to building nothing but a flat warehouse. I do not see why there should not be a provision which would enable a person to build either a flat warehouse, or an elevator. Last year we wanted to build an elevator in place of a flat warehouse, and we found a provision in the law under which we could build a flat warehouse, but there was no provision for us to build an elevator, and we could not get the right of way from the company. It is in the interest of the country that elevators should be built in place of flat warehouses, and I do not see why we should not have the privilege of building them. If the farmers have enough money to build an elevator they ought to be allowed to build it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the expression 'flat warehouse' defined by statute or is it merely a term known to the trade.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. So far as I am aware it is not defined by statute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There does not seem to be any restriction on the height of a flat warehouse.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. An elevator is a warehouse, but a warehouse is not necessarily an elevator. An elevator is a warehouse which has machinery for lifting the grain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that, but there does not seem to be any restriction in this statute on making a flat warehouse as high as one likes, and there is nothing in the Act to prevent you from having machinery in it. Why does it not authorize the building of an elevator ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I do not say that it does not, but these are questions which are often required to be determined by the court.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to have the word 'elevator' inserted because we do not want to have any trouble about it. We got a lawyer last year and he advised us that we could not build an elevator under the provisions of the Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not disputing that. I was merely seeking information from the minister as to the meaning of the statute.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I took the expression 'flat warehouse' as I found it in the Manitoba Grain Act of 1900. I am willing to consider all these amendments together.

On section 5, subsection 2,

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I wish to add the words 'within the limits of the station yard' so as to make it read 'each loading platform shall be erected within the limits of the station yard.'

Mr. DAVIS. Where there is no station yard, and the farmers want the platform, where do you provide it shall be erected ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. It will have to be provisionally erected where the commissioner directs.

On section 5, subsection 4,

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I wish to introduce the words here 'unless prevented by strikes or other unforeseen causes.' That will make it read that they shall erect the platform within 30 days unless prevented by strikes and so on.

Mr. McCREARY. 30 days is too long. I think the Minnesota State Act only gives them 10 days within which to erect a loading platform, and if you give them 30 days there should be no exception with regard to strikes. There might be a strike for instance, on some portion of the railway, but not among carpenters at all, and the company might use that as an excuse for not putting up a platform.

Mr. SCOTT. I draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the fact that the government have announced their intention of introducing legislation next year absolutely to prevent strikes on railways.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. If they succeed in doing that all the better.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is just one suggestion with regard to the second clause, that is, that in the amendment which the minister has proposed, there is no obligation to construct a platform except at a station. It was somewhat broader before.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I would suggest adding the words, 'and where there is no station yard, at such place as the commissioner may prescribe.'

Mr. BOYD. I would like to have a legal interpretation of the meaning of the words 'undue delay,' in the clause requiring railway companies to furnish cars to farmers without undue delay. Do they mean forty-eight hours, a week, or how long ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think I can answer that question by asking my hon. friend to try to express the idea better. I think he would then realize the difficulty of trying to regulate business by an Act of parliament. The only thing we can do is to employ general terms which are to be understood in their ordinary and common sense. You cannot say in an Act of parliament that if a man asks a railway company for a car for a certain purpose the company shall furnish it to him within a certain time, because unforeseen circumstances might render it impossible to do so. I think my hon. friend will see that we have gone just as far as we could go in a legislative enactment by declaring what the duty of the company shall be. Undue delay means unreasonable delay. If you covered pages of the statute-book with explanations I do not believe you could make the provision any more effective.

Mr. DAVIS. The real difficulty is this. The railway companies bring a certain number of cars to every shipping point, and what we want to provide is that the farmers shall get a fair proportion of these cars.

Mr. SCOTT. This particular clause has no reference to the distribution of cars so much as it is to make provision that the cars shall be furnished to farmers at all points—not only where there are loading platforms, but at other points.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This clause lays down the principle that the farmer is entitled to get his share of cars. The company cannot say, 'we are only bound to furnish cars where there is a warehouse or an elevator.' We settled that question by this clause.

Mr. BOYD. I have no desire to hamper the railway companies in doing business. But the minister has asked me if I would

suggest something that would be more effective. I could very soon do it, but it is a question whether it would be exactly fair to the railway companies. For instance, if a farmer keeps a car for a certain time and does not load it he has to pay for the car. If, on the other hand, you provide that when the farmer demands a car within a certain time the company shall pay if they do not furnish it within that time, you will get over the difficulty. But for my part, I suppose we may be satisfied in the meantime to see how the railway companies are prepared to meet the provisions of the Act so far as we have gone and deal with them later on if they do not do so.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I think that would be the wiser course. This Act will, I think, be up for revision next year, and in the meantime we shall have an opportunity of seeing how it will work.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You are proposing to extend the power of the commissioner to put up loading platforms wherever he chooses. He should not have that power at all. I would suggest that they be put either at a station or at a siding.

Mr. DAVIS. I think that should be left in the hands of the commissioner who is on the ground and knows the conditions. There are places where there is plenty of grain, but where there is not a siding for a distance of twenty miles.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I move the addition to section 2 of the words 'and where there is no station yard at such siding as the commissioner may prescribe.'

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 8,

Mr. BOYD. I beg to submit the following amendment: On the second line between the words 'agent' and 'and' that the following words be inserted. 'There shall be a suitable blackboard, upon which the prices of all grains offered for sale under this Act shall be plainly written daily at 9 a.m. and 1 p.m.'

Mr. DAVIS. Who will do this work—the railway company or the government?

Mr. BOYD. Take it out of the inspection commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Provision is made in the Act to provide papers giving the prices in Liverpool and other points, and also Chicago and Minneapolis, to be seen every day in Winnipeg, so that the suggestion of the hon. member for Macdonald is simply to carry this forward from Winnipeg to outlying stations.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. There are nearly a thousand such stations, and this might be a very considerable tax on the Inspection Act, which is hardly equal to the requirements made on it, as it stands. I would like a little time to consider that amendment, and I hope, when we come to the third reading, to be able to give an answer. There is no limit to the time in the amendment, and to supply for several months prices twice a day to a thousand stations might involve much greater expense than the hon. gentleman contemplates. I suppose his intention is that these prices shall be supplied by the Canadian Pacific Telegraph Company, which is the only company that has communication with all these stations. From my own experience, I should say that to supply twice a day to a thousand places by telegraph the prices of all kinds of wheat offered for sale under this Act, might involve a very considerable charge. Judging from my own experience, I should say that to supply, twice a day, telegraphic statements to a thousand places of the price of all the grades of wheat offered for sale under this Act might involve a very considerable charge. It might run into a great many thousand dollars.

Mr. DAVIS. And what about the case of places where they load from the platform?

Mr. BOYD. Of course, where there is no telegraph, it cannot be done.

Mr. DAVIS. Then, one portion of the community would be protected and the other not.

Mr. BOYD. It is better to have some protected than none.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. While it is, without doubt, important and desirable that the farmers selling wheat should know what that wheat is worth at Port Arthur afloat, as a matter of fact, the only way in which that could be brought about is by making some kind of amicable arrangement with the railway companies who have the telegraph lines, to furnish it.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). That is the way the Agricultural Committee of the legislature decided to do it—to make the request of the railway companies.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Without warning, or notice, or discussion, to put a statutory obligation on the railway companies would not be so advantageous, I should think, as for the department to try to make an amicable arrangement with the companies. My impression is that there would be no great difficulty about it, but, of course, I cannot speak with certainty. But my hon. friend will see that it would be much better to make the attempt, because if the railway companies desire to do it, they have the facilities, having both the means of communication and a staff of officers to post up the informa-

tion. But, if you make it obligatory by statute, you do two things. In the first place, you are to a certain extent, making yourself responsible for the correctness of the prices quoted, which is not altogether a satisfactory thing to do. The hon. gentleman knows that, on the street in Winnipeg you may meet a man who will say: I will give you so much for wheat, and five minutes after he might be willing to give you two cents more. Under such circumstances, who is to say what the price really is at Port Arthur. The only thing you can do is to give it as nearly as possible, and it will be much more satisfactory if that were done under an amicable arrangement with all parties than under a statute which, the railway companies would naturally feel, imposed upon them a duty which it was difficult to perform. I think it would be better for the department first to attempt to work out the arrangement with the railway companies than to make it statutory.

Mr. BOYD. For my part, I can see no difficulty about this being carried into effect. At the present time in many places in Manitoba—and for that matter, throughout Canada—we get market quotations hourly. And, as I say, if it is necessary to make a charge on the farmers, a very small charge on the millions of bushels of wheat going to Port Arthur would meet all the extra expense, and the farmers would be well remunerated by the service that would be rendered them in posting up these prices.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I quite agree with my hon. friend.

Mr. BOYD. If the hon. minister agrees, there need be no great difficulty in working out the details. I have offered the suggestion and am satisfied to leave it with the minister until the third reading of the Bill. In the meantime, he can confer with his officers and devise a means of carrying out an improvement which, in my opinion, is absolutely necessary. And I think that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who represent the grain sellers of this country will support me.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. I will accept my hon. friend's (Mr. Boyd's) suggestion. We will take this into consideration and will announce our conclusion on the third reading of the Bill. I wish to make a further amendment in this clause. It has been represented that there are a number of shipping stations in the same agency, and that it would be desirable to amend the section so as to include the various shipping points where there is no agent permanently resident. Also I propose to strike out the words 'forty-eight hours.' The first part of the section then would read:

> At each station where there is a railway agent and where grain is shipped under such agent, an order book for cars shall be kept open to the public for each shipping point under such agent in which applicants for cars shall make order. Applicants shall make order according to their requirements; cars so ordered shall be awarded to applicants according to the order in time in which such orders appear on the Order book.

And so on.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This clause seems to me the most curious piece of legislation I ever read. I do not see how it is possible to carry it out. Suppose a party who has ordered a car, and after a delay of 48 hours, if he does not take it, it is awarded to the next person. If the next person does not take it within 48 hours, when there are a couple of hundred applicants, it may be, how long will it be before some one will appear who will take it? It is impossible to work out anything of the kind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the individual does not appear the railway company can come upon him for demurrage, if he does not use the car within 48 hours. Under the common Railway Act an individual has 48 hours within which to use the car, and it would be only just that the railway company should charge demurrage for the detention of the car.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is no provision for demurrage. Suppose there are fifty applicants for a car. The first man forfeits his right in 48 hours. The next man may live five miles or ten miles from the station. Notice is to be sent to him. who is to send the notice, or who is to pay for sending it? Even if he lives convenient to the station, he has 48 hours more to wait, and so it runs on, and the railroad company has to keep the cars there all the time. I do not see how you can make any practical use of this kind of legislation.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend's imagination may suggest a great many difficulties which are not likely to occur in the practical working out of this clause. There will be no attempt to send a word to anybody that there is a car there waiting for him. Cars are coming in every hour of the day, and no station agent will keep a car 48 hours if the applicant is not there to take it. If a man has ordered a car and is there he will get it, if he is not there, he won't get it, and it will be given to the next man who is there. The real effect of this clause is to give an individual the right to order a car and to get a car, the railway company are compelled to furnish him a car. I am not disposed to be unreasonable with the railway company. I recognize the fact that it is a very difficult business for any station agent to handle the business at a point where there is an immense amount of wheat, and perhaps a shortage of cars. But at the same time there are substantial grievances on the part of the farmers. Every member of the House who represents a

wheat growing constituency in the North-west will know of cases where cars have gone by day after day, where there are people at an elevator or warehouse who are entitled to cars and cannot get them. What we desire is a law which shall give to each man fair play and no discrimination. There may be practical difficulty in working out the clause, but I do not think any better way can be suggested of attaining the object we have in view. The clause has received very careful consideration.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister says that it practically will accomplish what is required. Fancy thirty applicants where there is a forfeiture and every one waiting his turn. The station master has absolute control over the matter and if the first one forfeits his right he passes over him and goes on with the rest.

Mr. SCOTT. If we have conditions in future in any way approaching what we had last year there will be no danger of forfeiture. I know of a case last year at a station ten miles north of Regina where three or four cars were placed on a siding on Sunday night. Before daylight on Monday these cars were all filled. The farmers left home with their loads at midnight and loaded the cars.

Mr. BOYD. I am not dreading very much the fear that the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has suggested in regard to this. I desire to mention the amendment which I propose to move to clause 54 and which I will hand to the minister. It is in regard to dockage. I propose to add to section 54 the words 'and shall be given the full amount of dockage from their grain if they desire the same.' I explained that merchants who buy grain are in the habit of docking the grain very heavily and then keeping over half of it. It is to prevent this practice that I suggest the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would remind my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) that the legislation of the North-west Territories effectually stands in the way of this amendment. This matter was discussed at very great length in connection with the Bill with persons well acquainted with the condition of things in the west. The Noxious Weeds Act of the North-west Territories stands in the way of what may be taken as dockage being given back to the individual who owns the grain.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. What are the general provisions of the Noxious Weeds Act ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That the individual shall not be allowed to take the stuff which has been cleaned out of his grain, put it in his conveyance and take it home, because he would scatter the weed seeds all the way.

Mr. SCOTT. If there are noxious weed seeds in the refuse or small wheat.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is to prevent the spread of noxious weeds ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, that is the difficulty which is in the way, and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to it. We certainly have no objection to the provision which he suggests but this is the difficulty in the way of its adoption.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the advantage of having the dockage in the hands of the merchant more than in the hands of the farmer ? Is it not just as liable to be spread in the country in the one case as in the other ?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is usually burned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you have a provision requiring it to be burned that is all right.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not know what the provisions of the Noxious Weeds Act of the North-west Territories are, but my recollection of the Manitoba Act is that it is made an offence to allow the tailings to be taken away from the elevator and they are required to be burned.

Mr. BOYD. So far as that is concerned the elevators of Manitoba have been selling them right along, and I know of cases last winter where they shipped them out of the country. They have been shipping them to Minneapolis.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As long as they ship them to Minneapolis it is all right.

Mr. BOYD. It is a fact that the elevator men are making an undue profit out of these screenings and I do not think the Act of the territorial legislation should stand in the way of this amendment. If the territorial assembly feels disposed to pass an Act that will prohibit this being done, well and good ; but I do not think it applies to the province of Manitoba under the present statute.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I would ask the hon. minister a question in reference to the form of storage receipt in schedule as to the charges for receiving, cleaning, insurance against loss by fire, handling, storing, and so on. I see it says :

It is provided by law that this charge shall not exceed. . . . . dollars of a cent per bushel.

Is there a stipulated amount for charges mentioned in the Act ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The amount which the elevator man can charge by this Act is under the regulation of the Governor in Council.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). Is it a stipulated amount ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It is under the control of the Governor in Council.

Mr. ROCHE (Marquette). I know that the farmers consider that this is an excessive charge, although I am not aware what it is. The resolution passed by this investigating committee suggested that the Act should be amended so as to read that the charges shall not exceed one and three-quarter cents per bushel and that they shall be only one and a quarter cents per bushel where the cleaning is not done.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That would be a proper matter to have to consider. I could not very well put in any fixed rate without inquiring, but I can have the attention of the grain commissioner called to the matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Section 33 of the Manitoba Grain Act provides:

> The Governor in Council may, before the 1st of September, in each year, and as often as he deems proper, make and promulgate all suitable and necessary rules and regulations for the government and control of public country elevators and warehouses, including flat warehouses, and the receipt, storage, insurance, handling and shipment of grain therein and therefrom, and the maximum rates of charges therefor, and so on.

The Governor in Council has power now, under the Act, to regulate the charges.

Mr. BOYD. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce if he would be so kind as to send me a copy of the amendments that he decides upon.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. That you have just submitted?

Mr. BOYD. The amendments that you propose to enact.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What my hon. friend (Mr. Boyd) means is that if the hon. minister takes into favourable consideration any of the suggestions which have been made he would like to have a copy of the amendments which the hon. minister proposes in accordance with these suggestions.

Bill reported.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL SUBWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

On section 20, subsection (b),

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have an amendment to suggest. I am sorry the promoter of the Bill is not here, but I wish to say that I have had a consultation with some of the promoters of the Bill and they have agreed to this amendment with a view of stopping any further opposition, so that the Bill may be able to go through both Houses this session. The amendment reads:

> The company shall, within seven months of the passing of this Act, expend on construction work of said subway the sum of $200,000; otherwise the charter will be considered null and void.

The men at the back of this Bill are some of the best men we have in Canada; the Hon. Senator Mackay and others who could build the subway themselves without any outside assistance, but if any accident should happen, so that during the next seven months they do not desire to go on, then it would give some other company an opportunity of advertising a Bill for the next session of parliament, either for a bridge or a tunnel. I am speaking now entirely in the interest of the city of Montreal. We have got to get a bridge or a tunnel at once. I am glad to see some of the members from Montreal here, and I am sure they will back me up in what I say in this regard. We have been waiting for communication between Montreal and the South Shore year after year, and if these people are willing to build this tunnel as they say, without asking the country to assist them in any way, why, of course, we should let them do so, and we should let the bridge people do the same thing under similar conditions. If they are going to build bridges and tunnels to connect Montreal with the South Shore, and not ask the country for subsidies; by all means let them build them, and if possible immediately.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When the Bill was being considered in committee last time, I suggested an amendment similar to this, but one of the promoters of the Bill objected to it. They would not agree then to spend even $100,000 on construction, and declined to accept the amendment I offered. I did not want to appear as being opposed to the Bill, and so I let it go, but I am very glad to hear from my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) that he has seen some of the promoters in Montreal and that they have agreed that a clause should be inserted to the effect that they would spend $200,000 on construction work within seven months after this Bill had been sanctioned. I think that is a proper amendment, and I, for one, am ready to accept it. While I am on my feet, perhaps it might be just as well to know how we stand on this matter. These people from other parts of the country, from Quebec and from Toronto, have extended their unbounded generosity to us in Montreal. They want to build a tunnel for which we are very thankful indeed, but those who are a little old in this parliament and outside of it do not always take for granted what they see on the face of a Bill. For instance, when names are on a Bill like this we do not take it for granted that those who

allow their names to be put on will subscribe to the stock themselves. There is not a man in this House who has any experience, who does not know that behind every Bill there are schemes and wheels within wheels; there are contractors and things like that. We all know that. It is a very old story indeed. Therefore, I think we should know exactly where we stand. A tunnel for railway purposes alone would not suit the interests of the city of Montreal and of the South Shore. There is not a single member from the district of Montreal who would say that a tunnel for railway purposes would suit us, and therefore the two tunnels, the one for vehicles and the one for railways have to go on together. I have no hesitation in saying that the whole population of Montreal is in favour of a bridge instead of a tunnel, but I hope that the tunnel will be successful. That, however, has to be proved. It is not very attractive for the farmers to travel with their produce and their families and so on in a tunnel.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is not intended as a pleasure road.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is not a pleasure road no doubt, but I can tell my hon. friend that the farmers on the South Shore are most prosperous; they come every day to the city, and there is a strong feeling in favour of some new communication between the South Shore and the city. That feeling has arisen because they believe the Grand Trunk Railway has not used them liberally enough. They believe that the rates on the Grand Trunk Railway bridge are too high, and so they insist on having a new means of communication. Before this Bill goes through the House, I shall, therefore, insist that the two tunnels will go on together, and I am sure I will be supported in that by all the members from the district of Montreal. Speaking of the amendment just proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike), I may say that I am very glad that he has taken the trouble to consult the promoters of the Bill in Montreal, and I fully agree with him.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This question was fully discussed in the Railway Committee, which came to the conclusion that it would exact from these parties a deposit of $50,000 for their good faith when they would submit their plans to the Governor in Council, and also that $100,000 would be spent by them within nine months. I believe that guarantee is amply sufficient unless you want to kill the project. For my part, I am rather inclined in favour of a bridge, and I have been in favour of a bridge for 20 or 25 years. I know that the citizens of Montreal are in favour of a bridge, but in what position are we at the present time? We are in the position that we are not likely to have any bridge Bill passed during the present session of parliament. The only bridge Bill that was submitted to the committee seriously was withdrawn, but there remains another Bill which is on the Order paper for the second reading. If the hon. gentleman who occupies the important position of Minister of Public Works in the government of Canada; if he will undertake to support the other Bill which is the second Order of the day, and if he will undertake to give to the citizens of Montreal and to the people on the South Shore some help as regards improved means of communication with the city, I do not know what I would do myself under the existing conditions. But I do not think that it is possible to have the other Bill passed during this session. If prorogation is going to take place next Tuesday or Wednesday, this other Bill cannot go before the committee until Monday, and there is no knowing when it would come back to the House. Although, as I have said, I am not quite favourable to the tunnel scheme, yet as a representative of Montreal for the past twenty-five years, and knowing the sentiments of the people there, I know that they want that the promoters of any scheme which will give them communication between the two sides of the river, shall have a chance to go on with the execution of the work which they contemplate.

Not a word has been said against the promoters of this enterprise. There are two or three of them who are certainly in a position to build and to carry to a success this enterprise with their own resources. If they are not serious, or if they discover within the next three months, after having put engineers to work to ascertain what is to be done, that it is impossible, with the amount of capital at their disposal, to carry on the work, there will be nothing lost, and there will be opportunity for any serious company to give the necessary notices and come before parliament next session and ask for the necessary legislation to give them the right to build either a tunnel or a bridge. I repeat that all we want is communication between the two shores of the St. Lawrence; and as a citizen of the city of Montreal, interested in the welfare of the city, and knowing the sentiments of the people, I think we should give every possible chance to this company to become incorporated and to start the necessary works. If you impose upon the company conditions which are impossible, you might as well kill the Bill at once, and tell the people of Montreal to wait until it pleases us to have this communication between the two shores provided. I say this without any hesitation, knowing, as I have said, exactly the sentiments of the citizens of Montreal. The amount required to be deposited, $50,000, as a guarantee of good faith, is a better provision than the one suggested by the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division; because if these people are not serious, they will not risk having the $50,000 forfeited,

whereas people who are not serious might say, 'We will go on and get the plans prepared and submit these plans to the government, and after we have done that, we will spend part of the $200,000, and then try to get an extension of time from parliament.' Then they would come here and say to parliament: 'We have had plans prepared at a cost of, say $50,000, and we have spent $30,000 in making soundings and experiments, and we want an extension of time.' Parliament, being always well disposed, would grant the extension of time for another year; and the result would be that the citizens of Montreal and the people on the south shore of the St. Lawrence would be deprived of the incorporation of a serious company, which would have been in a position to go on with the undertaking. I speak feelingly on this matter, not only as a representative of the city of Montreal, but as one interested in the welfare of the people on the south shore; for I may say that the door of political life was opened to me by the people of my native county of Chambly, and I have a great deal of sympathy for them. I know what the farmers of the south shore have been suffering for years; I know the sentiment they have towards an enterprise of this kind. When it was decided by this parliament that half a million should be granted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company to enable it to enlarge the Victoria bridge and to make it a general traffic bridge, as was stated at the time, the project was hailed with rejoicing on both sides of the St. Lawrence; but when it was discovered that instead of it being a traffic bridge, it only gave one-fourth the advantages which were expected, the people of the south shore were only pacified by the friends of the government telling them that whenever a serious company would undertake to build a bridge or to carry out some other scheme to provide communication between the two shores, it would be given the power to do so. If you now refuse this opportunity to this company, and impose upon it conditions which are impossible, and which will prevent people even thinking of undertaking such a work, you will do an injustice to fifteen or twenty counties on the south shore of the St. Lawrence, as well as to the city of Montreal. I have no hesitation in saying that if the hon. member for the St. Lawrence division were not actuated by good motives, and really thought that his amendment would block the enterprise, I do not think he would persist in it; because the clause as it stands in the Bill before the House affords all the necessary safeguards to the public; and next session, if these people prove not to be serious in what they undertake, the field will be perfectly open to another company to come before this House and get another charter.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Surely my hon. friend can have no objection to accept the amendment which has been accepted in Montreal by the most influential promoters of the Bill.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not know that before.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend from the St. Lawrence division met to-day the hon. Senator Mackay and Mr. Ross——

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Mr. Miles.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I beg pardon—Senator Mackay and Mr. Miles, and both of them have authorized him to move this amendment. Here is the amendment:

The company shall within seven months of the passing of this Act expend on construction works of said subway the sum of $200,000, otherwise the charter shall be considered null and void.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that strike out the necessity of the deposit of $50,000?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. The deposit remains as it is; but instead of $100,000, which is specified in section 21 of the Bill, the amendment provides that $200,000 shall be spent on construction work. Surely the people of Montreal cannot have any objection to taking every security that it is possible to give. I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Préfontaine) is deeply interested in the welfare of the city of Montreal and the ridings on the south shore; but it has not been by granting charters imprudently that we have served those large interests in the past. We have had on the statute-book for the last ten or twelve years a charter to build a bridge, but it is not built yet. The promoters of the undertaking, being substantial men, have approved of the amendment, and under the circumstances, I think it should be accepted.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is the sum of $200,000 substituted for the sum of $100,000, which was inserted in the Bill by the Railway Committee?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Public Works is entirely mistaken. According to the amendment, the sum of $200,000 is to be spent within seven months after the passage of the Bill, whereas, if I remember rightly, the Railway Committee decided that the sum of $100,000 should be spent within nine months after the approval of the plans and specifications by the Governor in Council. The two provisions are entirely different.

I am sorry to see the opposition of the hon. Minister of Public Works, for I think

it is the duty of the government to sustain the action of the Railway Committee. As the hon. minister says, most respectable men are the incorporators in this Bill. After full discussion, the committee decided that, as an evidence of their bonâ fides, $50,000 should be deposited by the parties who were applying—that is by the incorporators—which, in the event of their not going on with the undertaking, will be forfeited to the Crown, and further, that, on the expiry of nine months after the acceptance or approval of the plans by the Governor in Council, $1,000,000 shall have been expended on the undertaking.

Mr. McCARTHY. Make it $200,000 if you like.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Make it $200,000 and then I suppose there will be no objection to the Bill. I draw the attention of the hon. member from St. Lawrence (Mr. Bickerdike) to the fact that this amendment is completely irregular. He has not given notice of it, and canont move it except with the unanimous consent of the House.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I know that.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I came here to-night to try and get the Bill through, because if we do not get it through to-night it will not go through at all. This is a compromise, which was arrived at yesterday in Montreal, and I ask hon. members to accept it now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We will do it unanimously, if the hon. member will agree to substitute $200,000 for the $100,000.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I am quite willing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And provide that it be expended on construction work.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If after the passing of the Bill, when the borings are made, it is found that the company cannot go on, I want to give other parties an opportunity to advertise in time to have a Bill introduced next session.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. You can advertise whether you are going on or not.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No reasonable men would come in unless they be given the time I ask.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will not the hon. member for St. Lawrence accept the amendment proposed by the promoters of the Bill to have $200,000 substituted for $100,000 ? The hon. gentleman must understand that the promoters cannot commence the work until the plans are approved by the government, and they are only given nine months after the approval of the plans for the expenditure of $200,000. There is a forfeiture of $50,000, to which they are subject, and they have besides to expend $200,000 within nine months after the approval of the plans, under penalty of forfeiture of their charter.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If the hon. gentleman will accept seven months instead of nine months——

Mr. COWAN. There are a lot of Bills behind this, and let us get through with it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I want this to go through.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. What the hon. member asks is fairly reasonable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the committee to substitute $200,000 for the $100,000 provided in the Bill ?

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that this is too important a Bill to railroad through the committee at the rapid rate at which it is attempted to put it through. We had considerable discussion in the committee over this Bill and a great deal of impatience was shown and a very strong disposition to force it through, whether, in the judgment of many, it was right or wrong. It is a very important undertaking, far reaching in its consequences, and it seems to me that a little delay would be more in keeping with the best interests of the city of Montreal and the people of that part of the country than to hurry the measure through too rapidly. When this Bill was before the Railway Committee, one of the strongest reasons given in its behalf was the respectability and financial strength of the men whose names appear as its incorporators. But members of parliament, who have been in this House any length of time, have learned to estimate at its proper value this parading of prominent names. We have learned over and over again that these names are simply used for the specific purpose of influencing the House and the committee to get a scheme through, and find out afterwards that the owners of these names had indeed very little to do with it, and very often the charter passes shortly afterwards into the hands of men who are little better than men of straw. Older members do not lay as much stress, as do some of the younger ones, on the importance of these prominent financial names, which are too often lent for the purpose of carrying the Bill through the House. I am not underestimating the financial ability of these men as financiers of Montreal or the Dominion. There is no doubt they command a very large amount of capital. And if their financial wealth were at stake, that would give us a guarantee that they intended to carry the enterprise through and do not intend to let it pass into other hands. But it is because we know from experience that such is not always the case and that too often these prominent names are used for the purpose of getting a Bill through the House, and for

that purpose alone, that we do not attach to them the value we otherwise would. It is proposed to make a tunnel under the St. Lawrence, and that suggests the questions whether the scheme is feasible, how much it will cost, when it can be completed, and of what utility it will be when completed. These are the questions we naturally consider in seeking to determine whether it will be wise or otherwise to assist them in putting through this scheme. If we consider what other tunnels have cost and compare them with the proposal in this Bill, we can come to but one conclusion—that the gentlemen who have lent their names to this scheme have taken but little trouble to collect the data which they ought to have for their own guidance and for the use of parliament and of the committee in the discussion of a scheme of this kind. I have a few facts with regard to the cost of the St. Clair tunnel, and this proposed St. Lawrence tunnel, I believe, will be a great deal more expensive. The St. Clair tunnel cost $3,324,000——

Mr. BELCOURT. I rise to a point of order. Are we going to have a dissertation on the cost of every tunnel in America as part of the discussion of this Bill, when there are twenty Bills on the Order paper awaiting the attention of the committee ?

Mr. SPROULE. That makes no difference.

Mr. BELCOURT. It surely is not germane to the question to discuss the cost of tunnels elsewhere.

Mr. CASGRAIN. On the question of order, I venture to submit that the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Sproule's) remarks are quite pertinent to the question. It is most important to consider whether this tunnel really will be built, and the information the hon. gentleman is giving is relevant to the question and important in consideration of it. I do not think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) is quite within his rights.

Mr. SPROULE. I was sure you would make such a ruling, Mr. Speaker, for it would be unprecedented to deny the right to present legitimate arguments such as I am presenting in connection with this matter. It must not be forgotten that this can only pass this House by unanimous consent. Any member has a right to object to the amendment if he desires to do so. The fact that we do not act upon that right shows the indulgence we are inclined to exercise towards the hon. gentleman's scheme.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the promoters accept the condition of the expenditure of $200,000 within nine months and the deposit of $50,000, does not the hon. gentleman think that a sufficient guarantee that these people are in earnest ?

Mr. SPROULE. I would consider it better than the $50,000 alone. But it is not enough to satisfy me that they——

Mr. PREFONTAINE. How much do you want ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am opposed to the principle of a tunnel, for the reasons that I propose to give to the House. In the first place, I say the cost is very much greater than the promoters of this Bill have estimated it to be, and that would be one of the strongest deterrents to the fruition of the scheme. I was about to say that the St. Clair tunnel, which is a single tunnel with a single track and which is only twenty feet in diameter, which is through clay thirty feet below the water at the lowest point, the approach grade being only two per cent on one side—while this St. Lawrence tunnel is two per cent one side and steeper on the other—cost $3,234,857. Now, if this St. Lawrence tunnel is to give the accommodation to the public the promoters profess a desire to give, it would require not one tunnel but two or three——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two tunnels.

Mr. SPROULE. This would make the cost at least twice as great as the St. Clair tunnel, that is to say, the cost would run up to about $7,000,000, even if it were no greater in length than the St. Clair tunnel.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What is the length of the St. Clair tunnel ?

Mr. SPROULE. The open cut on the Canadian side is 3,270 feet ; tunnel on the Canadian side, 1,160 feet ; tunnel under the river, 2,310 feet ; on the American side, 1,810 feet ; open cut on the American side, 2,820 feet—total, 11,370 feet, or 2·23-100 miles. The proposed St. Lawrence tunnel is 4·11-100 miles in length. Thus, besides requiring two tubes, this tunnel is nearly twice as long as the St. Clair tunnel. I think we have every reason to believe that it will be proportionately as costly, and, on that basis, the expense involved will be about $15,000,000. We must take this item of cost into consideration, in deciding whether it is wise or not to give the promoters the right to build this tunnel. For, the existence of this charter, even if the work were not carried out, would have the effect of preventing the building of a bridge which, to my mind, would be much better. Now I have the figures here concerning the Washington tunnel in Chicago. That is a dry tunnel. It was built in 1867 for general traffic. But it was very unpopular and was never used to any great extent. We are

told by the promoters of this Bill that this St. Lawrence tunnel would be as useful for traffic as a bridge. Any one who knows anything about tunnels knows that that is perfect moonshine. What benefit would it be to the farmers of the south shore if they have the tunnel built? Practically none at all, for they could not use it for general traffic to any great extent. The Washington tunnel was turned over to the street railway in 1890. It consists of two arches with centre walls, approach grade seven to eight per cent, with a length of open cut of 570 feet and tunnel 930 feet, a total of 1,500 feet. It was very costly, but I need not go into the figures, as that part of it does not bear any relation to this. Now, what is proposed for this St. Lawrence tunnel? They propose to build a tunnel open at the north side for 2,500 feet, against 3,370 feet for the St. Clair tunnel. There will be a land tunnel of 6,800 feet. The river tunnel will be 5,500 feet, whereas the river tunnel under the St. Clair is only 2,310 feet. I give these figures to show how much more expensive this one will be and how much more imporant this enterprise will be, than even the St. Clair tunnel which took such a long time to put through. The land on the south side would be 2,630 feet, the open cut would be 4,220 feet; in all the total cut with the tunnel would be 21,700 feet, while the St. Clair tunnel had only 11,370 feet. Now, when these figures are remembered one can understand what it means to build a tunnel under the St. Lawrence down at Montreal. But they are going to double track this tunnel, it is going to be 26 feet wide and 23 feet high. The estimated cost, without the land damages, will be $3,500,000. The cost of the St. Clair tunnel for a single tube was over $3,234,000. You see the enormous disparity between the sizes of the tunnels, and yet the one is to cost about the same as the other. It shows how little time has been spent in making up the estimate, on what slight data a conclusion has been based of the cost of this tunnel. This tunnel would cost at least $13,500,000, and it is to require three years to build it. If we may judge from the rapidity with which these tunnels have been built in the past it is more likely to take four or five years to build it than three years.

Now, it will not give the same accommodation as a bridge would give, and in my judgment a bridge is the only feasible scheme there in the interests of the people, because we want the common people to be able to use it as well as the railway companies. The railway companies can use a tunnel all right but the ordinary foot passenger cannot use it, and the man with a horse and vehicle cannot use it. I asked the question in the Railway Committee, how is the man going there with his produce to get through the tunnel? It has to be put on a car, horse and all, and carried through. When you consider the amount of traffic from one side of the river to the other you can understand how many will use it. It will require three tunnels similar to this one to give the same convenience to the people as a bridge would give, and three tunnels at the estimated cost given by the hon. gentleman for this one would cost $10,500,000. And what I have given you with reference to the actual facts of building the St. Clair tunnel justifies the conclusion that instead of its costing $15,000,000 it would cost nearer $20,000,000 or $30,000,000, and I have no doubt it will when it comes to be built.

Now, the time they require to build it in is three years, as against two years for a bridge. We are told, and I think we are justified in believing that a bridge could easily be built inside of two years. But it would be utterly impossible to push on a tunnel at the ordinary progress usually made in building tunnels in anything like that time. For these reasons I am opposed to a tunnel entirely. But if we must have a tunnel, then I want to say, in view of these prominent names that are paraded with their financial strength as a justification for us to give them this charter, that we want the very strongest binding clauses that can possibly be put in to satisfy us that these men are prepared to put their own money into it, to go on at once and build this tunnel and not keep it for speculative purposes and sell out to the first man that comes along. I am opposed to it in the next place because, considering the gigantic nature of the undertaking, I do not think it is likely to be carried through. I am opposed to it because I do not think we have sufficient data to enable us to determine whether it would be wise for us to pass this Bill. Has there been a boring made in the St. Lawrence river to show what the sub soil is like? Has there been any engineering investigation; anything more than an ordinary estimate? Nothing, so far as I know, nothing that was before the committee; so we are really going it blind. I am opposed to it, as I said, because it involves an immense expenditure of money which is not likely to be made inside the next four or five years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But these gentlemen do not ask us for any money. I want that fact to be kept in mind. The promoters of the Bill told us the other day that they do not ask us for a subsidy.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not taking that into account at all. I am discussing the feasibility of the scheme, the probability of its being carried out, and the importance of it after it is built; and I am drawing a comparison between the value of that scheme to the people both on the north shore and the south shore, and the value of a bridge, and I reach the conclusion in my own mind

that if this tunnel is undertaken it will destroy the probability of a bridge ever being built for a long time to come. These are the points of view from which I am discussing the scheme at the present time. Now, the expenditure on the tunnel is to be very large, and these names are put forward as a reason why it is going to be built. I do not wish to underestimate the value and the financial importance of these names, because I believe they are all respectable men, all men of wealth and men who can control a great deal of money with their influence, if they desire to do so. Therefore if they are bona fide and going to invest their own capital and are not asking parliament to give them any subsidy why, they should have, it is said, an opportunity to build it. But it is because I believe they do not intend to build it that I am speaking against this Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. How do you know ?

Mr. SPROULE. I am giving reasons why I come to that conclusion. I do not say I know, but I say I am justified in coming to that conclusion for the reasons that I have given. Then again I say, in conclusion, that the tunnel is of no use for ordinary traffic purposes. What are the chief requirements for the ordinary farmer on the south shore ? It is to get over the river cheaply and readily to reach that great and valuable market. Are they going to get there through the tunnel ? Farmers do not use the St. Clair tunnel, they do not use any other tunnel for that purpose that I know of. Why ? Because they cannot use it with safety, they cannot use it with convenience, they cannot use it without very great danger, and they are not likely to use it at all. We are told that these tunnels, filled as they are with trains passing back and forth, with smoke, gas and foul air, not lighted, not properly ventilated, that they cannot be used by the ordinary travelling public at all. What benefit will it be to the farmer ? I am talking on behalf of the poor farmer that wishes to get to this market. I spoke on exactly the same lines when the Victoria bridge was being widened and I did my level best then to get a clause put in that Bill that would protect the travelling public against exorbitant charges I was fought on that line by members who advocated the scheme. And what was the result after the bridge was built ? Why we had the representatives of the people coming back and saying that the charges were most exorbitant. It is in view of that experience that I desire to take time by the forelock and not allow the poor habitants to be bound up for all time to come without being able to take advantage of the convenience which they desire for the purpose of getting to that important market. I say if that tunnel is built it will be of no value to the farmer on the south shore, but if a bridge is built it will be of immense value. I wish the government to keep in their hands the right to reduce the tolls, and to say they shall not be so onerous that the ordinary habitant cannot take advantage of the tunnel. For these reasons I am opposed to the tunnel in toto. But if this House must pass this Bill, then I want to see it passed with the most stringent provisions that will guarantee the building of it at an early day, because as long as this Bill remains it will prevent the possibility of any corporation taking up the scheme of building a bridge across that river, which would be by all means the most valuable communication for the poor people who require it the most.

Mr. BALL. Before this Bill is carried I would like to make a few remarks as representing one of the south shore counties, the county of Nicolet.

I live in the town of Nicolet. The Quebec Southern road is going to pass through Longueuil and then try to get across, and as one interested, I would like if something else should be built there besides a tunnel. I am getting a little old and I would like to cross over either by a tunnel or a bridge before I die. Why is it that there is a discussion to-day about a tunnel ? There was no talk of a tunnel a few months ago. There was only talk of building the Montreal bridge. Everything was prepared for the building of a bridge ; soundings were made, plans drawn and capitalists were ready to undertake the work. I am told that the owner of the charter had an offer for the sale of that charter. There were capitalists from the United States who desired to purchase it but they could not succeed in the negotiation. I will tell hon. gentlemen why. I was surprised the other night to hear my hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) say that he was in favour of a bridge, but after making a close investigation he found that a man by the name of Armstrong, was interested in the scheme. Well, it was not the case. He was playing upon the word. There was an Armstrong interested but it was not Mr. C. N. Armstrong, as he wanted to make hon. gentlemen think it was. Mr. Préfontaine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BALL. The hon. member for Terrebonne and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Préfontaine). As he was not acting as a member, I have a right to name him. I name him as a partner in this project. Have I a right, Mr. Chairman, to name a man when he is a partner and when I am speaking about his affairs and not speaking about him as a member of this House ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You can suit yourself.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Préfontaine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BALL. I will not mind you while I am with the Chairman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BALL. Don't carry it yet. I have five minutes more.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Time, time.

Mr. BALL. No time. Mr. Préfontaine——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BALL. I intended to say that as the Chairman permits me to say that. He had shares in this project. He had no shares as a member of this House, but he had shares as an individual in the bridge. Mr. Armstrong had shares individually in that bridge some years ago. But four years ago he transferred these shares to his son, Mr. Edgar N. Armstrong. They look a little like each other, but they are not the same individuals. Mr. Armstrong had indorsed notes for the Baie des Chaleur Railway Company. He was the endorser for about $60,000 of notes at the Banque Ville Marie. Everyone knows, I suppose, the former Banque Ville Marie. These notes were sold at auction and they went at one cent on the dollar, and Mr. Préfontaine bought the notes for $600.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. BALL. The hon. member for Maisonneuve bought the notes. They went at a cent on the dollar, and the hon. member for Terrebonne sued Mr. C. N. Armstrong and got judgment against him. Later on he sued his son to nullify the transfer and to retain the shares in the hands of Mr. C. N. Armstrong. The court dismissed his case; he could not seize the shares, so he relinquished the whole thing and made an arrangement with other parties—I do not know if I can name that word—schemer—who made application for a tunnel and for a bridge so as to kill that charter that had only to be revived and in regard to which all the preliminary work was done. They tried and with success to kill the charter that only required reviving.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the committee rose and reported progress.

YUKON TERRITORY ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 119), further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—The Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) furnished me with a draft of some amendments to the clause which I read when we were in the committee on the Bill before. I see no objection to the draft which was given me by my hon. friend except one. Inadvertently the words 'commissioner in council' are inserted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Subsection (e) reads as follows:

> Provided always, however, that no ordinance made under this Act imposing a tax or royalty or any matter relating thereto shall be, or be deemed to be retroactive, &c.

My hon. friend will see that that clause is not practicable, because it will apply to all the grants which are already made, and so will be retroactive. At present we have, under the Dominion Lands Act, imposed a royalty of 5 per cent, and we intend to abolish that royalty and impose a general tax of 2½ per cent. We are asking for this legislation because we intend to collect in another way, and we do not think we have power to make provision for the collection without legislative authority. If we abolish the present royalty and undertake to fix a royalty under this Act, subject to the provision that it shall not be retroactive, I am afraid they will be able to say that they have escaped from the royalty which had been levied on them before, and that under this Act we could not impose a royalty upon them. We cannot retroactively apply anything which would be any higher than 5 per cent, and that, no doubt, will meet the object which my hon. friend has in view. It would not affect the rights of any person who has acquired rights under contract from the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not think the word 'retroactive' would have the meaning the hon. gentleman suggests.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It might not, but it would be very unfortunate if it were so held.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There have been some questions pending.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The last section is quite sufficient to protect any questions pending, which are all in the shape of suits in the court. It is in respect to past transactions that the questions have arisen, and the royalty of 2½ per cent would be a new transaction. There is absolutely nothing in the questions between the government and any person in respect to the royalty, except a few suits that were brought on the ground that we had collected royalty in 1897 when we were not supposed to do so; that our officers commenced too soon to collect royalty. That is the only question pending, and that is before the Exchequer Court.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it not a very usual principle that no provision of this kind should be made retroactive?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. But if we abolish the 5 per cent tax and put another tax in place of it, we might be in the position that there was a limitation in this clause, and it might be held that we could only apply the tax subsequently.

That might not be the case, but I do not think that the government should take any chances.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not wish to leave the legislation in any uncertainty that might make the future collection of taxes doubtful. I am as anxious to avoid that as the hon. gentleman. But is not that matter made perfectly plain under the provisions of the Interpretation Act, which I presume would apply to ordinances made under the provisions of a statute. The hon. gentleman is aware that under the provisions of the Interpretation Act, when we repeal a statute the new provisions shall take effect, and every matter and thing shall be carried on just as if the amending Act had originally been in force instead of the repealed Act. Would not that prevent any such difficulty as the minister suggests?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why could it not be made perfectly plain by adding a proviso to the effect that this shall not in any way affect the substitution of the new tax for the old tax?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. All we get power to do is to levy a royalty. That is going to affect all, whether the leases are issued at the present time or any past leases or subsequent leases. We intend as soon as this legislation becomes law to pass an ordinance levying a royalty on the gold output of the Yukon Territory, and we intend immediately before doing so to repeal the present Orders in Council, under which the royalty of 5 per cent is collected. We want the legislation to put us in such a position that there can be absolutely no question about it. There is no mine at present in the Yukon which claims in any way to be exempt from royalty except under the exemptions which the royalty Orders in Council provide at the present time. What we have decided to do is that instead of the exemption and a royalty of 5 per cent, there shall be a general tax of 2½ per cent. We do not want any doubt to exist as to our right to do that. I can assure my hon. friend that there is no question at the present time except with respect to certain claims which arise out of the Act of 1897. We desire to have the legislation in such a position that there cannot be any possible ground for litigation after the Order in Council has passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The new tax will take effect from the date of the new Order in Council?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is not the government perfectly protected by providing in the new Order in Council that the old tax shall continue in force until a particular day, after which the new tax shall take effect?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so. The very fact that there is doubt about it is the reason we are asking for legislation. We unquestionably have power to impose a royalty under the Dominion Lands Act; but I doubt if we have power to impose it in the form in which we desire to do it, that is, as a royalty to be collected at the boundary line instead of at the mine. We have to take certain proceedings in order to collect the royalty in that way, which we have not the power to do by Order in Council without special legislation, and that is the reason why we are asking for this legislative power. If we could justify it under the old law, this Act would not be necessary. There is a question of some hundreds of thousands of dollars of revenue involved, and if we lost even half a million dollars, we could not go back on our legislation if we made a mistake or took any chances. The rest of the clause, as my hon. friend has drawn it, I am quite agreeable to accept; and I think I can suggest what would perhaps meet my hon. friend's wishes and not incur any danger, that is, to add to subsection 'a' a clause like this: Imposing a tax or royalty not exceeding 5 per cent thereof on gold and silver the output of the mines of the territory, to be levied from and after the date of the ordinance. That could not be the subject of any doubt. It could not be retroactive.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would assist.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to point out to the hon. minister that the last subsection of the amendment only applies to suits now pending. If it is to have the effect he thinks it ought to have, it should have words added which would include any cause of action which has not yet begun.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We will make it read: 'Any cause of action now accrued or any matter or suit now pending in any court.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one other matter I would like to mention. Under section 2 of this Bill, the commissioner in council has the same powers of legislation with respect to the Yukon territory, which the government of the North-west Territories have with respect to the North-west Territories. Then under another clause the Governor in Council has the power to make certain ordinances respecting the Yukon Territory, and I would like to know whether or not these powers conflict in any way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. A clause has been drawn by the Department of Justice providing that in case of conflict the ordinances of the Governor in

Council will prevail. As matters are at present, there will be very little necessity for the Governor in Council taking action. That would only happen in some special emergency, and in case of conflict, in order to avoid unnecessary litigation, we provide that the ordinances of the Governor in Council shall prevail. Of course we have the power of vetoing any ordinances, and the effect of the clause will be simply to avoid any unnecessary litigation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is to say there is a power of veto which can be exercised. I have one more suggestion ; would the hon. gentleman have any objection to qualifying clause 6 by adding some such provision as we have added to clause 3 ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are not giving them anything which they have not at present practically. The only thing we could add would be a clause similar to what they use in the American States, providing that there shall be no interference with vested rights, but we are simply following the legislation in connection with the North-west Territories, and no difficulty has arisen there. They simply deal with questions of property and civil rights of a local kind.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am inclined to think that there is a clause which covers that objection.

Bill, as amended, reported; read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Charges of management—Additional sum required for clerical assistance in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, $1,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We had to take a supplementary vote for the current year, making our appropriation for this year $7,300. We are asking now an appropriation which will make the vote for next year $8,000. This is owing to the fact that the increase of circulation makes necessary additions to the clerical staff.

Mr. WILSON. You are saving that much interest.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought these Dominion notes were issued by the American Bank Note Company.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is confusing this with the item of printing. The notes are printed and supplied to us by the American Bank Note Company, the contractors. But, however great may be our confidence in that company, we would hardly entrust them with the signing and issuing of these notes. This money is to pay for clerical assistance in countersigning the notes and superintending the issue. This is work largely performed by young ladies who receive, I am sorry to say, not very large salaries—from $400 to $600.

Civil government—Department of Railways and Canals—To provide for the promotion of F. A. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose that in the amount already voted for salaries, the salary of this gentleman is included. You are voting it again, except that there is here, I suppose, an increase. What becomes of the amount already voted ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. While there are two votes, they represent but one salary. Perhaps it would be sufficient to vote only the increase. The Minister of Railways and Canals has placed it in this form. Of course care would be taken that there is only one salary.

Mr. GOURLEY. Could not the word be added that would make it clear ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The point is that this salary has already been provided for. But the object here is to promote this officer.

Mr. GOURLEY. But could not you add some words such as 'this sum to be in full of salary,' or something like that ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The other could be dropped on concurrence. I suppose ; at the same time there is a little difficulty in that. I can give the House the assurance that it is not the intention to pay more than one salary. But I would not like to change the vote in the absence of the minister. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) wishes to have the item stand, there will be no objection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think this is a very good way of putting the appropriation. Perhaps it would be better to let it stand.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very well, let it stand until the Minister of Railways arrives.

Item allowed to stand.

Civil government—Department of Trade and Commerce—To provide for one senior second-class clerk, $1,100.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this an additional clerk, and if so, what is the occasion for the increase ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is made necessary by the fact that the Department of Trade and Commerce is taking over work from the Department of Inland Revenue, such as the inspection of staples and the grain inspection.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not observed any corresponding decrease in the Inland Revenue Department.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But, without this change, there might have been

an increase in the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I suppose there would have been an explanation of that. Otherwise, the reason for increasing one department seems a good reason for decreasing the other.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If any of those items is objected to it must stand until the minister to whose department it relates is present.

Auditor General's office—To provide for the salary of a junior second-class clerk, contingencies, clerical and other assistance; printing and stationery, $3,600.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Auditor General requires extra assistance, and we are glad to give it to him. He has been rather sharply criticised for not doing enough; I think he is disposed to do a little more and make his book a little larger.

Mr. GOURLEY. Is this additional clerk intended to keep a record of the numerous times in which the Treasury Board overrules the Auditor General ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Perhaps that may be included among his duties.

Department of Public Works—To provide for the salary of one first-slass clerk, R. C. Desrochers, assistant secretary, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Desrochers is an old and valuable employee whom I have just promoted.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But $100 a year is a very small salary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, but this is an increase.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The way it reads in the resolution, it is to provide a salary. I thought he was only getting $100 a year.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. He has been promoted. The balance of his salary is paid in some other way.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Borden) is right in his criticism. The item should read 'to provide for increasing his salary.'

To provide for an increase of salary for S. E. O'Brien, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. O'Brien has just been promoted to the position of first-class clerk, and he is at the same time secretary of the Ottawa Improvement Commission. In view of the large amount of work he is doing the government has thought it only fair to give him this increase of salary. He has been 12 or 15 years in the service. We have asked him to act as secretary of the commission; he does that work at night.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Yukon public buildings, $36,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I move to reduce that item to $34,000.

Motion agreed to.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The details of this work are as follows: Administration building, filling up swamp and making sidewalk, $6,000; post office, filling swamp and grading, $5,000; furniture, $1,000; government house, filling in and fencing sidewalk, $3,000; court house, $2,000; mining inspectors' offices in four places, $15,000; furniture. This will be all. I pledge myself not to ask for any more money for this purpose. All these items have been discussed with Mr. Commissioner Ross and have been carefully considered. They will complete the erection and equipment of public buildings out there.

Mr. WILSON. Will the revenue from the Yukon pay all this money we are spending this year ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes. Without reference to a particular year, the expenditures in the Yukon have been less than our revenue up to the present date. I am not quite sure as to any particular year, but the aggregate expenditure is less than the aggregate of our receipts in the Yukon up to the present. The Minister of the Interior has announced that he is going to make a reduction in the royalty. We are hopeful that even with the reduced rate, we shall continue to receive enough to pay all the expenses. The very fact that we have received already a larger sum than we have expended is fair ground why we should reduce the royalty; because, while we are anxious to make the Yukon pay for the Yukon, we are not desirous of making a profit out of it. We are hopeful that under the new system for the collection of the royalty at the reduced rate, it will still yield us a liberal revenue, enough to meet all the expenses.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. While I am on my feet, perhaps the committee would like to have some explanation on a subject which we discussed the other day concerning an employee of Mr. Justice Dugas. Here is a report that has been sent to me, or rather to the chief architect, by Mr. Fuller, who until recently was our resident architect at Dawson. Here is a report that has been addressed to me re William St. Denis and Louise Collinet :

Department of Public Works,
Ottawa, May 6, 1902.

Memo to the Hon. the Minister :

Re William St. Denis, caretaker, and Louise Collinet, matron, Court House, Dawson.

Both were employed by the government previous to the assuming by the Department of Public Works of the maintenance, &c., of the public buildings in Dawson, in the winter of 1900.

Rations were issued to them by the North-west mounted police, and their wages were $80 and $60 per month respectively.

Their duties were the care of the court house and the quarters of Hon. Justice Dugas, which were then in the same buildings.

Notice in the fall of 1900 was given our department that no further rations could be issued to them by the North-west mounted police, and on the recommendation of hon. the Commissioner of the Yukon, they were given $30 per month in lieu of the same, and were still provided with rooms, heat and light.

The court house above referred to is the old one.

Upon erection of the new court house, St. Denis and Collinet were transferred to it, and as the old police court was used as a police court, and Hon. Justice Dugas' quarters were removed therefrom, they were deprived of the rooms, heat and light, and were placed on the same footing as other charwomen and caretakers, namely: Louise Collinet received $150 per month without board, rooms, heat or light, and William St. Denis received $160 per month, and on the further condition that he attended to the fires in the court house, and guard the building during night, he was given a room in the court house.

While the quarters of Hon. Justice Dugas were in the old building, they attended to them as well as to the maintenance of the court proper.

When the judge's apartments were moved to another building, they still continued to look after them the same as before.

No change has been made in the original duties of these two parties from what they were required to perform previous to the assuming of the maintenance of the court house by the Department of Public Works, the only change being that Louise Collinet receives the same pay as other charwomen, namely: $150 per month without board, rooms, heat or light, with liberty to make any such arrangement for the same as she might see fit, and William St. Denis receives $160 per month, the same wages as other caretakers without board, and for his services (nightman of court house) is given a room in that building.

This is all as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned.

If William St. Denis has been dismissed from his position as caretaker of the court house, said dismissal must have occurred after I left Dawson in March, therefore, I cannot say what has been the cause for the same.

The ordinary wages for men in the Yukon are $7 to $8 per day.

The ordinary wages for women in the Yukon are $5 to $6 per day.

I have the honour to be, hon. sir,

Your obedient servant,

T. W. FULLER.

I telegraphed Mr. Bertrand and he replied saying that Louise Collinet and her husband had been dismissed because they had declined to obey orders. That is all I know about the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know what explanation the resident architect offers of his letter in which he says :

You will continue therefore, to be at the service of Mr. Justice Dugas, and act under his guidance for any work which you shall be required to do as matron of the court house.

You will arrange with the judge for your meals, which, under any circumstances, must not be taken within the court house.

What had these people to do with Judge Dugas in regard to their meals ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. They were transferred from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Public Works, and up to that date they had been paid only, respectively, $80 and $60 per month. Later on, they were given additional salary, but they were supplied with lodgings and rations. Later on again they did not get lodgings or rations. Then they were placed on the same footing as other charwomen and caretakers, the wife receiving $150 a month and being free to arrange for her meals anywhere she liked. I apprehend that she made an arrangement with Mr. Justice Dugas to board at his place, and it looks very much as if she had paid her board to Mr. Justice Dugas. I am not here to defend the judge. It is not my business. I state the facts as I understand them. It is not my business to defend that arrangement. I have nothing to do with that. All I want to state is that my department followed towards these people the ordinary course. As to the arrangement with Judge Dugas, it is for him to say whether it is proper or not. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see an explanation of the order given by the chief architect to this matron that she should be at the service of Mr. Justice Dugas. He does not explain that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, he explains that in his report. The mounted police had arranged that the caretaker and charwoman would take care of Mr. Justice Dugas' lodging rooms. He was in the mounted police apartments then. When he went to other quarters, the same arrangement continued. Rightly or wrongly, it continued. But, it won't happen again, because, thank God, I am getting rid of the whole thing. The commissioner of the Yukon will settle that himself. I took good care when I found out that there was a Yukon government, to wash my hands of the whole thing.

Mr. BELCOURT. I suppose that this report of Mr. Fuller simply means that Judge Dugas for two years, or until the new court house was built, lived in the old court house. Louise Collinet and her husband were, the one caretaker and the other charwoman in the court house, their duties being to keep the court house clean and attend to the various duties of caretaker and matron, at the same time attending to Judge Dugas, who was an inmate of the court house. They lived in the court house, and so long as they were allowed to do that, they received salary and their rations. When the new court house was built, new quarters were

found for the judge, and these people were given, instead of salary and rations, a salary of $150 and $160, respectively, a month, and they had to provide for meals wherever they could get them. It seems to me that is as plain as anything could be, and I do not see where the wrong is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That would be an explanation to a certain extent. The hon. gentleman is full of information on this subject, and perhaps he would explain the statement: you will arrange with the judge for your meals.

Mr. BELCOURT. I cannot speak of an arrangement of which I know nothing, but I can understand the report which I have heard read.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I can only say that that order does not stand good now; it is all over.

Mr. SPROULE. We look with considerable suspicion on these items because every expenditure made there is enormously high and we are told that wages are dear.

Mr. BELCOURT. Five times what it is here.

Mr. SPROULE. When we asked for information we were told that the government was obliged to pay $20 a cord for wood, but I have a Dawson newspaper here which declares that the wood which was furnished to the government at $20 a cord was being bought by private parties at $6. That is enough to excite suspicion. We were told last year that all the buildings were completely furnished, but now we have $24,000 for odds and ends to complete the furnishing of these buildings.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That covers the building of four mining offices, levelling the ground, fencing and so on.

Mr. SPROULE. We are always told that everything is dear there, but letters from friends and the local newspapers give us contrary information. It is declared that the supplies are bought at exorbitant prices by the government, or there is a heavy rake-off for the middle man.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Public tenders were called for the supply of that wood, and the lowest tenderer was $11 per cord, and then it had to be cut. That cost $4 per cord. I have in my hand the same paper that the hon. gentleman has and the price of wood quoted there at $6, is for wood in the bush without cutting. However, public tenders were called for this wood and the lowest was accepted.

Mr. SPROULE. I have here a Dawson paper of April 5th.

Mr. BELCOURT.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have the same paper here.

Mr. SPROULE. This paper says:

> The government paid $20 per cord for wood. The contract was not let out by tender because very few here could supply it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not true.

Mr. SPROULE—(reading):

> Why isn't some official decent and honest enough to tell the Minister of Public Works that all the wood was bought by a middleman for from $6 to $10 per cord; that the wood merchants have delivered it all winter by the cord for from $10 to $12 retail; that there is a divvy of from $6 to $10 per cord—that has to be paid. There are very few here who supply the wood? White & Eaton will supply all the government wood at $8 per cord. Alex. Prudhomme, Jeff Davidson, Dan Matheson or a half dozen other responsible men will fill the contract for even less. Will the man who supplied this wood to the government tell us his name and what price he received and how much he 'cut up' to get the contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That man Prudhomme, whose name is mentioned, tendered at $13 a cord not cut.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I have a letter from a gentleman whom I believe to be reliable and truthful and he corroborates this information. In face of that we are justified in believing that either a very high price was paid for that wood or that there was a rake-off to some person. At all events the government seems to be paying enormously higher prices than are paid by private individuals for the same article.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not one word to add except that I hold in my hand a report from Mr. Fuller, giving me the names of the tenderers—public tenders having been asked for.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister state how many tenders were received, from whom received, and the amount of the tenders?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. With the greatest pleasure. The report is as follows:

> Memo.
>
> Purchase of 600 cords of fire wood for the public buildings, Dawson City, Y.T., maintained by the Department of Public Works (not including any of the North-west mounted police buildings) for the season of 1901-1902.
>
> Public tenders were called for on the 9th July—all tenders to be in by 1 o'clock on the 20th July, 1901.
>
> Specifications called for sawn wood, spruce or birch not cotton wood.
>
> Wood to be in 16 foot lengths delivered on government reserve, Dawson city, not later than 10th September, 1901.
>
> Following list of tenders received.

C. C. MaKay	$15 00	per cord.
R. Creelman	14 50	"
Yukon Fuel Co. (L. L. James Man)	12 00	"
James Hart	12 10	"
R. M. Delgex	12 50	"
Patrick Keys	13 00	"
J. Luck	11 50	"
Canadian Yukon Lumber Company (lowest)	11 00	"
J. H. Davidson	13 20	"
James Williamson	12 45	"
D. A. Matherson	18 00	"
Dwight H. Robinson	11 95	"
R. Young	13 00	"
Gilbert Soule	12 00	"
Alex. McLeod	11 85	"
Edward Fearon	12 90	"
Frank Elliott	12 85	"
G. R. Allen	11 90	"
Alex. J. Prudhomme	13 99	"
H. M. Hemming	13 00	"

Contract was awarded to lowest tenders, Canadian Yukon Lumber Company, $11 per cord.

Sawing, Splitting and Piling.

Two tenders received.

Joseph Morgan, $4 per cord. Mr. Foley, to cut only, $3.50 per cord. To cut, split and pile, $5 per cord. The lowest tender was taken, viz., Joseph Morgan.

Then there was the delivery, which was done by ourselves, and that cost $2.50 per cord.

Mr. SPROULE. How much does this bring up the price to, all told ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $17.50—$11 per cord ; cutting, splitting and piling, $4 ; delivery at various places, $2.50 ; making $17.50 at public tender.

Mr. SPROULE. What was the first price for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For the wood 16 feet long. Then it had to be cut and split and delivered at different places on the government reserve.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister told us the wood was good value at $20 a cord. If we believe this statement, there is certainly a wonderful difference in the price the government are paying and the price private individuals are paying.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. What else could I do ? Public tenders were asked !

Mr. SPROULE. I want the hon. minister to allow me to say this, that in the face of the information given here, the denial that the contract was let by public tender, and the statement that wood was being sold at $6 a cord and upwards, we are justified in making the inquiry ; and after the minister has made the explanation he has, that the contract was given by public tender, and that the wood cost so much, I am not saying that he did more or less than he should have done ; but it is well to have that information, because it relieves our mind of the suspicion that there was a job somewhere.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be more than surprised if there was anything dishonest in this transaction, because the architect is a most honourable young man.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In looking over the expenditure in connection with Yukon public buildings for the past year, I observe that some of the practices which have prevailed in regard to Mr. Justice Dugas have not by any means been confined to him. For example, we find that for the residence of Mr. Justice Craig $494 has been paid for electric lighting, $759 for fire wood and $49.50 for installing the electric light. These charges are as open to criticism and objection as similar charges with regard to Mr. Justice Dugas, and I desire to repeat the statement I made the other night that it would be just as right for the Minister of Public Works to provide at the public expense residences for himself and the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am responsible, of course ; but I want to state again that this was not my own personal policy ; but the government decided for a time to erect residences for the judges. We found it was too expensive, and in the meantime we paid for their rentals and the maintenance of their houses. Whether it was right or wrong, of course I am fully responsible, but let it be understood that it is not my personal responsibility alone.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not criticising the hon. gentleman ; I am criticising the government, and I am under-stating the matter. Suppose the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance, in addition to the salaries they enjoy as servants of this government, were allowed $3,000 or $5,000 for living expenses, and in addition took money voted for public buildings in Ontario and with it provided themselves with residences here in Ottawa, furnished those residences, and paid for coal and electric lights for themselves : they would be in exactly the same position as the two judges, the Gold Commissioner and the Commissioner of the Yukon. I think I am correct in saying that the Gold Commissioner had an allowance for living expenses. That is correct, is it not ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think it is.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I find that $3,826.15 was expended on his residence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that some of our officers were for a time lodged over a public building. That may have been the case in this instance, though I do not know positively that it was.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If they were lodged over a public building, I do not see

that that necessarily implies that the country should pay for their fuel and lighting. We find the same condition of things with regard to the Commissioner of the Yukon. If I am not mistaken, he had an allowance for living expenses, and yet no less than $6,209.89 was charged in conection with his residence.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure my hon. friend will agree with me that it is just as right for this government to lodge the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory as it is to lodge the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-west Territories. We have just completed the erection of a residence for the Commissioner, and it is only right that we should furnish it. He represents Canada there. He occupies a high position.

Mr. GOURLEY. You do not furnish the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia with living expenses. You give him a salary of $9,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. But my hon. friend must not lose sight of the fact that the provinces supply their own Lieutenant-Governors with all the furniture they require.

Mr. GOURLEY. I venture to say that the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia does more entertaining in a day than the Commissioner of the Yukon is called on to do in a year; and this is the purpose for which living expenses are given. When we give a man a salary in this country that is supposed to cover what his services are worth. We are not supposed to give him in addition, in a hap-hazard manner, a living allowance and furnish besides a residence and light it and heat it. We furnish a residence and its lighting and heating to each of our lieutenant-governors, and we might be expected to do the same in the case of the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory, as holding a somewhat similar representative position, but we do not besides give them living allowances. What does this judge do with his salary? Does he pocket it?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend must not lose sight of the fact that for a time the judge in the Yukon Territory had not a residence supplied by the government. We have just completed his residence, and it was before that was completed, I suppose, that we were giving him that allowance.

Mr. GOURLEY. It seems to me a very inequitable proceeding to give a judge of the Yukon such extraordinary emoluments, which are denied judges in the older provinces, who have no doubt to maintain larger establishments. In Nova Scotia you limit a judge to a salary of about $4,000 or $5,000, and I am bound to say that the man whom you sent out to the Yukon is not equal in education, training or social position to the judges in the older provinces. Yet you make a pet of this man, you give him a larger salary, you give besides a living allowance of $3,000, and you furnish him with a residence and its lighting and heating. You furnish him also with men servants and maid servants, and treat him as if he were a prince. That seems to me extraordinarily unjust, especially in view of the fact that you have refused to increase the salaries of the judges in Nova Scotia a mere $1,000. Surely this thing never grew up by hap-hazard, but must be based on some principle. Upon what principle are these large extras based? I do not want to fancy that this country is run on the boodle principle, but it is very hard to account for this state of affairs. Here is a man who, I do not imagine, was selected for the position he holds—for after all he is merely a magistrate out there—because of any exceptional ability or training, who is no doubt an ordinary man, and yet he is treated in a manner in which no judge is treated in this country, no matter how eminent in the profession he may be. That certainly requires some explanation. Here is an item for Judge Dugas' residence $4,000, salary $5,000, living allowance $3,000, some $12,000, which would probably pay the salaries of half the bench in Nova Scotia. There must be something very wrong in this state of affairs, and the hon. minister should explain on what principle these items were allowed. It has been pleaded that the opposition are blameable for not having vigorously protested against these items. We are told that we should not have allowed them to pass. No doubt I am to blame myself for not having investigated the matter, but the hon. minister can hardly hope to escape responsibility by any plea of that kind. It is the government, and not the opposition, who are responsible for every dollar of public expenditure. We are told that the living expenses in the Yukon are extraordinarily high. Well, I would undertake to say that they are not much heavier in Dawson City than in Victoria or Vancouver. Why should they be? You can reach Dawson City in four days' travel from Victoria or Vancouver. There is a line of railway completed, besides a line of boats well equipped, over which you can get all the provisions you require, and you can buy them in eastern Canada at the same prices as can the people of Victoria or Vancouver. The only difference in price between Dawson City and Victoria or Vancouver is the cost of transportation from the latter ports to the Yukon. And if you have a telegraphic service and a boat service, and a railway service, all so perfect, the additional cost of transportation must be very low. I would venture to say that this whole excuse of the extra cost of living will not bear investigation. I am quite convinced that if we were to telegraph to Dawson City for the

quotations there of sugar and flour and the other necessaries of life, you would not find them much higher than in the east. Why, here are members of parliament getting their little indemnity of $1,500 per session, and ministers of the Crown having to put up with a salary of $8,000 per year. I pity the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. You are right there.

Mr. GOURLEY. That hon. minister occupies a most inferior position compared with Judge Dugas. He only gets a tuppenny-ha'penny salary of $8,000, while the judge out in the Yukon draws some $13,000. It seems to me that the minister should resign as a protest against the gross injustice of his treatment.

Mr. McEWEN. He ought to go out there as judge.

Mr. MORIN. He should discharge the judge and take his position.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not think that the hon. Minister of Public Works could have known what a soft snap there was out in the Yukon, or he would not have remained here in the position he now holds. I am going to find out all about this story of the extra cost of living in Dawson City. I do not believe that to-day there is very much difference between the cost of living there and elsewhere. My opinion is borne out by this letter, in which it appears that this judge is keeping a boarding house, and a very cheap kind of boarding house at that. I have a notion to go out there this summer for a little trip and learn how he runs this boarding house. Forty dollars a month, he wanted to charge his caretaker, for board The cost of living cannot be very great when he can board a man for $40 per month. I have been paying three times that all winter myself, and have not lived in any great luxury. It seems to me, therefore, that according to the judge's own estimate, this whole story about the cost of living in the Yukon is unfounded. What we want to do is to scale his salary down to that we give other judges, and cut off all this nonsense. All these extras must have been given for some reason other than that disclosed in these items. There must be some other principle that governs this expenditure. Why load this man down with such extraordinary favours and be so penurious with judges in the older provinces, who are called on to do infinitely more work, and work that requires considerably more knowledge. and ability What does he do with his $3,000 living allowance ? Does he found a school or give it to charity ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The only explanation I can give is that I am asking $34,000 for the Yukon public buildings and not a dollar for the judge. My hon. friend is quoting items that are paid and on which we cannot go back. We cannot get the money back. I am not asking anything for the Department of Justice. I do not belong to the legal profession, and do not want to be responsible for the misdeeds of lawyers. Let them defend themselves here. Judge Dugas is not under me, and I am not asking for any item to be paid to him. My hon. friend, in talking about our salaries, thinks that the ministers of the Crown are not well enough paid. Well, if he and his friends desire that our salaries should be raised, I would not object. We are not in it at all, and if Mr. Dugas is not better paid than we are, I pity him. My hon. friend is unfair, no doubt unwittingly and unknowingly, in his remarks about the salary and living expenses of Justice Dugas and Justice Craig. I am sure that living expenses there are very high to-day. And I have asked my secretary to telegraph to Dawson City for the prices of the necessaries out there just now.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) If my hon. friend from Colchester goes out to that country, I hope he will call upon that judge and ascertain from him personally the treatment he has given to his housekeeper.

Mr. BELCOURT. I hope my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) will not feel offended if I say that the only really sensible thing he has said is that he is going out there to find out. I think it would have been better if he had found out first and then had spoken.

An hon. MEMBER. You did not do that.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is exactly what I did do. I am speaking because I did find out. I was in the Yukon, and I learned enough to convince me that a good many of the statements that my hon. friends have made are absolutely wrong. As I understand it, and I think every hon. gentleman understands it in the same way, Judge Dugas, the commissioner of the Yukon, the gold commissioner, and a number of other officers, went out with the understanding that the government would provide them with lodging, living allowance, and salary, I think every hon. gentleman who was in the last parliament, understood that. The hon. member for Colchester has told us that a salary of $10,000 or $12,000 in the Yukon is something that ought to be scaled down to the level of what is paid to an ordinary magistrate in Ottawa or Nova Scotia. I do not mean anything offensive when I say that that is nonsense of the worst kind. I had personal experience of two months out there, and I know that living is five times what it is here in the east. If we pay a judge a salary, living allowance and lodging, making a total of $12,000, he is getting what would amount here to about $2,400 in the east. I am prepared to give the House my assurance

from personal investigation and personal experience that the cost of living in the Yukon is five times what it is here. I was sorry, when I was in Dawson last summer, to see that Judge Dugas and Judge Craig were lodged in houses that I do not think would be acceptable to men here who are earning $1,000 a year.

Mr. GOURLEY. They are saving their money.

Mr. BELCOURT. No, they are not saving their money. The house in which Judge Dugas lived had two bedrooms besides his own, and cost him $1,800 a year. I know also that a law office ten feet by twelve in a small wooden building in the city of Dawson actually cost $200 a month. If my hon. friend from Colchester accepts these statements on my assurance, I do not think he will consider these salaries exorbitant. My hon. friend says he can go to Dawson in three or four days. If the accuracy of his other statements is to be measured by that, it will be plain that the hon. gentleman does not know what he is talking about. Under the most favourable conditions, making close connections at every point, you cannot go to Dawson within eleven or twelve days.

Mr. GOURLEY. You mean from here. I was speaking of going from Victoria.

Mr. BELCOURT. You cannot go from Victoria in less than seven or eight days. Why, it takes three or four days between Victoria and Skagway and then three or four from Skagway to Dawson. I am glad my hon. friend from Colchester is going out there to find out about these matters.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think the hon. gentleman who knows and does not tell us is about as bad as the one who does not know. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has assured us that he knows about the cost of living in the Yukon and gives in proof of it the cost of renting a law office. That, I suppose, is what the judge is supposed to keep his table on. The hon. gentleman having had an experience, he is evidently anxious the House should know about it, but if he is to discuss the question, he should tell us something about the cost of living in Dawson. He should tell us what flour, beef, bacon, tea and some of the other articles of every day diet cost out there, and we, being fair mathematicians, can calculate the matter for ourselves. I am inclined to think there is not so much exaggeration in what the hon. member for Colchester has said, particularly when we find that the hon. member for Ottawa when he attempts an answer, confines himself to saying that the hon. member for Colchester is talking nonsense, that he does not know what he is talking about, and that the cost of living is five times greater than here, but does not attempt to say what the cost of anything really is.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to put against what the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has said, quotations from this paper of the prices of staple articles on the 13th February. Beef cost 30 cents a pound. The hon. gentleman says that living there costs five times as much as it does here. Can he buy beef here at one-fifth of that price, or 6 cents a pound? Veal is 40 cents a pound. Can he buy veal here for 8 cents a pound? Pork costs 45 cents a pound. Then take some of the other lines. Sugar per 100 pounds costs $12.50. One-fifth of that would be 2½ cents a pound. Can the hon. gentleman buy sugar for that here? Beans in Dawson cost $8 per 100 pounds. It is not very likely the hon. gentleman can buy them for one-fifth of that here. Rolled oats cost $10 per 100 pounds. One-fifth of that would be 2 cents per pound, and you cannot buy rolled oats for that here. Rabbits cost 50 cents each. Can the hon. gentleman buy them at 10 cents a piece here? Poultry costs 40 cents per pound. Does the hon. gentleman think he can buy poultry for 8 cents per pound here? Going over the whole list, the prices do not bear out the statements of the hon. member.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Is not the rate of wages a pretty fair standard by which to judge the cost of living?

Mr. SPROULE. I am talking about the prices of articles that go to make up the cost of living.

Mr. BELCOURT. Does the hon. gentleman know that the ordinary rate of wages there is $10 a day?

Mr. SPROULE. No, I see by this newspaper that the ordinary rate of wages there is $5 per day. The government may give what they like, but according to the newspaper, that is what the ordinary employer pays. But that is not the way to judge the cost of living; the best way is to take the prices of articles of food on which the party lives. The prices of articles of food in Dawson must be the closest criterion by which to judge the living there, and those prices do not bear out the contention of the hon. member for Ottawa.

Mr. HENDERSON. As to the hon. member for Ottawa's (Mr. Belcourt's) proposition that the rate of wages is a fair criterion of the cost of living, a judge of the Superior Court gets a salary of $7,000, yet he would not eat more than the labouring man receiving $1.25 a day. The rate of wages affords no basis of comparison.

Mr. GOURLEY. I do not object to the personalities of the hon. member for Ottawa, but I think he would not have taken the position he did, had he recognized the obvious fact, that the price of an article in the Yukon is the price in Toronto or Montreal

plus the cost of transportation. Had the hon. gentleman based his statements on that proposition, I would have listened to him with the greatest respect. We have heard this kind of talk before, we have been lulled to sleep on many occasions by it. Every year when these extraordinary sums are proposed to us we are told, Oh, the cost of living in the Yukon is very great. I must say that I do not think the hon. gentleman has inquired into the matter of the cost of living at all. He went up there, probably, with some large retainer in his pocket, and he did not care whether the cost of living was $100 a day or 10 cents. I fancy, notwithstanding anything he has said to-night, that the cost of living in the Yukon to-day is not very much more than it is in Victoria or Vancouver; it is probably increased by the cost of transportation only.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Pork is 45 cents a pound.

Mr. GOURLEY. Why should you not supply a judge in Victoria, as well as in the Yukon with his living expenses, and all these extras ? I think that the explanations put forth by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) has weakened the position of the Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then I want those words to be struck out.

Quebec harbour improvements, $100,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose the House will expect some explanation of this item. A good deal of money has been spent on the Quebec harbour in the past, much of it, I am sorry to say, has not been spent to the public advantage. I have no desire to go back to ancient history. Let by-gones be by-gones, and let us look to the future. We shall have in a short time, I hope, a fast line of steamers. I am confident this country will not stand much more delay in the solution of that important question.

Mr. SPROULE. I would remind the minister that we have heard that hope expressed for the last five years.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Good things do not lose anything by being repeated. It is better to go slow and safe. If we had attempted a fast line two or three years ago it would have cost a much larger amount of money than it will cost now. In point of fact, up to within a couple of years, it would have been impossible, except at an extravagant price, to secure the building of large ships fitted for that purpose. However, Quebec has practically no harbour equipment. There is only one berth for large ships in the whole harbour of Quebec. A ship loading or unloading there has either to anchor in the middle of the river, or to be loaded and unloaded with lighters. Now, we think the time has come when the port of Quebec will have to be equipped. I have here a plan of the improvement, which I invite hon. gentlemen to examine with me. It shows the famous Louise Basin, of which we heard so much years ago. We propose to construct four berths for the largest ships. They will have 40 feet of water at high tide. Of course, we will build the cribs deeper than the existing walls of the old cribs, so as to give them greater solidity. These works that I intend to carry out gradually will cost about $1,000,000. I do not wish to conceal from the committee the fact that we cannot equip a harbour like Quebec without spending a good deal of money. This plan has been recommended to me by my officers, but there is another plan proposed, that is, to use the existing walls in another part of the harbour. I point out to the hon. gentlemen where all the railways are centering. I wish hon. members would take more interest in the transportation question, and compare what we are spending with the vast sums spent by our American friends for the same purpose. I may mention that these plans I now propose have been approved by the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, and their able engineer. I hope that before many years are gone we will have completed the equipment of our harbour so as to allow the largest ships to enter. It is a great pity that the plans have been prepared in the past by foreign engineers. They know nothing about our country.

Mr. SPROULE. There is one thing at least about the hon. minister's explanation which I admire. It reminds me of the story of an ancient maiden lady who gave her age for eleven years in succession as eighteen. When reminded by the assessor that she had given the same age eleven times she replied : I am not the kind of person who will tell one story to-day and another to-morrow. The hon. minister thinks that he cannot repeat a good thing too often. He has told us for the last five or six years that we will soon have the fast Atlantic service and he will not tell one story to-day and another to-morrow. All I can say is that I hope we are nearer to the fruition of that project than we were five years ago.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amalgamation of the American lines makes it imperative that we shall not lose any more time and let the opposition do their duty and push us on more vigorously than they have done in the past.

Mr. SPROULE. I do think that the ocean port must ultimately be at Quebec. I believe this is as clear as anything can be and with the prospect of a fast Atlantic service we cannot start to work too soon to complete the harbour there. Whether the plan outlined by the hon. minister is the best one that can be devised or not, I am not prepared to say, but it does seem

to me that we cannot commence a moment too soon, because, at the rate of progress we have been making for some pears past, it will be a good many years before we are prepared to accommodate a fast Atlantic service in this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In two years these works will be completed.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister is asking for $100,000. Is that for new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. I assume that the data furnished is by some competent engineer who has taken the trouble to examine the whole question and to give more than an ordinary estimate.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Every possible care has been taken on this occasion. My best engineers have been at work on this plan. Soundings have been made and every possible precaution taken.

Mr. SPROULE. How will the shipping interests be accommodated by the elevators already built there; because, if I remember they are on the other side of the dock ? They will not be near the new harbour as it is proposed to be made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be an easy thing to have conveyers from one side of the basin to the other. In the city of Montreal we intend to accommodate the three wharfs that are built with one elevator. We have devised a plan by which we will have 800 or 1,000 feet of conveyers, I do not know whether there will be a great grain trade at Quebec. I think we will have some trade there but I do not share all the expectations of those who believe that grain will be shipped in large quantities from Quebec. I expect a great deal more from the fast line for perishable fruit and so on. I do not see any reason why barges loaded with grain should not pass down from Montreal where these carriers of freight will be able to go. In discussing that very question with Mr. Hays, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, and one of the ablest railway managers in the world, he expressed the same view that I hold myself. We had never discussed the question as fully before as we did on that occasion There will be trade for all of the St. Lawrence boats. I expect a great deal from the maritime province boats when we are fully equipped. When we have enough carriers on the lakes and when we have enough elevating capacity to accumulate the grain, that grain will have to reach the seaboard in some way. When the Canadian Pacific Railway will have completed the improvement of the short road to St. John, I have no doubt a large quantity of grain will be taken to that port in the winter months. In fact during the last winter the Canadian Pacific Railway took two or three million bushels of wheat over their line to St. John direct from the west.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are they taking it to ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To the port of St. John. They are not making much money out of it but let us not forget that grain is only an incident. A railway which is well equipped has good connections enabling it to carry all sorts of merchandise and other goods. If the Canadian Pacific Railway are able to carry grain, perhaps with not much profit, they make it up, I suppose, in carrying perishable goods. They have important connections in the American west and they carry large quantities of canned meats and other perishable goods. That makes the trade of the railway and I hope in future will help to build up our Canadian ports. I anticipate that in connection with this fast Atlantic line we will have a line of freight carriers. The two things will go together. There is no doubt that if the company which operate the fast line of steamers were not in a position to have freight liners they would be taken by the throat and other companies would refuse to help them in handling the traffic. So that this country must look to the establishment of a fast line and at the same time to the establishment of a line of carriers. The sooner we in Canada realize that we must stand on our own bottom the better.

Mr. SPROULE. I have noticed in the press of late an intimation that there are some important negotiations going on in England by Lord Strathcona in regard to this fast Atlantic service, and the plan which the hon. minister has outlined would indicate that he imagines there is some possibility of the project being realized at an early date. Has he any information to give the House in regard to what is being done in view of the fact that there appears to be a combine of the carrying trade of the Atlantic at the present time, and can he tell us what steps the government are taking to prevent the possibility of any line that is established being absorbed by the combine ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not see that the government can do much to prevent the shareholders in any existing company selling their shares if they see fit. That is the great trouble. We have nothing to say, we can do nothing.

Mr. SPROULE. If you subsidize a line of steamers, can you not attach conditions to that subsidy ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am speaking of the past and as to the future the Prime Minister could speak if he were here. I have no doubt we will take good care that our subsidies are not lost.

I have the greatest hopes that at the imperial conference this question will be discussed and solved in the interest of the empire and the colonies. I expect the greatest results from that conference.

Mr. SPROULE. What will be the length and depth of that wall ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 1,200 feet on one side and 410 feet on the other.

Mr. SPROULE. What will it be built of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Concrete and cement, and crib-work under structure. I believe we have made a great mistake in using crib-work in the past. Its average life out of water is between seven and eight years and the outside life ten years.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the life of it below water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Eternity, unless there is some accident or unless worms eat the timber, and in future we will creosote all timber where there are worms. I am taking a vote for a creosoting plant.

Mr. MORIN. The Minister of Public Works admits himself that there was a great mistake made in placing this basin at Quebec. I am surprised, however, that the minister has not learned something from the mistakes made in the past. I believe that if he carries out the project he has now in view he will commit a bigger sin than has been committed by his predecessors in office. The hon. gentleman has the bad example of others right before his eyes, but yet he has learned nothing from experience and he proposes to follow out that bad example. He is going to build a little crib-work there and he will have two or three small boats in the harbour and to do that he will have to dredge in the river and blast the rocks, and he may spend $1,000,000 or $2,000,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no rock there at all.

Mr. MORIN. I know there are no floating rocks but there are rocks down below. If the minister intends to make a decent port at Quebec, why does he not go right below the St. Charles river and build a straight wall to the asylum at Beauport ? If the minister does that he will have one of the best ports in Canada and there will be all the facilities for shipping that can be required. If the minister of Public Works commences at the St. Charles river, he can build his wall or wharf and go clear down to the insane asylum if he wishes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MORIN. There is an insane asylum about two miles below, and I am perfectly right in saying that he can extend down to the asylum. There is no joke about that matter at all. If the minister would adopt the suggestion that I am making, he could accommodate thirty vessels at a time and he would have a port which would last for ever, and which would not cost him so much as this patch work which he now proposes and which is always very expensive. The present basin at Quebec cost $5,000,000 or $6,000,000, and it is practically of no use whatever. Vessels can only go in and out when the tide is high, so that they have to wait seven hours a day, which is a great delay in view of the expedition which our trade requires at the present day. If you build a wall down from the St. Charles river you can accommodate all the vessels you like and you can build all the railway tracks that are necessary. Clear down to the Montmorency falls, at the mouth of the Beauport river, there is a splendid bottom, and the water is quite deep, and you could build the wall along there, and you would not have to dredge much. You could establish a port there that you and your children and the whole country could be proud of. You would not be wasting money patching here and there, but you would be spending money to good advantage. The wall we have built has moved about three feet and sunk in the basin. It is a dangerous place.

Mr. BOYD. Before that item passes, I think it is well that the minister should give us some explanation in regard to it. I supposed, when the hon. gentleman was making his explanations, that at last we had got part of some well defined scheme of transportation to meet the present emergency, especially in the western portion of the country; but after listening to the practical remarks of the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin), we find that, instead of any well-defined scheme, we have what he describes as a tumble-down portion of what is impracticable. I am tired of this little patching of wharfs and the indiscriminate expenditure of money all over this country in the manner in which it has been done by this government for some time past; and it is time that the government realized a sense of the duty they owe to the country, and arranged some well-defined and well-matured plan to meet the emergency of that western country that is staring us in the face.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have great confidence in the judgment of my hon. friend from Dorchester. He is a practical man, whose experience seems to have convinced my hon. friend from the west that we do not know much about carrying out these works. But let me say to my hon. friend that the carrying out of his plan might come later on, when trade developes more, and when the building of these long piers might become a necessity. But they would cost a vast amount of money.

Mr. MORIN. Not much.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let my hon. friend have some confidence in those who have given great attention to

such matters. It is not the first time I have heard of that project. I was in Quebec for 18 years, and I know about that wharf. Beyond a doubt it would cost a large amount of money; and I think in the meantime the country will be contented with the moderate expenditure we are making to provide accommodation for four or five steamers. At the same time, my hon. friend from the west should not speak in that wild way, if I may be allowed to say so, accusing us of giving no attention to the west.

Mr. BOYD. I did not say that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad to hear that he did not. I think we are providing to-day a pretty general plan of transportation. Let my hon. friend look at what is taking place. The two great railway companies, the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific Railway, are adding five or six million bushels capacity to their elevators. There are elevators being built or in sight in nearly every harbour on the Georgian Bay; in Montreal the Harbour Commissioners are building a large elevator; the Grand Trunk Railway is applying for space to build an elevator of 1,000,000 bushels capacity. There are elevators springing up everywhere. We have to-day passed a Bill which would not have been passed if the House were not kind to the west. It was a pretty hard Bill to swallow.

Mr. SCOTT. Will it do any harm to the east ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I think it will do good to the east. But every member of parliament will admit that it is an exceptional Bill. I am strongly in favour of it.

Mr. BOYD. What Bill is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Grain Bill. It is a very important Bill. We are doing what we can, and we think that by completing our St. Lawrence route, and deepening and equipping our canals, we are going to secure for the west cheap transportation. When we have on the Atlantic ocean the large carriers that I expect to see, and the fast line established, which may be before many years, our equipment will be complete. We are doing now the work that any progressive government would do. We are equipping all our harbours on the St. Lawrence; we are helping the equipment of our harbours on the Georgian Bay; we are deepening the Kaministiquia river; we are deepening Port Arthur; the Canadian Pacific Railway is going to add greatly to its rolling stock and its tracks; the Canadian Northern is also adding to its equipment. We think we are going as fast as we can be expected to go. I know that my views are not shared by everybody ; but I am confident that within two years our Canadian system of railways and waterways will be in such a position that we shall be able to give cheaper rates to the west than the Americans can. We have the shortest route; we have only to make it the best in order to give cheap rates to our friends in the North-west; and this will help us to establish a Canadian marine, which will employ a large number of men and help to build up our cities, as Buffalo and other American ports have been built up.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to give my advice to the minister, who can, of course, take it or not as he pleases. The minister said he would patch up that basin at Quebec, and then probably go on and build a wall or wharf towards the insane asylum; but he said that at present he did not wish to spend too much money. Well, I will tell him just about what will happen in a year or two if he does not go on with this wharf now. If he occupies the position he does, he will feel afraid to commence it. If somebody else occupies his place he will want to wait a year or two before going on. But the way to do is to make a beginning, and keep on year after year until the work is finished. If you keep patching here and there, all the time afraid to commence the work, you will never build it. The minister also said it would be expensive. That is correct; but what will the wharf be worth when it is built ? You will not be sinking money uselessly, but you will be building a wharf and getting value for your expenditure.

Mr. BOYD. I think the hon. Minister of Public Works cannot say that he has received any strenuous or factious opposition from me towards any of the schemes he has propounded in this House. As regards the opinion he may have of myself or other members from the west, or of our breezy manner of putting things, that is immaterial.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a very good opinion.

Mr. BOYD. Well, the opinion of the minister is reciprocated by myself. The other evening the hon. minister was having a discussion in regard to matters of this kind with the hon. member for Saskatchewan. And he waxed rather warm in regard to what this government had done and was doing for the people of the west. Now, I do not know what the Liberal members of the House think of what has been done by this government for the west in the way of any large expenditure, but I fail to see where any great efforts have been put forth which has caused this country any expense. The Canadian Pacific Railway and all connected with it are no part of the administration of this government. The Canadian Northern got a slight bonus from this government on its Ontario division some two years ago. Apart from that, I do not know of anything that the hon. gentleman can accuse us of having received.

During all that time we from the west have been sitting here voting millions of dollars upon the waterways of this country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For our common benefit.

Mr. BOYD. Perhaps, but the discussions in this House on many of these public works would not bear out that assumption. We may be accused of being somewhat aggressive and enthusiastic about our country, but it is estimated that at present only one-seventieth of that great country is being cultivated. When we recognize that fact and recognize also that people are pouring in there at present by the thousand, it behooves this government to be on the alert for the future. I was under the impression that at last we were going to receive some of the benefits of the many suggestions thrown out from this side of the House, and that some well considered plan of transportation, to prepare for the great emergency that is awaiting the people of eastern Canada, would have been submitted for our approval. Hon. members speak of the great crop in the west last year, but I have known of three or four better crops in Manitoba. Our average in that province last year was about 22 bushels to the acre. I myself have grown 28, and we have had a better average on two or three previous occasions. There was a better average in the North-west Territories, but we need not look to last year's crop as something exceptional. We are liable to have a greater crop at any time, and with increased cultivation and our enormous acreage, it behooves the government to prepare for a much larger export from that country than we have hitherto had.

Port Colborne—Harbour improvements, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What progress is being made at Port Colborne ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are about 1,200 feet of breakwater built out of 5,000 feet, but I may say that this amount is not adequate for the completion of the work we have been authorized to carry out. If hon. gentlemen will follow me, I will explain on this map what is being done. When the plans for the breakwater were prepared, my engineers were of the opinion that it was necessary to have a breakwater 40 feet wide. I was away on the other side of the ocean when the plans were finally adopted. My hon. friend and colleague, the Postmaster General was acting for me. After mature consideration, he made up his mind that 25 feet wide was sufficient. Well, the waves of Lake Erie are just as heavy as those on the Atlantic ocean, and during a gale in the month of February the breakwater moved a couple of inches. I am now asking for $100,000 to add 25 feet width to the breakwater, so as to make the width 50 feet. About 10 or 15 days ago, in another gale, the breakwater was moved about 2 feet, and it is imperative to complete that work. Of course, it will not cost more now than it would have had the original plans prepared by my engineers been adopted. When this breakwater is completed 5,000 feet long, it will give all this area which is marked on the map to the large ships that will come to load and unload in the canal. The Minister of Railways and Canals is dredging the entrance of the canal. We shall not be as well equipped as Buffalo, for they have 5 miles of breakwater, and 50 elevators. We have already received application for sites for elevators from private corporations. I do not know what our policy will be, but, in the meantime we are preparing the ground. This year, Mr. Woolvin, who is undertaking to carry grain to Quebec, will use a part of the breakwater. He will have a floating elevator to tranship his grain from large carriers on the lake to small craft that will go to Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the addition to be built of ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Timber, with a concrete top.

Mr. SPROULE. Above the water ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, about seven feet above the water.

Mr. SPROULE. How long does the minister expect it will take to complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I must give the contract without an hour's delay, because our breakwater is exposed and I am afraid of another storm. One thing that has helped to save it is that Messrs. Hogan & Macdonald, the contractors, have wintered a large quantity of stone inside the breakwater.

Mr. GERMAN. The breakwater ought to be completed next year. It was reasonably light, but the minister says he will strengthen it by putting a concrete wall inside that will make it pretty strong. The whole breakwater should be completed next year ; it must be completed by that time.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It will be, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. GERMAN. There are some other matters in connection with the inside harbour that must be discussed later. But, so far as the breakwater is concerned this will be all right.

Mr. SPROULE. That means it will be completed in two years ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, completed for next season. The contractors have large quantities of material on hand and a good organization. I was there about the time of the opening of parliament, three months ago and saw what they were doing.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the contract let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, I speak of the first contract.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that part built of crib-work with a concrete top ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately no. I believe that in that we made a mistake, and that it should have been built in concrete. Of course, it costs a little more money. But, in future, I will ask parliament, in all these large public works, to allow me to use the best materials, because they are the cheapest in the end. As I have said, the outside life of the wooden structure above water is ten years and the ordinary life is between seven and eight years. In Buffalo they made the same mistake that we have made. But now, they are building with large blocks of stone.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister, no doubt, is proceeding upon information which he regards as justifying his course. But it does not appear to me that the best plan is to build with cement on top of crib-work. There must be the same liability of the wood decaying.

Mr. GERMAN. Wood never will decay under water.

Mr. SPROULE. How many hundred years has the hon. gentleman lived to be able to determine that ?

Mr. GERMAN. I do not need to live five years to determine that. If the cribs are absolutely under water they are safe from decay for all time to come. That is the testimony of all engineers, and you can only proceed in these matters on what you are told by the best engineers in the country. They will tell you that cribs sunk under water with a concrete top make the best breakwater or dam that you can put in—the cheapest and the best.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be very valuable, but the hon. member (Mr. German) will hardly expect us to take it upon his experience.

Mr. GERMAN. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) ask any engineer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a fact—if my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will allow me to interrupt him. Wood under water, instead of decaying becomes harder and harder.

Mr. SPROULE. All kinds of wood ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All kinds of wood—that is the teaching of experience.

Mr. SPROULE. The contract is to be let at once, and the hon. gentleman expects to have the work done at the end of the present season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the entrance to the canal be deepened and widened so that navigation can be carried on successfully there ? And what provision will be made at the end of that time for the traffic ? Is the hon. gentleman building elevators for the grain ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Will any provision be made this season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a question of policy which I would not like to discuss to-night, as we are not providing for it in the estimates. My own personal opinion is the same as that I expressed three years ago—that the government should provide elevators in harbours that we build ourselves. Take Port Colborne, for instance; or let us take Montreal. In Montreal we are to have a public elevator, because the harbour commissioners are trustees for the government and for the commercial community. My own opinion is that an elevator should be a public work as much as a pier or a breakwater. I know my views are not shared by everybody. So far, we have not built elevators ourselves except at St. John and Halifax in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. Private enterprise has supplied elevators on the lakes, for instance, at Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, Midland. But in respect of canals, they are our national property, and the question is whether we ought to build elevators on the canals. Time will tell. If private enterprise can do it, well and good. Speaking for myself alone—because I have no authority from my colleagues to say this—I believe it would be better for the government to own the terminal facilities where they own the works; in other words, at Port Colborne I think it would be better for us to own the elevators so as to be able to control the rates. My own opinion is that when we are fully equipped in Montreal, Quebec and St. John—I speak of the main points—our system of canals will be more largely used than it is at present. New ships are being built, there are two new ships under construction on the lakes to-day. Our canals will be used on a larger scale than they are now, and then if we have the control of our own routes we can control the rates. If we want to secure lower rates so as to compete successfully with our American friends we will be in a better position to do that. At the next session of parliament, if private enterprise has not solved the question, we shall have to do it ourselves. Although we have only part of the breakwater built, there are large ships going there now. We will see during the recess what will turn up.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is like Micawber, waiting for something to turn up. It seems that the government have not thought out any plan for solving this great question of transportation. It is just as important for successful transporta-

tion to have elevators as to have harbours. There is no analogy between Port Colborne and Collingwood, Meaford, Goderich and Owen Sound, because in these places the railway companies have an interest in private elevators, and the towns have each of them given substantial bonuses for that purpose. Consequently, they are more likely to get elevators there than at Port Colborne. My fear is that after this very large expenditure, we will only have half the benefits resulting from it which we would naturally expect, provided the harbour was equipped with proper facilities for storing and handling grain when this dock, or wharf, or breakwater, is finished.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I share the views of my hon. friend. But when he becomes Minister of Public Works he will find out that influential as he may be, he will not be able to do everything that he wants to do. A successful public man must learn that the first virtue is patience and persistence.

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Chairman,——

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let us get through, let the item be carried.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I wish to remind the committee that if we are going to discuss the entire question of transportation upon every item that refers to a harbour, or a bridge, or an elevator, we shall not get through in a month. I hope the committee will confine themselves as near as possible to the question before the Chair.

Mr. GERMAN. I suppose a member of this House has a right to speak on a question that pertains to matters in his own constituency. I am not sure that the Chairman of this committee has a right to suggest that I should not make a remark in answer to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do not misunderstand me. I am not suggesting that a member should do anything but speak to the point.

Mr. GERMAN. As I have not spoken at all, it is very questionable whether you knew whether I was going to speak to the point or not.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I had taken the point of order before you commenced, because the last half hour has been spent in speaking upon questions outside the question before the Chair. All I ask is that hon. members would be kind enough to confine their remarks as nearly as possible to the question under discussion.

Mr. GERMAN. I intend to speak to the question under discussion, and I do not need any suggestions from you as to how I should speak.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member is out of order. The hon. member has a right to address the Chair, but he has no right to lecture the Chair.

Mr. GERMAN. I was just suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that I intend to speak to the question under discussion if I am allowed to do so. If you suggest that I have no right to speak to this question, I will certainly sit down.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not so decided.

Mr. GERMAN. Well, the hon. member for East Grey made a suggestion that the government was building a breakwater at Port Colborne and expending a large amount of money there without any idea of bringing about a culmination of that expenditure in the interest of the country. Now, the situation is this: A breakwater is being built there to construct a harbour. The difficulty so far as transportation is concerned between the west and the east of Canada is that there has been no harbour at Port Colborne in which vessels could go to tranship their cargoes for our canal system. The government of Canada has spent about $100,000,000 on the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. It has been absolutely useless and it will remain useless for all time to come unless you have a satisfactory harbour at Port Colborne into which vessels can go and tranship their cargoes. So soon as you have a sufficient harbour at Port Colborne and elevators built there is not a question about it that not only the bulk of the grain but all the grain products of the North-west Territories will come to Port Colborne to be transhipped into canal sized boats and go to Montreal or Quebec. This is the cheapest transportation route to Europe on this continent by two or three cents—by two cents at least. Grain can be carried from Port Arthur to Montreal by the Welland canal and St. Lawrence route as cheaply as it is being carried from Buffalo to New York. The ship-owners of Canada and the United States appreciate that fact. They so thoroughly appreciate it that Mr. Wolvin, of Duluth, one of the largest ship-owners in America, is putting on a line of boats to carry grain from Buffalo to Quebec through the Welland canal. If this government will complete these harbour facilities at Port Colborne and will build elevators, and my own opinion is that the proper policy for the government to pursue would be to build elevators at Port Colborne and control the rates, the trade will certainly pass through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. There are certain companies, or individuals, at the present time who are looking to get the concession of building the elevators at Port Colborne and of putting on a line of boats between Port Colborne and Montreal. My suggestion is that the government should build the elevators at Montreal and Port Colborne, control the rates and put the canals in a safe and proper condition and that if

they do so the products of the North-west, so far as the capabilities of that line of transportation are concerned, will go in that way. When these facilities for transportation are exhausted let us build other lines of transportation. We need, in this country, more than one transcontinental line. We cannot in Canada, in the future, carry all the products of the great North-west to the ocean by means of the Welland and St. Lawrence canals. The North-west of Canada is destined to be the greatest wheat-growing country on earth. It will produce more grain and better grain possibly than any other country in the world. It is not one-quarter, not one-tenth explored. The Peace river district will, within the next twenty years, produce more wheat than any person at present conceives to be possible and it is our duty to look to the future. The engineers of our canal system in the past have been looking too much to the immediate present. They built the Welland canal fifteen years ago for the navigation of fifteen years ago without looking to the future. They looked at the St. Lawrence canals on the same principle without looking to the future. Let us look to the future and have confidence in the development of the country that we own irrespective of our political feelings and it will be better for us and better for the country. We want at Port Colborne the proper harbour facilities which the country demands. We want proper navigation through the Welland canal which, I believe, the people of the country will approve of and we should, so far as we can, in a legitimate, economical way, develop the resources which we have in our country.

River Kaministiquia—dredging, $25,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that work to be done at the mouth of the river or up the river ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. From the mouth of the river up to the Canadian Pacific Railway elevators.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the government are going to do this work with their own dredge or are they going to do it by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have made arrangements for a certain time for fifteen cents a yard.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that a contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a contract for fifteen cents a yard.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the best way of making a contract. I made the inquiry because I was not aware whether the government had any dredges on Lake Superior that are available for doing this work. I wish to say that I had a letter from a gentleman in Duluth some time ago saying that he had one or two very fine dredges and he understood that the hon. minister required dredges very badly and that he would be glad if he could make an arrangement with him to do some dredging anywhere on the upper lakes.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We were obliged to employ an American dredge at that very spot last year. We were paying fifteen and one-half cents a yard then, but this year we are giving 15 cents a yard. There were large shipments of grain being made, there was not enough water for the vessels to get up to the elevators, and I made the arrangements which I have mentioned a week or so ago.

Mr. SPROULE. I will let my hon. friend have the letter so that if he should desire to communicate with the gentleman that I have referred to he can do so.

St. Hyacinthe public building, $12,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The building there has become too small, and it is necessary to make that addition.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these works to be done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not speak of the small works, but this one will.

Montreal Branch Post Office, $30,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you branching out with another post office in Montreal the same as in Toronto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have either to enlarge the main building or to branch out. The Postmaster General has made up his mind that he can give a better service with these branches.

Mr. SPROULE. And you will not have to buy automobiles ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will get along without them in Montreal.

Valleyfield public building, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Valleyfield is a thriving city with a population of 12,000, and in a couple of years it will have over 15,000. It is one of the most thriving little towns in the province of Quebec. It has no public building now at all. Last year parliament was good enough to allow me to have a sum in the estimates which I did not employ, but next year I intend to go on with the work. I have another vote for $10,000 for this in the main estimates.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you put $10,000 in the main estimates and $10,000 in the supplementary estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It might have been better if I had put the two together, but I did not do it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know the hon. gentleman did not do it, but what I want to know is why he did not do it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. If it had been in the estimates a month ago it would not have helped me at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is very convincing, but I would like to know whether the hon. gentleman did much canvassing on this building in the late election in Beauharnois ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I used just the ordinary convincing argument that public men use on such occasions. The $10,000 were in the estimates and the people knew I would build it. I did not make any promises. Now that the election is over I want to go on with the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose the hon. gentleman drew their attention to the fact that they needed it very badly, and of course by implication gave them to understand that if they elected his candidate he would go on and build it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Joking apart, this building is very much needed.

Toronto post office—building for branch office in west end of city, $20,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there not an item already in the estimates for this building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have $15,000 in the main estimates ; but since then we have bought a site. We will spend about $35,000. The work is under way now.

Mr. SPROULE. Will that complete the building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Ottawa post office and custom house, $20,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When these alterations are completed, we will save a rental of $1,000 a year, which we are now paying for the Customs Department on Sparks street.

Ottawa public buildings—Repairs to masonry wall, $6,500.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). What building is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is to repair the wall of the eastern block, which is falling, just as a wall in the western block threatened to do three years ago. I was very much surprised to see how light the walls of these buildings are.

Mr. SPROULE. How is this work done—by contract or by day labour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. These repairs cannot be done by contract. They are carried on under the chief architect.

Rideau Hall, Ottawa—Drain from Government House to city sewer, $7,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there never a drain there before ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, the old drain is choked. We are going to change the whole system and have the drainage of Rideau Hall and grounds carried to the main sewer which has been built by the Ottawa Improvement Commission.

Toronto post office—alterations and additions, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The post office in Toronto is in a dilapidated condition.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister decided that certain repairs were necessary, why did he not have votes for them all put in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The policy of the Public Works Department in the past has been to have all new works and repairs which are not begun placed in the supplementary estimates. Whether that is a good policy or not I do not know. I would rather have my main estimates include everything.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. One reason for this is that the main estimates are prepared in December or January, and three or four months later we are in a better position to determine how much money we can allow for these expenditures.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in believing that there are new works in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not one.

Toronto Junction public building—additional amount, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will that complete it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say. The contract is not yet awarded. The previous amount voted was $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the site likely to cost?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not expect to pay more than $3,000 or $4,000 for the site.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose this is to carry out the understanding between the hon. gentleman and the electors at the time he was helping Mr. Campbell ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend attributes to me motives which never came to my mind. That amount was in the estimates when Mr. Clarke Wallace was in his seat.

Hamilton—Examining warehouse extension, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why this expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The public building has become too small, and the business cannot be carried on longer in it. I am obliged to give an extension.

St. Catharines drill hall, $10,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the cost going to be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not expect to be obliged to spend more than $40,000. The site has been given to us, and all parties are agreed that the site chosen lately is satisfactory. I cannot say positively what the cost will be as there may be heating or something like that to be done, but we will try to do the right thing.

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose it will be between $40,000 and $50,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). In moving the adjournment I wish to say that there has been some conversation among members as to the desirability of our giving some time to-morrow to private Bills. I think that that can be arranged. I had a conversation with the hon. leader of the opposition, who is equally desirous that some time should be given, but I prefer not making any definite arrangement until the right hon. the Prime Minister is in his seat. We can arrange to give some time to private Bills either to-morrow or Monday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a very large number of Bills on the Order paper—something like twenty. It would seem undesirable that the expense incurred should be lost to the parties simply for lack of time this session to pass the Bills. When the government took Monday, some time ago, I mentioned that I thought a longer time would be necessary for private Bills, but they did not share that opinion. They were not sufficiently impressed with the number that would probably come before the House. A portion of to-morrow or Monday should be taken, and I would support a proposition to that effect. I should suppose, in view of the necessary work to be done on a number of Bills, in the committee, that it would be desirable to assign a portion of to-morrow rather than Monday, but that is a matter of arrangement. Apart from the private Bills, what government business are we likely to have to-morrow ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We shall proceed in Supply with the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.35 a.m. Saturday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

SATURDAY, May 10, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Royal Marine Insurance Company.—Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure).

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I have been appealed to by members on both sides of the House to have the order for private Bills called up now. I therefore move that the House do forthwith proceed with the Orders of the Day for private Bills.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it is very desirable that these Bills be given an opportunity of being passed, and possibly it might be expedient to take first the Bills which stand for a second reading, upon which there is not likely to be any controversy. There are twenty-six private Bills on the Order paper, of which eight stand for a second reading ; and if these are allowed to pass their second reading, they can go at once to Committee.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There is a Bill on the Order paper in which I am interested, and to which I gave notice that I would move some amendments when the motion was made to refer the Bill to the Committee of the Whole House ; and if private Bills are taken up now, it will of course be on the understanding that I am allowed to move these amendments now.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection personally, but it may be that these amendments are material ; and as the object of this motion is to enable parties who may have adverse interests to any of these Bills to receive notice of them, I think it would be more prudent to allow any Bill to which amendments are to be moved to stand over until Monday.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS.

MONTREAL SUBWAY COMPANY.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 98) to incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

On section 20, subsection b,

Mr. HENDERSON. When this Bill was up for discussion before, I took occasion to refer to the fact that the words 'for actual construction' were not read by the Chairman, and in that way I was led to the misapprehension that these words had not been included in the amendment. I desire to say that I did not intend to cast any

reflection upon the examiner of private Bills or to hold him responsible for the omission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. This is the first time they appeared.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the Railway Committee it was understood that those words should be inserted, and when you read the clause and the words did not appear, that was the cause of my remarks.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 21,

Mr. SPEAKER. Notice of motion has been given by my hon. friend Mr. Geoffrion to provide that the two subways shall be constructed simultaneously; and therefore I move that the following words be added to subsection a :

And both the said subways for railway and highway purposes shall be laid out and constructed simultaneously.

Amendment agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE SOUTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 85) respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the same Bill we had up last year ? It seems to be practically of the same nature.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). It is the same Bill, except that the last part of it to which objection was taken last year, has been dropped. It gives an extension of time to construct the line of railway.

Bill reported ; read the third time, and passed.

THE GASPE AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GAUVREAU moved that the House go again into Committee on Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was agreed that this Bill should go over until Monday. I have given notice of several amendments which I wish to move. That was the understanding.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, there was no such understanding.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Certainly, the premier was here and consented, and I appeal to the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It goes over till Monday if there is any objection.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Let it stand.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I know nothing about any such arrangement.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have no objection that the Bill should be taken up this morning if the promoters and all the parties concerned are agreed.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The objection comes from me. I have amendments of which I gave notice for Monday.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Let us take them now.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This is an important matter, and these notices are given for Monday.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) insists we cannot go on.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The amendments could be discussed now, they are not of great importance.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There are certain parties who wish to take part in the discussion of these amendments, and who are not here this morning because the notices are given for Monday. That was the understanding when we came to an agreement to take these Bills up this morning.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

Progress reported.

YUKON PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

The House proceeded to consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 65) to incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. McCreary.

Mr. FLINT. This amendment, as I understand it, prevents this company from building to the boundary line. That matter was fully discussed in the Railway Committee, and it was decided that this company should have this power. I will therefore move that the Bill be referred back to the Railway Committee for further consideration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amendment does not refer to building to the international boundary line, but to the boundary line of British Columbia. The Senate amendment is that the company shall not build within five miles of the boundary line of British Columbia.

Mr. FLINT. In that case I misunderstood the amendment.

Mr. McCREARY. I consented to have the line go to the boundary of British Columbia, but the Senate amendment is that it shall not go within five miles of the boundary of British Columbia. I have not consented to that so far, but I suppose I will have to do

so to-day, as I do not wish to put any obstacle in the way of the Bill passing.

Amendments read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to point out that we are getting into a very loose way of passing these Senate amendments. Some one should explain what they are in each case, so that we may know what is going on.

DOMINION ASSOCIATION OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS.

Mr. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa) moved second reading of Bill (No. 160) to incorporate the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I understand that this Bill has already been inscribed on the orders of the Private Bills Committee, under the impression that it is to reach them to-day, which rather indicates that it is to be railroaded through the House. I have no special knowledge of the Bill, but I have received a telegram from the president and the secretary of the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Nova Scotia, which reads as follows :

> Institute Chartered Accountants here object to Dominion Bill. Our interests require its rejection.
>
> S. S. SCOTT, President.
> W. E. LEVERMAN, Secretary.

Of course, I offer no objection to the Bill going to the committee, but it should be with the usual understanding that opportunity shall be afforded in the committee for all parties interested to be heard.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). In corroboration of what the hon. the Minister of Finance says, I have received a telegram from Toronto, which reads as follows :

> Eighty chartered accountants oppose Accountant's Bill. Name and other features objectionable. Kindly vote against it and get others.
>
> A. T. KERNAHAN.

So that from both ends of the Dominion opposition is being manifested to this Bill.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). This Bill has been before parliament ever since the opening of the session, and it has been discussed probably as much as any other private bill before parliament. In the Senate both those in favour of the Bill and those opposed to it were represented, and active canvassing has been going on ; and the sending of these telegrams at this time, in view of the fact that the Bill has been discussed openly and fully, is to my mind simply unfair. I have no objection to find with the manner in which they have been brought before the House ; but I am sure that if my hon. friends will reconsider the circumstances, they will not think of objecting to the Bill being considered by the Private Bills Committee. Any person or persons who want to be heard before the committee will have an opportunity of being represented by counsel when the committee meets at three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend rather misses the point of my observation. I do not object to the Bill going to the committee, but I say that if it does go, it should go under the same conditions and limitations as any other Bill—that the committee should afford an opportunity to all parties interested to be heard.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am in charge of this Bill, and I wish to say that I do not think there is any attempt to railroad it through. This Bill has been before parliament since the opening of the session, it has been thrashed out in the other House, and if it is to be passed this session, it must be dealt with by the Private Bills Committee to-day.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I do not see any objection to the Bill going to the committee, provided there is an opportunity for all parties to be heard.

Mr. BELCOURT. They are all here.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is speaking without warrant, because I know that parties from Toronto who intended to be here are not here.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, a resolution has been placed in my hands by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in Halifax, which I propose to read to the House, this being the first opportunity I have had of protesting against this Bill. The resolution is as follows :

> Whereas it has been brought to the notice of this institute that W. H. Cross, Henry Barber and others have applied at Ottawa for an Act incorporating them an Institute of Chartered Accountants,
>
> And whereas, it is the opinion of this Council that in view of work being done by existing provincial associations, that the time has not arrived for the creation of a corporate body by Dominion legislation to interfere with and against the wishes of existing bodies, therefore,
>
> Resolved : That the Council of the Institute of Nova Scotia declare itself opposed to the passage of the said bill at the present time, on the following grounds :
>
> First : Because it is an interference with the names and rights of the existing provincial charters.
>
> Second : Because existing chartered bodies are opposed to it until such time as they and the promoters of the proposed legislation can agree upon suitable legislation in the interests of the profession as a whole.
>
> Third : Because the promoters did not consult or seek the co-operation of our Institute, which should have been done if the promoters were acting in the interests of the general profession.
>
> We therefore respectfully recommend that the proposed legislation be deferred until such time as the existing bodies can determine upon suitable legislation for all Canada.

That is the resolution which has been passed at a meeting of the Institute of Char-

tered Accountants of Nova Scotia, and I propose to bring the matter up in the Private Bills Committee when the Bill comes before it.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). I desire to say that I also am in receipt of requests to oppose this Bill. As it has been stated that all parties interested have had an opportunity to be heard, I beg to say that that is a mistake, and this morning I telegraphed to Toronto for counsel to come down. They cannot possibly be here until Monday, and therefore I think it would be unfair to press this Bill before the committee to-day. The very fact that the Bill has been before the Senate for such a length of time is excellent reason why it should not now be railroaded through the Commons without careful consideration.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I believe there was an understanding that any Bills which were opposed should stand over until Monday. I do not want to obstruct this Bill, but if it receives its second reading to-day I wish it to be on the understanding that the committee shall let it stand until Monday. If the parties interested in it do not then appear or send any one to represent them, that is another question. Otherwise I think we have a right to object to this motion. I understand that the Private Bills Committee is now sitting upstairs waiting to receive the Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. I understand that the House has already passed a resolution to the effect that the posting of private Bills after their second reading shall be dispensed with. That I understand is a general motion applicable to all private Bills, and this Bill, if it is now read the second time, will follow this rule. The committee is not sitting now, but is to sit this afternoon at three o'clock, and I think the Bill ought to go to the committee to be dealt with this afternoon with other Bills.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not the understanding that Bills which are opposed should not be taken up to-day ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think there was any understanding as to what Bills should be taken up to-day. The committee only adjourned ten minutes ago, and they are to meet again at three o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. I object to the Bill going to the committee this afternoon. There is no possibility of forcing it through now and sending it to that committee at once. The hon. leader of the Opposition expressly declared that when a Bill was opposed it must be held over.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It is claimed that it was agreed yesterday that if a Bill was objected to to-day, it might stand over until Monday. If that be the case, all we have to do is to object to the Bill, but if the House will agree to pass the Bill now and not have it go before the Private Bills Committee until Monday, I think that would meet the views of all concerned.

Mr. A. C. BELL (Pictou). I think it should be kept in mind that this Bill has already been thoroughly discussed in the committee of the Senate. Every opportunity was there given to parties interested to be heard. These parties were present and amendments were made to meet their wishes, and they expressed themselves perfectly satisfied and undertook to withdraw any opposition. Now it seems to me as if this action taken so hurriedly is intended to destroy any chance of the Bill passing. It cannot be argued that the Bill has not been thoroughly discussed.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I would like to suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill that in view of the position now being taken, he should agree to its being here referred to the Private Bills Committee, and considered by that committee on Monday. No one can say that he has not had due notice of this Bill. We have been flooded with resolutions passed weeks ago by the association in Halifax, and with literature during the past two months from other sources opposed to the Bill, so that it cannot be said that at least advantage is taken of any person in the Dominion regarding this legislation, but if objections are made to our dealing with the measure now, I think it would only be fair to refer it to the committee on Monday, and no good can come of pressing it through at present.

Mr. BELCOURT. I am very loath to accept that suggestion because I feel that the result will be the killing of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. The display of temper in the House this morning leads me to believe that it is the intention of certain hon. members to kill the Bill. I submit to the sense of justice of the House whether any good reason has been given why this Bill should not be considered in committee this afternoon. If, when the Bill is called in committee, some of the interested parties are not present, and it be claimed that they have been taken by surprise, that is a matter for the committee to deal with. If the committee finds that some parties should be present who are not here, the committee could let the Bill stand over until Monday, but to refuse to consider the measure now, for no reason except that some people are opposed to it, is not fair. That is a matter for the committee to decide, and which this House is not in a position to decide. If it be not considered in committee this afternoon at three o'clock it is going to be defeated. But let it be defeated on its merits and not on mere obstruction.

Mr. W. F. McCREARY (Selkirk). Some two or three weeks ago I received a letter from Mr. Hugh John Macdonald, the solicitor for the Chartered Association of Accountants of Manitoba, asking me to oppose the Bill. I always supposed, with a large number of other hon. members, that I would have an opportunity to oppose it in the committee, but so far I have not seen it in any Private Bills committee. The association of Manitoba have employed a solicitor to oppose the Bill. He was here yesterday and went home on the understanding that it could not possibly come before the House to-day, and before it goes through the parties opposed to it should be given a hearing. There are also some members of this House not now in their seats who intend opposing this Bill, but did not expect that we would get to it to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I have been appealed to by parties in favour of and against this Bill. I think, in view of the position in which it stands to-day that the Bill might be allowed to go to the committee for this reason. Eminent counsel have been brought from Montreal and Toronto in support of and against it, and if the Bill be not allowed to go to the committee to-day these counsel will have to remain over at great inconvenience. If it should go to the committee to-day it can be discussed there, and there will then be ample opportunity for discussing it again before the House, and if it be found that parties should have been heard who had not the opportunity of being present, the rules of the House are ample to prevent the Bill going through without full consideration being given everybody interested to be heard. The parties who want to be heard must be heard or otherwise the Bill could not pass, and under the circumstances it seems to me that we should allow the second reading to take place and refer the Bill to the Private Bills committee.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say that I telegraphed to the parties interested that the Bill would not be before the committee until Monday. Of course I did this on my own responsibility, but I thought it was a fair view to take of the case, as the Bill had not passed its second reading. If the committee would take up the Bill this afternoon on the understanding that the promoters of the Bill will give us the assurance that they will not attempt to take the final judgment of the committee, but allow the measure to stand over for final consideration until Monday, I think that would remove all objections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). I told a gentleman who spoke to me that I did not think the Bill could come up in committee to-day, and it was not necessary for him to be here to-day. Further than that, when there was a motion made last night to dispense with the necessity of forty-eight hours' notice before Bills would be taken up in committee, after getting the second reading, I had a most distinct understanding which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will remember, with regard to all the Bills, that they should not be taken up until those interested had an opportunity of being heard before the committee. My hon. friend will remember that as far as this Bill is concerned, I should object—not that I have any interest in it—from the standpoint I took last night, to it being proceeded with to-day.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Would you be satisfied to have it taken up Monday ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, perfectly satisfied, but I object to its being gone on with to-day.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Counsel have been brought here from Toronto who are anxious to be heard, and I would be glad to have the committee hear them. The suggestion of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, seems to me a very reasonable one. We could allow the Bill to go to the committee this afternoon and counsel could be heard, but with the understanding that the committee will not close the matter, but will continue it until Monday, so that the clients of my hon. friend could be heard.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the inconvenience is that there would be nobody on the other side, and it is a little difficult to answer counsel if there is nobody——

Mr. BELCOURT. As having charge of the Bill, I will undertake not to have it put through until Monday, but I would very much like to have it considered to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But is it not a little inconvenient to have counsel addressing the committee with nobody on the other side ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Could they not do all the better if they were unopposed ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I think counsel are pretty well aware of the arguments pro and con on this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I object to this if it is regarded as carrying out the understanding upon which the motion of my hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) passed last night. I do not consider that the parties would be in exactly the same position if they are not here when counsel are addressing the committee in favour of the Bill. If counsel are here in the absence of one side the parties are not in the position in which they should be placed. I would not have permitted the motion to pass last night without further discussion, if I had

not distinctly understood that the people interested would have an opportunity of coming before the committee. Under the arrangements proposed, the Bill would be heard partly in the absence of those interested in opposing it. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to think that is all right, but his colleague (Hon. Mr. Sifton) sitting alongside of him, will tell him that if anything of that kind were proposed in a court of law, it would be laughed at. This inquiry before the committee is really a judicial inquiry, and, as in other judicial inquiries, you must have the parties before you.

The PRIME MINISTER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) thinks that the understanding was that the matter should not be taken up until Monday, then, let the Bill stand until Monday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would be better.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I think that this measure is opposed by some members on very strong grounds. If you refer to clause 2 of the Bill, you will find what its object is :

2. The objects and powers of the association shall be to promote by all lawful means the practice of accountancy, and for the said purposes :

(a) To hold such examinations as may be found expedient ;

(b) To grant certificates of efficiency to its members ;

(c) To establish classes of membership ;

(d) To determine the rights, privileges, terms and conditions of said classes.

As I understand it, this Bill is of an educational character, and as such, it is not within the purview of the powers of parliament, as the subject if education is relegated to provincial authorities.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the Committee on Private Bills, to be considered on Monday.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.—Mr. Davis.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 143) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 55) respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—Mr. Sutherland (Essex).

Bill (No. 87) respecting the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. Scott.

Bill (No. 125) to amend the Acts relating to the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway.—Mr. Champagne.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—Mr. Maclaren (Huntingdon).

Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Union Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 144) to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman—Mr. Flint—on division.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Securities Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Royal Marine Insurance Company.—Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure).

MANITOBA GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) moved the third reading of Bill (No. 162) to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Were not some suggested amendments to be dealt with ?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Yes, I was looking over the amendments proposed by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). Though I shall endeavour to induce the railway companies to comply with the suggestions as to the posting of prices of grain at railway stations, I have come to the conclusion that it would imperil the whole progress of the Bill if we put in any more amendments at this moment. I am anxious to get the measure to the Senate and have it considered there. They have had full notice of the amendments I proposed, but not of those proposed yesterday. However, I have made note of them and will endeavour to meet the views of the hon. gentleman later on.

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

REPRESENTATION OF THE YUKON.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 134) respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons.—The Minister of the Interior.

Mr. LANCASTER. I move to add as subsection (a) to section 29 the following, which will not interfere with the numbering of the other sections of the Bill :

In the compilation of such list the enumerator may only enter therein the names of such person or persons as shall, by statutory declaration filed with him, be declared by such person or persons, or some agent having personal knowledge of the facts declared therein, be entitled to vote under the provisions of this Act.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 30,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I move that the word 'eight,' the second word in the third line, be changed to 'fifteen,' in accordance with the understanding arrived at yesterday.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is all right.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 31,

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved:

That the word 'two' in the second line of section 31 be struck out and that the word 'seven' be inserted in lieu thereof.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. Has the hon. minister considered who should have custody of these lists after they are revised by the enumerator? The hon. minister objects to the amendment which I was proposing to make providing for an appeal to the Chief Justice.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Under section 33 it is provided that the lists shall be sent to the deputy returning officers.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 139) to amend the Exchequer Court Act.—The Minister of Justice.

REMISSION OF PENALTIES.

Bill (No. 151) respecting the Remission of Penalties (the Minister of Justice), read the second time and House went into Committee thereon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick), to explain the object of this Bill if he has not done so already. I have had some communication concerning it in regard to actions against companies for exhorbitant tolls.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). We are making an exception as to that.

On section 3,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved:

That after the word 'of' in the second line the words 'sections 298 to 305 of' be inserted.

He said: This will exempt the case in question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This does not include extortionate tolls?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Extortionate tolls would come under section 290.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 155) to amend the Railway Act, (the Minister of Railways and Canals), read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Chairman, I explained when I introduced the Bill that this is a very small trifling amendment to the Act and is intended to make clear what, I think, anybody would have thought to have been the meaning and intention of parliament in the enactment of the clause originally, had it not been for a decision which has been reached lately in one of our provincial courts. To briefly explain to the committee what the difficulty is, I may say that a spur line was thrown out from a railway in order to reach a ballast pit. The ballast pit was at one side of a stretch of water and the spur line struck the water at a point opposite the ballast pit. The court decided that the company could not exercise the powers contained in the Act because the spur line did not actually touch the ballast pit itself. The point is to enable the line to be constructed and the necessary powers to be exercised in its construction under the circumstances which I have stated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you give them the power to expropriate under this?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are making clear that they have the power to expropriate to a point which would not actually touch the ballast pit which is in connection with it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I see in one of the sections: 'All the provisions of this Act, except such as relate to the filing of plans, shall apply.' Why should you not file a plan, and give notice to the proprietor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. So we do usually.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of this language then?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not notice that part of the section. I had not given any instructions with regard to that, but I presume it has been inserted by the law branch of the department with some idea in view that it was desirable. I would not strike out that clause at present, but I would ask to have it stand until I make inquiry.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You give them the power to expropriate the user of the land for only a short period, but the Railway Act only gives the power of absolute expropriation.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I remember that some years ago we tried to get power from parliament to expropriate a less interest in the land than

the ordinary power, and there was such a strong feeling against it that I did not feel like proposing it generally again.

At one o'clock the committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have taken occasion to look at the original Act, and the sections are identical in all respects, except in making a provision that they may lay down their tracks and expropriate under the Railway Act to the water's edge, so as to be in connection with the ballast pit from which it is proposed to take ballast for the purposes of construction. It is limited to that in this section, but it is not limited in the original Act.

Mr. SCOTT. If hon. gentlemen will turn to the Votes and Proceedings of the 5th of May, they will find that I have given notice of an amendment to this Bill ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amendment ?

Mr. SCOTT. The amendment is as follows :

1. Every railway company owning or operating a railway in the North-west Territories shall, on or before the thirty-first day of July in each year, provide a fire guard on each side of the line of railway upon any uncultivated or unoccupied land not covered each side by timber adjoining such railway, consisting of ploughed land at least eight feet in width which shall at all times thereafter during the year be kept free from grass and other inflammable matter.

2. The fire guard shall be distant at least three hundred feet from the centre line of the railway, and the company shall cause the grass to be burned off between it and such centre line not later than the first day of August in each year.

3. The company shall, when causing such grass to be burned, have present sufficient persons and appliances to prevent the fire from spreading.

2. Any company neglecting or failing to comply with any of the provisions of the foregoing section, and the officers and directors thereof, shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty of $1,000 for each day of such neglect.

3. For the purpose of complying with the provisions of section 1 hereof the company may enter upon any land not owned by it, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the provisions of the said section 1.

4. This Act shall be read and construed as if it formed part of The Railway Act, chapter 29 of the statutes of 1888.

As is very clearly and plainly set out in that amendment, it is intended to compel railway companies operating lines in the North-west Territories to construct such fire guards as will prevent the spread of fires and the starting of what are known as prairie fires. To show the necessity for such action by parliament, I may state that within the last year there have been a number of very serious fires started from railway engines in the ranching country. Last fall one fire was started from the Calgary and Edmonton line, some distance north from Calgary, which burned what are known as the Nose creek and Beaver dam ranges That fire destroyed some 10,000 tons of hay and burned the houses and holdings of two settlers. East of Calgary last fall there were two very bad fires which burned over a large portion of the range country. East of Medicine Hat, too, there was a serious fire started from the railway which burned over the larger portion of the Cypress Hills country, and destroyed a very large quantity of hay which was put up for winter feed by the ranchers. South of the Bow river, south of Calgary, the most serious fires of the year occurred. Besides destroying the grass on a large area of the range, and burning a quantity of hay, it destroyed no less than 500 head of stock. We have spent a considerable time this session in discussing the want of cattle guards which seems to be a grievance in Ontario ; but I would venture to say that one single prairie fire in the range country will do as much damage as is done in four or five years through the lack of cattle guards. Within the past month there has been a series of serious fires started from the railway line, and I will take the liberty of reading a portion of a letter which came to me a few days ago from Medicine Hat, and which will give some information on this subject. It is dated April 13th, and the writer says :

Since the 5th instant this country has been nearly ruined by prairie fires. On Saturday, the 5th instant, a train leaving Medicine Hat set fire to the country on the west side of the river, and completely burnt over all the country north of the railway to the Red Deer river. The Canada Land and Ranch Company's farm at Stair, eight miles from Medicine Hat, is completely burnt over, not an acre left, and three fine Clyde mares are lying dead in their pasture burnt, and their fine herd of Galloway cattle are scattered all over the burnt country. On Tuesday a fire started on the railway somewhere near Dunmore, east of Medicine Hat, and has burnt the whole country clear to Swift Current. The Drowning Ford Ranch Company lost 300 tons of hay, and Charles Strong, rancher, of Walsh, lost all his hay, buildings, wagons and machinery, hay press, &c., and the loss to the stock industry will be very severe. The hay grounds are all burnt over and will be no good for a couple of years. There have also been great fires in Alberta.

I may say to the committee that this matter was discussed in this House ten or eleven years ago. My late predecessor from Western Assiniboia brought the subject up in 1890 by way of resolution, very nearly in the terms of the amendment which I propose to-day. The resolution was discussed at length, and the government of that day accepted the spirit of it. The next year the same gentleman brought in a Bill in almost the identical terms of the present amendment. The principle of the measure was endorsed, and the Bill was read a second time; but I understand that at that

time the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which was then the only railway company affected, agreed with the government that they recognized the need of action, and agreed that they would take action, and from that time to this the railway company have been doing considerable and expending considerable money in the way of fire-guarding their line. But the truth that they have not been attending to the matter completely is shown in the fact that this large number of serious fires have occurred and are occurring yearly. I may tell the committee, too, that if the railway company were subject to the control of the North-west assembly, there would be no need of action by this parliament. Every person in the North-west who is subject to the control of the assembly is liable to severe penalties for doing anything which may cause injury to the public by prairie fires. I may read the section of the prairie fire ordinance of the North-west assembly :

No person shall directly or indirectly, personally or by any servant, agent, or employee kindle on any land a fire for the purpose of guarding property, burning stubble or brush or clearing land unless the land on which the fire is started is at the time it is started, completely surrounded by a fire guard not less than twenty feet in width consisting of land covered with snow or water or so worn, graded, ploughed, burned over or covered with water as to be free of inflammable matter, and any person kindling a fire for such purpose shall during the whole period of its continuance cause it to be guarded by three adult persons provided with proper appliances for extinguishing prairie fire.

I think it is only right that a railway corporation should be subject to the same law in respect to this matter as are private individuals in that country. I think it is not right to allow a railway company or any corporation or any individual to carry an engine which results in destruction to property without having proper provision made to guard against the destruction. I beg, therefore, to move the adoption of this amendment.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think the committee can hardly exaggerate the importance of the matter which my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has brought to our attention. It is a subject which has engaged my attention at different times and in different ways, and I can, without any qualification, corroborate the statements he has made as to the very great damage which arises from these fires and as to the grievous consequences which follow, in some cases, to individuals who are wholly unable to bear the losses which they are called upon to bear. I have not followed the legal decisions on this subject within the last two or three years, but when last my attention was drawn to the details of the matter, my recollection is that, as the law stood, the railway company was not liable for a loss by fire caused to an individual unless the person claiming damages could show that the railway company had been guilty of negligence. If the railway company could show that it had used the latest and best appliances known to science for the purpose of preventing the spread of fire, the best kind of spark arrester known, then it was held that the railway company was not guilty of negligence, and the person whose property was destroyed had no redress. I myself have known grievous cases in which fires caused by passing railway trains have burned wheat stacks, hay stacks, barns and houses of men who had absolutely nothing in the world besides what had been destroyed, and who could obtain no redress. If it were necessary to decide the point. I would not hesitate to say that if the state of knowledge in regard to the management of locomotives is such at the present time that it is not possible to prevent an occasional fire, which results in the destruction of a large amount of private property, the House could well decide that the railway company could better afford to bear the loss, or a considerable portion of it, than the individual who has no means of protecting himself, who has not been guilty of any contributory negligence, but who, conducting his farming operations legally and properly on his own property, has his property wiped out and destroyed.

My hon. friend has not however made any proposition which would tend to change the liability of a railway company in respect of the loss or destruction of property by fire, but has made a proposition which seems eminently reasonable and proper. It is that the railway companies, in that district of country, which is peculiarly liable to prairie fires, which run in such a way that once they get started they are almost inextinguishable, should take the necessary precautions for the purpose of preventing, as far as human foresight can do so, the spreading of these fires. When my hon. friend first spoke to me, in the early part of the session, about the proposition he now makes, I ventured the opinion that in all probability the cost would be enormous and almost prohibitory. But my hon. friend has made inquiries on that point, and he now informs me that the calculation which has been made, as the result of negotiations with the North-west Territorial government, results in the conclusion that the total expenditure by the Canadian Pacific Railway would be something in the neighbourhood of $20,000. So far as I am personally concerned, I have not the least hesitation in saying that if over several hundred miles of railway running through such a country, by an expenditure of $20,000, life and property can be protected from danger of fire, it is the duty of the committee to impose on that company the obligation of providing that protection. But I think that my hon. friend will require to include the whole prairie country in his amendment, both Manitoba and the North-

west Territories. I think also that some of the latter portion of the amendment might well be left out, because it is probably covered by the general provisions of the Railway Act. Probably my hon. friend the Minister of Railways can speak on that point. But in so far as the general principle is concerned, I am entirely in favour of the amendment, though I am not as a rule disposed to place any undue restrictions or obligations on any transportation company, which could have no practical result, simply for the furtherance of an idea. Having lived in that country since the Canadian Pacific Railway was incorporated, and before the first mile was constructed, I know that it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the question which my hon. friend has brought to our attention. It has reference to a real and substantial grievance which this House ought to remedy.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) I do not think the amendment moved by the hon. member for West Assiniboia goes far enough. By the clause which he wishes to embody in this Bill, the promoter deals only with the interests of the west, whereas the Bill under discussion concerns the country at large.

In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company vs. Roy, the Judiciary Committee of the Privy Council has decided that a railway company which, in running its railway, complies with all the requirements of its charter, is not liable for damages ensuing from fire arising from the sparks emitted from any locomotive engine, in the normal use of its line. That you should use your own property so as not to injure your neighbour's property, is a principle of Roman law embodied in the legislation of every civilized country.

A company has the right to the normal use of its property, but it cannot go beyond that. When a company, in running its railway, sets fire to the neighbouring property, it goes beyond the lawful and normal use of its property, and it trespasses upon foreign ground. The Judiciary Committee of the Privy Council did not hold that it was not fair and just that a railway company should not be liable for damages resulting from the use of its line; on the contrary, the law lords held that it was common law, but they decided that a railway company was above common law, under the power conferred upon it by its federal charter. When the question was threshed out on the floor of the Quebec legislature, M. Duffy drew attention to that fact and spoke as follows:

> It is admitted that it is unjust that Roy should have had his property damaged by the railway company, even when that company was without fault. What is the remedy?
>
> The remedy does not consist in abolishing all appeals to the Privy Council and of doing away with that learned body so far as this province is concerned. The privilege consists in calling upon the Dominion parliament not to pass legislation where it has the jurisdiction which will permit such an injustice. A simple amendment to the Railway Act, providing that railways would be liable for damage caused in the manner mentioned in this case would of course do away with the evil.

There is no doubt that a railway company cannot trespass upon private property. If in the course of its operations, a railway company sets fire to a property of a farmer, upon whom shall the loss fall? It must fall either upon the railway company or the farmer who is the victim. But it stands to reason that the railway company has no right to the use of a property that does not belong to it. I beg therefore to move the following amendment:

> Whenever damage is caused to crops, lands, fences, plantations, or buildings, and their contents, by fires started by a railway locomotive, the company making use of such locomotive shall, notwithstanding any provision in any general or special Act of the parliament of Canada, be responsible for such damage, and may be sued for the recovery of the amount of such damage in any court of ordinary jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. What the hon. gentleman proposes to do is to engraft an entirely new principle, so far as the larger portion of the Dominion of Canada is concerned, upon the liabilities of railway companies. He asks that parliament should affirm, irrespective of whether or not a railway company is guilty of negligence, and although the company may have conformed in every particular with the requirements of the law, although it may have adopted the most recent up to date method for the protection of property along its tracks, that if damage should ensue to property through the necessary and ordinary use of the railway, the railway company shall be liable to make good to the person suffering such damage, any amount necessary for such purpose. That possibly may be a wise provision to adopt as part of the general law of the land, but I think my hon. friend would hardly expect that in the dying hours of the session, when we can scarcely give the subject the attention and consideration it demands, we should subscribe to the adoption of a new principle and an entire change in the doctrines and principles of common law, as they now regulate the question of negligence. I would not like at this moment to say that the committee ought to adopt this amendment, and I think perhaps the effect would be to complicate and injuriously affect whatever element there may be of merit in the amendment which the hon. member for West Assiniboia is asking us to consider. The question which arises under the amendment of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia is one which must largely depend upon existing circumstances and upon the possibility of an adequate and sufficient remedy lying in the hands of the railway company,

and a remedy which would not necessarily entail extraordinary and unreasonable cost to the company. I am not going to say that a railway company should not, even at great expense, be required to protect properties in the district it traverses, but I do think it would have been better if we had been able to hear, before coming to a conclusion, the other parties who are interested. for instance, the railway companies, who might wish to have something to say on the subject. I agree with the hon. gentleman who has moved this amendment and the hon. minister who has supported it, that a very strong case possibly can be made out, but is it wise, though the grievance is a serious one, though enormous damage has resulted to the people by reason of sufficient safeguards not having been provided heretofore, for us, in this form and at this moment, to say that this is the only and proper way in which the needed protection shall be provided.

Personally, I would gladly respond to any appeal which might be made by the hon. gentleman for legislative action in the matter. But I would not like to commit myself to this method, unless I had an opportunity to inform myself upon the subject, and should conclude that this was the best mode by which the remedy could be provided. I should imagine that, possibly, the meaning of this first clause would be that not only would the company have to plough the land on either side of the track, but they might be obliged to continue ploughing it—two or three different ploughings might be required. The company might be obliged to keep constantly ploughing on either side of the track from the last of July for the rest of the season. Is that a necessary thing to do? And, if so, can it reasonably be done? I would go as far as any hon. gentleman in pressing upon the railway company the duty of providing a sufficient safeguard. The existing condition is a very serious one, no doubt, one for which a remedy should be found. But is this the only remedy, and are we providing for it in a proper way? I feel some uncertainty about the matter myself, and therefore would not like very ardently to accept the motion. But I would not oppose it without hearing the opinions of others. There is a section which provides a penalty of $1,000 for each day of neglect of this ploughing. That would mean, I presume, that this penalty would be enforcible against the railway company for neglect at any point over its entire line. If that is a correct interpretation, still, if the first clause is one which meets with favour from the committee, I would not feel that the penalty was unduly severe. The third section provides:

> For the purpose of complying with the provisions of section 1 hereof the company may enter upon any land not owned by it, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the provisions of the said section 1.

Perhaps it is not necessary to regard that as a very serious question, though I mention it to call the attention of the committee to it. I confess to feeling a good deal of difficulty with regard to the proposed amendment. I would like to see something done. My hon. friend (Mr. Scott) has not had—it is no fault of his—the opportunity of having the matter presented and considered earlier. The fact that my hon. friend had given notice of this amendment was not brought to my attention until just before my motion for second reading of the Bill was made. Therefore, I have not had—and perhaps other gentlemen are in the same position—the opportunity to consider the matter and reach a satisfactory conclusion in my own mind. But, if the sense of the committee it not averse to the proposition, I would not offer any objection.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The fact that the hon. gentleman proposed the second amendment, the purpose of which is to deal with the points to which I adverted when I was on my feet a few moments ago, viz.: the liability of the company, shows that this is a question which has given rise to serious difficulty and serious consideration long before the present time, and not only so, but that the different methods of meeting the difficulty have been very carefully considered. Now, I submit that in so far as the method of meeting the difficulty with respect to the prairie country to which my hon. friend from West Assiniboia's motion refers, is concerned, no simpler or less expensive method could possibly be devised than that suggested. We are simply acting on the maxim that prevention is better than cure—that preventing a fire is better than paying damages for the results of fire. And, if we are in a position to estimate the expense approximately, as my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) is satisfied we are, I do not think that the committee will regard $20,000 or even $50,000 as an excessive amount to call upon a railway company to expend in order to protect a vast territory of that kind against the destruction which comes yearly by the starting of prairie fires. In this proposal, then, we have it appears to me, a simple, practicable, and not oppressivley expensive, method of meeting the difficulty. I would urge upon the committee that the usual indisposition to deal with such matters at a late period of the session should not influence us in this case. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia has been diligent enough in getting this matter before the House, and the fact that he has not succeeded in bringing it before the House at an earlier time is due to no fault of his, but to circumstances over which he has had no control. But if

the matter were considered for six months, though the committee might have greater knowledge of the details, yet I doubt if it would be in a better position to deal with the matter than at the present time. As my hon. friend (Mr. Scott) has stated, this is a subject which has been discussed between the railway company and the North-west government, and the fact that it is practicable to carry out this plan, and that it is, to all intents and purposes effective, is practically admitted by all parties concerned. All that is necessary is for this parliament to place upon the railway company the obligation, which, I think, every hon. member here will admit should be placed upon them, of taking reasonable precautions to protect the public from the loss which has hitherto been suffered. Let the railway companies understand that parliament has placed this obligation upon them, and we shall have no more difficulty about prairie fires starting from locomotives. The railway companies would do what they have done in other cases, they would take the necessary steps to comply with the conditions, and parliament might feel that at least it had prevented very serious losses such as have taken place during the past years. To my own knowledge railway companies themselves have very fully appreciated the difficulties of this question, and, as long ago as seven or eight years, I remember, the Canadian Pacific Railway made prolonged efforts to provide an inexpensive and effective means of clearing the fire-guard along its track. A complicated piece of machinery for that purpose was devised, but I believe it did not turn out successful in operation. As to the necessity of ploughing the fire-guards a second time, I think I can state to the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Blair) that such a difficulty would not arise. If in the case of the virgin prairie, land is ploughed once between the 1st and the 31st of July, seed will not germinate in such a way as to make it necessary to plough that land again—there will be nothing inflammable there except what is blown upon it. If the provisions of the amendment are carried out, the fire-guard might be ploughed anywhere between the 1st of July and the 31st of July; then, the ground between the fire-guard and the track being cleared, it will form an effective fire-guard for the rest of that season. So that difficulty as a matter of actual practice will not apply. The same thing might be said of a fire-guard being applied where the land had been cultivated before. Seeds will not germinate in such a way as to place any inflammable matter upon the ground which is ploughed after the 1st of July of any season. So we may, I think, feel satisfied that the amendment is an effective one, that it will accomplish the purpose for which it is designed, that it is not unreasonably oppressive, and that it is actually necessary for the purpose of removing a substantial grievance.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. In my opinion the the amendment moved by the hon. member for St. John's (Mr. Demers) will have the effect of changing the law altogether as it at present exists in Canada and in Great Britain. The law, I think, was very properly laid down by the Minister of the Interior when he said that a railroad company receiving a charter or a right to run through a country, when it exercises due precaution in running and is not guilty of negligence, is not liable to these incidental damages. The hon. member for St. John's would make the companies liable for the incidence, even the damage resulted after the use of the utmost diligence on the part of the company, and the utmost precaution in running the road. That is contrary to the principle of the law of this country, it is contrary to the law laid down in Great Britain; and it is contrary, if I understand properly the decision of the Privy Council of England the other day, to the code in Quebec. Notwithstanding the decision of the courts in Quebec on the matter, the Privy Council in England found that their interpretation of the code was wrong, and that the law was similar to what it is in our section of the country. It would be an entire reversal of the law as at present applied to railroads both in this country, in Great Britain and in the United States. However, I do not suppose there is any chance of it becoming law at this session, as I am glad to hear from the remarks of the Minister of the Interior that it was not his intention to press the amendment in reference to fire guards at the present session.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend must have misunderstood me. What I said was that I would press the committee to adopt it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman advocated it, and complimented his hon. friend on the introduction of the amendment, but the inference I drew from the remarks of the Minister of the Interior was that on account of the late period of the session it could not be fully discussed and considered at the present time. However, I state my objection to the section. I think the railroad companies in the North-west already try to protect, not only their own property by running ploughed tracks along their line, but also the property of the farmers in the neighbourhood. I do not know whether they are compelled to do it, or whether the territories have power to compel them to do it; I do not know whether it is in accordance with the North-west Act. But the question I want to present to this House is whether we have power to legislate in this direction? Is it an incidence to railroad travelling or railroad chartering?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I think so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I have a different opinion. We may make anything an incidence that we like in reference to railroads, we may say that they shall not run a railway unless they do so and so. But surely we have no power to pass a clause like this for the purpose of making them comply with all the provisions of section 1, which reads :

> The company may enter upon any land not owned by it, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the provisions of said section.

What is the object of the hon. gentleman in introducing his amendment ? It is to protect the farms in the neighbourhood of the railways from damage done by fire. It is not an incidence to the running of the road that they should exercise due precaution ; it is not within our power to give them the right to enter on private property and take possession of it for the purpose of doing or preventing a damage by fire to farms in the neighbourhood.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Would we not require them to keep their track in a certain condition ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We could require them to keep their track in a good condition, we could require them to exercise due precaution against fire ; but we could not give them power to enter upon private property and take possession of it, without compensation, for the purpose of preventing fire spreading to neighbouring farms.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question of compensation is a question for parliament. It is within our discretion. We can authorize the railway companies to do anything we consider necessary for the due protection of the public, either in regard to travelling upon the railway or in regard to traffic. Anything in the judgment of this parliament that is necessary for the protection of the public we can enact, and we can place that obligation upon the railway company.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is not for the protection of the public, this is not for the protection of traffic. It is not an incidence to the exercise by a railway corporation of its rights and powers. This is for the protection of farmers in the neighbourhood of a railway from damage done, though not through the negligence of the company.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We require the railway company to do a particular thing, and when they do not do it, then they become negligent, and being negligent, they are liable for damages when that negligence is established.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You may put any obligation on a railway company that you like. You may define what is an incidence to it, and what is negligence ; but can you give them power to exercise the right of going on to the property of a private individual without compensation, and doing what you wish them to do ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If it is necessary for the purpose of the Act.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Not at all. The clause reads :

> For the purpose of complying with the provisions of section 1, hereinafter, the company may enter upon any land not owned by it, and no claim for damages shall be maintained against the company for any act done in compliance with the provisions of said section.

You may say that the company may be negligent in doing anything, you may make any condition that you like in giving them their charter ; but you cannot interfere with provincial rights, you cannot say they shall enter upon any man's property for the purpose of doing something which is not an incidence to railroad traffic. But there is another objection still more serious which I wish to mention. The railway companies ought to have a right to state their case, either before parliament or a committee of parliament. Who is to determine whether the protection is proper, or whether a certain act is necessary to afford protection? Therefore I think the hon. gentleman who introduced this section will perform his duty to his constituents if he lets the amendment stand as a notice, and let the railway companies be heard in reference to these amendments. Amendments like this affect large amounts of capital which have been invested in this country. The parties should be heard before a committee of the House. It is unfair to the railway companies to enact legislation of this kind without their being heard before some authority appointed by this House for the purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any desire on the part of the hon. member (Mr. Scott) to be unfair to the railway companies, or to take the House unawares in any way. I understand that the hon. member has made every effort to get his Bill before the House, and that he did make every effort to get his Bill before the House at an earlier date in the session. Owing to circumstances he was not able to do so, and it is now for the House to say whether it considers it has received sufficient information on the subject to warrant it in coming to a conclusion or postponing that conclusion to some future occasion.

I would like to say, however, in reply to the contention set up by the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart), that parliament is here for the purpose of discussing and deciding these questions on

its own responsibility, and it is not absolutely necessary to the decision of the question that the private parties to the case shall be heard by parliament. Parliament is responsible for the decision, parliament can arrive at the decision by any means its sees fit, and it is not compelled to wait for such evidence as would be given before a court of law before reaching its conclusion.

In regard to the general question, there seems to be a very grave misapprehension on the part of hon. members as to what is attempted to be done. It is essentially not a question of protecting the farmers or farming property. It is an absolutely and entirely different question from the question brought forward by the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers). It is a question rather of protecting public property than of protecting private property. The country owns the land, the country owns the grass, the country derives a benefit from the use of that grass by reason of it being pastured by cattle and turned into valuable beef. It is in regard to the range country rather than in regard to the farming country that these amendments are suggested, and in regard to which the question chiefly arises. We have a condition of affairs that is absolutely different from that prevailing in any other part of the Dominion, and hon. members may be forgiven for not accurately understanding that position. It is because the condition is so radically different there from the condition elsewhere in the Dominion that we are asking for such radically different legislation. It is a different case, and therefore, we are asking for different legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. In the western states they have very much the same conditions as we have on this side. Is the hon. gentleman aware of what means they take to check the spread of fires on the ranges ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the faintest idea, but there is another piece of information which I will give to the hon. gentleman, and it is that in the range country of the western states the grass is not as rank, it is not as good as it is in the Northwest, and therefore it is not as subject to the spread of prairie fires. The grass, being longer in our country, when it becomes dry, the fire is much more easily and much more certainly spreads upon it.

The grass, as I say, belongs to the country. The country derives benefit from that grass, either directly by rental, or indirectly by the production of wealth in the growth of beef, and it is with the view of protecting the public interest, or the national interest, in that property, rather than protecting the private interest of the individual, that this amendment is proposed. Because, in the vast areas of country which have been burned over year after year by fires started by Canadian Pacific Railway locomotives, a very small proportion of the country has become private property, while a very large proportion of it is producing actual wealth for the country. The greater part of the area affected is not private property, it is public property, and parliament has a perfect right to direct that any action shall be taken in regard to that property that parliament desires. But, of course, a large part of the range country is also private property. It is owned, and in some cases, it is fenced. But there is no distinction in appearance, or in use, there is not even a boundary set up in many cases between what is private property and what is public property, and I can assure the committee that the fire does not recognize any difference between private and public property, between land that is owned and land that is not owned. If a fire starts on private property it spreads to the public domain, and if it starts on the public domain it overwhelms private property. It is a case in which the private and the public interest is the same. They are identical, the one has to be protected with the other, and the one cannot be protected without the other. There is no use requiring a railway company to go on public property and plough fire-guards and not require them to go on private property and plough fire-guards.

As to the constitutional question, or the question of law that has been raised, I will say nothing, but I will ask the committee if it seems good to allow this vast interest that exists in our country, that is increasing in value from year to year, to be jeopardized because of a constitutional point, because of some question in law, because of a ruling made by a judge on a question that does not appertain in any shape or manner to the condition of affairs which exists in these territories at the present time. What I ask the committee to do is to take into consideration the fact that the conditions are as they are, that they are absolutely and entirely different from any conditions existing in any of the eastern provinces, that it is the public interest that requires protection, that it cannot be protected separately from the private interest, that common cause has to be made against the common enemy, that is fire, that the local legislature has no authority in the matter, that this Dominion parliament is the only authority, and that, as far as our judgment goes—I speak of the western members—we have not been able to suggest any better remedy for meeting what is a tremendous and a growing evil than the suggestion made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott).

Mr. SCOTT. It would probably be well for me to give the committee the fullest information I can as to how this provision

would work out in practice if it is enacted. The only company, which, to-day, would be affected, is the Canadian Pacific Railway.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. And the Canadian Northern.

Mr. SCOTT. The Canadian Northern has only a few miles of road in the territories, and the class of country in which they are at present is such that they would not require to observe this provision. I will give the committee the total mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway which would be affected. On the main line guarding would be necessary between Qu'Appelle and Morley, 558 miles. There would be a mileage of 160 miles on the Soo branch, 160 miles on the Prince Albert branch, 165 miles on the Calgary and Edmonton branch and 211 miles on the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, making a total mileage of 1,254 miles. That mileage, of course, has to be doubled for guarding is necessary on both sides of the line, so that it makes practically 2,500 miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do they not do something in that direction now ?

Mr. SCOTT. They do a very considerable amount.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Are the railway company complying as far as possible with the territorial law in this particular ?

Mr. SCOTT. The territorial legislature are not competent to control the company in this matter. If the legislature were competent to do so I can assure my hon. friend that no action would need to be suggested in this parliament. I have the figures which have been prepared by I believe the most competent authority in the North-west Territories, the most competent person in Canada, with respect to this matter and he calculates that the cost of the first construction of such a guard would be about $10 per mile, amounting to $25,000 over the whole system. That would be in the first year, and he also calculates that the cost of maintenance in subsequent years would be $5 a mile for the back setting or re-breaking of the ploughed guard and about $3 a mile for the burning between the ploughed guard and the railway track. I may say to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals that the ploughed guard is not the chief thing, the burning between the guards and the track is the chief thing, and if that is done completely once a year it will be entirely sufficient. The total cost of maintenance therefore would be about $8 per mile, or as the Minister of the Interior has already said, a total of $20,000 per year. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has suggested that the company is already doing considerable in this direction, and that being the case we will not by this amendment be imposing a burden of $20,000 a year upon this company. I have no doubt that the company is already expending possibly $10,000 or $12,000 a year, so that this amendment would not impose a very great additional burden upon them. The fact that the company is not completely fire-guarding its system is proven by the very many and very serious fires which have occurred last fall and this spring.

Now, as to the feasibility of the particular plan which is suggested, I may say that the Public Works Department of the North-west government and the railway company have been negotiating with respect to this matter for two or three years, and the plan which they have decided on as being the best is exactly this plan which I have now proposed. The North-west government deemed the matter so very important in the public interest that, although they did not believe the government should be saddled with any portion of the cost, yet they went the length of suggesting that they would bear a portion of the cost if the railway company would undertake to complete the fire-guarding of their system. The company and the government are entirely agreed that this plan which is here suggested is the best plan, is a good plan, but they did not arrive at an agreement as to the terms. I understand that the government went the length of suggesting that they would be willing to bear half of the whole cost of first construction and maintenance, but so far as I have been informed the railway company did not see fit to agree to even that proposition.

Respecting the sub-clause which would give the company power to go upon other people's property without compensation, I may say that in practice I do not think any difficulty will be found. When the railway company were willing to agree with the North-west government to carry out this particular plan, they did not think evidently that there would be any serious difficulty encountered in that respect. In the portion of the country which is a farming country this fire-guard is not necessary, and it is only in the ranching country where people live far apart that it will have to be constructed. The people living in such a section are not likely to object to the company going upon their property, but as it would seem unreasonable to make a law compelling the company to do certain things and not relieve them from liability for damage for so doing, we have inserted this clause in the amendment. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that the proposition which we make with respect to prairie fires in the North-west is entirely on all fours with the proposition which was agreed to by a majority of the members of this House and by the government on the cattle-guard question. It was decided in that case that it would be better to find out what is the best cattle-guard and then to compel the railway companies to use that cattle-guard subject to a penalty for neglecting the use of it. I claim that I am suggesting

to-day what is the best fire-guard, and I ask parliament to compel the railway companies to use that fire-guard subject to a penalty for failing to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a very important question, and although I think it would be fair that the railway company should have an opportunity of presenting their view, yet that cannot be done during this session at least. I have some knowledge of the injury that has been done not only in the Northwest but in Ontario because of fires started by railway engines, and I confess that I would be inclined to go the length of saying that the railway company should not only be obliged to take precautions to prevent fires starting, but that they should be held responsible as well for damages done in this connection. In my own locality I have seen a farmer burned out three or four times over by reason of fire starting from railway engines, and yet he was unable to get a dollar of compensation. That is not justice. If a farmer lights a fire to clean his land after the 1st of June, and damage results from that fire, the law provides that he shall be responsible. Why should you impose such liability upon a private individual and exempt a great railway corporation. That is something that I cannot understand. If the information which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) gives us is correct, then the adoption of this amendment would not impose any very great expense upon the railway companies. He tells us that they would have to plough a section of the country sixteen feet wide and 1,272 miles long. That would be in all 3,544 acres, and assuming that it would cost $1.50 an acre—it would only have to be ploughed once in a season, although perhaps there might be localities where it would be necessary to plow more than once—but if done once in the season it would give fairly good protection and it would cost the railway company only $5,316. It happens very frequently that one farmer sustains a loss from these railway fires more than three times that amount, not considering the thousands of acres of pasture which are burned and the consequent heavy loss to cattle owners whose feed for their cattle has been destroyed.

Comparatively speaking it would be a very small expense to a rich corporation; but when you take into account the loss sustained by individuals and their helplessness under the circumstances, our sympathy should go to the individual rather than to the rich corporation. For this reason I would be inclined to support the amendment. I am not sufficiently versed in law to be able to say whether there is anything in the constitutional point raised by the hon. member for South Lanark; but assuming that we have the authority to legislate, the question is, should we put that obligation upon the railway companies? In my judgment we should. We give these corporations great powers and privileges. We give them franchises out of which they are able to earn immense amounts of money from the people. We give them rights which they exercise over the people, very often to the detriment and loss of private individuals. In almost every instance in which the interests of individuals are concerned, these suffer instead of the railway. In consideration of these things, I do not think it is too much to put upon the railways the obligation to bear the consequences of the damage they do. While I admit that the railway companies ought to be heard, I do not admit that we are not justified in passing this amendment, because I think we are. I, for one, would be inclined to go further, and say that we should hold them responsible for all the damage done by their locomotives, not only in Manitoba, but in every other part of the country. In carrying on ordinary business, if we do damage to another, we must pay for that damage; and I do not see why a railway company should not be compelled to do that which a private individual must do.

Mr. BELCOURT. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has preceded me as to the importance of this question. I regret that I am not in a position to speak to the House very intelligently upon it, because I did not see or hear of the amendment until it was read this afternoon; but I may say that I have for some time made up my mind on this question. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman who has just sat down that the legislation aimed at in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) is right, and expedient for this parliament to enact. Until the Privy Council decided recently the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway vs. Roy, I had thought that the provision of section 288 of the Railway Act (1888) had consecrated the principle embodied in this amendment; but the Privy Council has declared the principle to be non-existent in Canada. With the permission of the House I will read section 288:

> No inspection had under this Act, and nothing in this Act contained, and nothing done or ordered or omitted to be done or ordered, under or by virtue of the provisions of this Act, shall relieve, or be construed to relieve, any company, of or from any liability or responsibility resting upon it by law, either towards Her Majesty or towards any person, or the wife or husband, parent or child, executor or administrator, tutor or curator, heir or personal representative of any person, for anything done or omitted to be done by such company, or for any wrongful act, neglect or default, misfeasance, malfeasance or nonfeasance, of such company or in any manner or way to lessen such liability or responsibility, or in any way to weaken or diminish the liability or responsibility of any such company, under the laws in force in the province in which such liability or responsibility arises.

I had always been under the impression that this section preserved and sanctioned the principle that corporations or individuals who exercise an occupation or carry on a trade or occupation which is of a dangerous or obnoxious character, when that is done for gain or profit, do so at their own risk, and if in doing so they cause damage to any person, whatever precautions they take, they are liable for that damage. I have always thought that section 288 consecrated that principle ; but it is evident that I was wrong if the recent decision of the Privy Council is the true interpretation of the law. I would not venture to say, whatever my opinion is, that the decision of the Privy Council is wrong. But, I think, I may say that it has been guided more by the principles of English law than by the principle I have mentioned is recognized by the French law, and runs all through French jurisprudence. It may be that it has not received full sanction in regard to the railways of France ; but that is explained by the fact that the railways of France are mostly owned and managed by the state, and that the state has thought it well to protect itself from damages arising from fire on the ground that it does not operate the railways for profit or gain. Therefore the principle which permeates the whole of French legislation, has not received in France with regard to railways the sanction that it has received with regard to other subjects. I think the amendment of my hon. friend all the more expedient because of the interpretation which section 288 has been given by the Privy Council. It seems to me the amendment is not only expedient, but right and just. What are the facts ? A company is created by parliament for the purpose of carrying on the business of a public carrier. It is given certain powers which it can exercise, but if in the exercise of those powers it causes any damage to the people along its line, it seems to me the company ought to pay that damage. It is well enough to say that this parliament is supreme, and that it can enact any law. Of course it can; it can pass an unjust or iniquitous law. I am not discussing what this parliament can do ; I am discussing what it ought to do in a case of this sort. It is said that the course of legislation in England has been different from what is proposed here. I do not say that it has ; but assuming that it has, it does not follow that we must go on for ever bound by legislation which perpetrates an injustice. When this country was new and the means of communication were difficult, it was probably just that every facility should be given to railway companies to carry on their business ; but that time is past, and we have to-day railways passing through very thickly populated sections of the country, among hundreds of thousands of people whose property is daily and hourly subject to fire. The principle for which I contend has been sanctioned in the matter of expropriation. It is true, this parliament has given power to railway companies to expropriate property from individuals for the purposes of the railway ; but parliament has imposed restrictions and a procedure under which that must be done, and has also taken care to provide that in giving compensation to the people whose property is expropriated, the railway company must take certain matters into account.

It seems to me that this proposed legislation is eminently proper and just. Here is a railway company, which operates a dangerous undertaking for its own profit and advantage. Why should the people who live along the line of that railway be subject, not only to the noise, smoke and vibration and other inconvenience arising from it, but also to damages caused by fire. The principle for which I contend has been admitted in almost every other case where a dangerous or obnoxious trade or business is carried on. Our courts have frequently decided that persons operating a saw mill in a city should pay damages caused by the vibration of its machinery or by the smoke emanating from it. In a recent case in the city of Montreal, a livery stable keeper was condemned to pay the damages caused his neighbour's property by the bad smell emanating from his stable. The principle is not a new one, and I see no reason why railway companies should not be subjected to it as well as every other kind of business. The argument that the time has come for a change in our legislation in this regard is not a new one. In the imperial parliament in 1900, a Bill was introduced which is substantially to the same effect as the proposed amendment. That Bill provided as follows :

> Where damages caused to crops, hedges, or plantations by fire arising from sparks emitted from any locomotive engine on railways, the railway company owning such engine shall, notwithstanding their statutory powers and rights to the contrary, or the provisions of any special or general Act relating thereto, be liable to pay to the person whose crops, hedges, or plantations have been so damaged, the amount of such damage to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. That is both law and justice.

Mr. BELCOURT. That Bill did not pass, but there was a majority of practically four to one in its favour, the vote on second reading, I am told, standing 330 for and 84 against.

Similar legislation exists also in many states of the American Union. It seems to me that the time has come when we should compel railway companies to pay the damages they cause. The argument that these companies are operating pro bono publico is altogether exploded. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway and the other railway companies are not carrying on their business for the benefit of the public, but for the dollars and

cents they can make out of it, and I cannot see why a poor farmer, whose lands are often cut in two by these railway lines, should, besides having to run the danger of crossing the railway track in the operations of his farm, be also subjected, besides many other inconveniences and annoyances, to loss by fire caused by the sparks from locomotives. I do not delude myself into the belief that the House will adopt this resolution to-day when parliament is on the eve of prorogation, for I am afraid that a number of hon. members are not quite so zealous in the matter as are my hon. friend from St. Jean d'Iberville (Mr. Demers) and myself, and many others, but I believe that those who are in favour of this proposed legislation should put themselves on record and thus create a public opinion that will eventually bring about its adoption.

The PRIME MINISTER. Personally I am in sympathy with both amendments, especially that introduced by my hon. friend from St. Jean d'Iberville (Mr. Demers). If that amendment were adopted, we would have legislation on our statute books, which would not only be law but also equity. I cannot conceive of any reasonable argument against such a law. A company is authorized to carry on a certain enterprise, and at present, if it makes use of the latest inventions for protection against damage, it is not responsible. That may be law, but it is not equity. If in the course of its operations, a railway company sets fire to a poor man's crop, as often happens, the company pleads that as it has taken all the precautions possible, it is not responsible for any loss. The company pleads that the loss occurred through no fault of its own. That may be, but neither was it the fault of the poor man whose property was destroyed. A loss has to be borne; upon whom shall it fall. It must fall either upon the railway company or the settler, who is the victim, and under the circumstances certainly equity demands that the victim should not suffer the damage, but the party who caused it, even though that party be free of blame. For my part I am in favour of the amendment of my hon. friend from St. Jean d'Iberville, and I am also much in sympathy with that of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia, although the latter amendment is not free from doubt. There is a good deal to be said in favour of the argument of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart). I do not know that we have the power at this moment, though we might have had it when granting the charter, to provide that a company shall be authorized to go on private property and there put up any construction it may deem necessary. I would ask both my hon. friends not to press their amendments, not because I am not in favour of them, but because I think it would be wiser to follow the usual method of dealing with such matters. My hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has said that parliament should deal with these questions as it pleases. That is no doubt true, but parliament has thought fit to adopt certain rules, and it is always better to follow these rules, even when we have made up our minds that there is no other side to the question. But there are two sides to every question, and it is only right that we should give the railway companies an opportunity of presenting their views before enacting any legislation of the kind proposed. The rule hitherto followed is that legislation of this kind should be referred to the Railway Committee, where opportunity is given to all parties to bring witnesses and have the whole question properly threshed out. I would suggest that that rule be followed in this case, and I would say to my hon. friends from West Assiniboia and St. Jean D'Iberville, that the government pledges itself to give them an opportunity early next session to have this matter referred to the Railway Committee in order that it may be discussed there in all its phases, and proper legislation drafted. With this assurance, I hope that my hon. friends will agree to follow the course I have suggested.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one thing I would like to say, and that is that while this evil may be greater in the Northwest than in other parts of Canada, it is by no means confined to that particular part of the country. In the eastern provinces we have had many cases in which property has been destroyed by fire from locomotive engines, and the parties interested have been unable to recover because they could not show negligence on the part of the railway company. In other words, a railway company is not liable so long as it is shown that it has employed the latest and most improved methods known to science for the purpose of preventing fire being communicated to the adjoining property. When this question comes to be discussed next year, as the right hon. gentleman says it will be, there is one subject which the government should consider in that connection, and that is the liability of the Crown by reason of its operation of the Intercolonial Railway. There is no special reason why the Intercolonial Railway should not be subject to the same rules as other railways in that regard. It runs through a large portion of Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and at present I do not see what remedy there is, in case of damage, even if negligence were established. I know that there is a statute which says that the Crown is liable for negligence committed by any of its servants on public works, but whether or not that would apply to the case of the user by the Crown of a locomotive not in conformity with the latest improvements, is a question I have not looked into.

When the government come to deal with this question in the North-west, I think they will perhaps be obliged to deal with it on different lines from those on which it should be dealt with in the other provinces. I suppose that a provision of the character suggested by the hon. member for West Assiniboia would not be of very much use in the older provinces. Therefore, I think that when the question presents itself to the government next year it will probably present itself in the somewhat broader aspect than that in which it is presented in the amendments of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia—more in the light of the amendment introduced by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville. It is a pretty large question. Railway companies have been exempt from liability in the past by reason of the fact that they operate their railways under laws which empower them to do so, and which, for the most part, provide that their lines shall be located in certain places. This was the cause of exemption in the first place, the reason why they were exempt from being treated as a public nuisance. They were authorized by statute, or by ordinance having the force of law, to operate their lines in particular places. But that does not apply to all corporations carrying on business. A great deal depends on the terms of the particular statutes. It is a great question in this country, particularly in view of the fact that great industrial enterprises are being advanced at the present time. You must consider not only the liabilities of railway companies carrying on enterprises of that character, but you must consider the liability that should attach to other corporations, such as the great manufacturing concerns. It is a subject that is by no means free from difficulty and will involve a great deal of debate. The question with which we are more immediately concerned is the liability of the railway companies. As far as they are concerned, there seems a great deal of force in what has been urged from both sides that persons who, through no fault of their own, have property destroyed through the causes we have been discussing, should have some remedy pointed out to them, or, at all events, those exposed to such danger should have, possibly some better safeguard employed than is at present provided. But I entirely agree with what has been said by the right hon. leader of the House as to the unwisdom of dealing with this question without giving the railway companies an opportunity to put the other side of the question. It may be that there is no other side to the question—the Minister of the Interior says that there is not. That is all very well, but the railway companies should be heard from, and, after hearing we can judge better whether there is another side to the question or not. It is true that in questions of this kind this parliament is paramount. I believe that parliament has power to pass this legislation. But parliament should not, without hearing the other side, always exercise the power it possesses. Otherwise a local legislature, having jurisdiction over property and civil rights, could pass one man's property over to any other without giving the man whose property was being sacrificed the opportunity of saying a word in his own defence. That might be the result of the argument presented by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Oliver) if carried out to its legitimate conclusion. I think it is quite right to postpone this legislation to another session, and, when it comes up again it should be discussed from all standpoints, and after hearing all parties interested.

Mr. SCOTT. So far as concerns the amendment that I proposed, I desire to say that it is with very extreme regret I feel impelled by the remarks which have been made by the right hon. leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) to ask permission to withdraw it.

Amendment, (Mr. Scott), withdrawn.

Mr. DEMERS. I also beg leave to withdraw the amendment I offered.

Amendment, (Mr. Demers), withdrawn.

Bill reported.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Bill is read the third time, I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) what is the explanation of the words to which I called attention this morning. Is the effect of the section this—that the person whose land is taken for this temporary purpose shall have notice of what land is taken, and will he have compensation, and will he have the usual remedy ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He is entitled to compensation, and he will have the usual remedy provided in the original statute.

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

CITY OF OTTAWA.

Bill (No. 164) to amend the Act of 1899 respecting the city of Ottawa (the Minister of Finance) was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. CHARLTON. Do the commissioners receive a salary ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the compensation is entirely honorary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many of these commissioners are appointed by the government, and how many by the city ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As the law stands now there are four commis-

sioners, of whom three are appointed by the Governor in Council during pleasure, and one is appointed from time to time by the corporation of the city of Ottawa. This proposal is to add four, all of whom will be appointed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is to say, seven will be appointed by the Governor in Council and one by the city.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it found desirable to have an even number of commissioners rather than an odd number? Or would there be any objection to having another representative for the city? You are doubling the number, but you are altering the proportion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I may say when the matter was first broached I had contemplated a larger measure which would include an additional representative for the city of Ottawa, but owing to the late period of the session I concluded it was better not to do that at present. I do not think the city has any reason to complain or are complaining. Whatever is done is done entirely for the city of Ottawa. If this were a case of a joint expenditure, part of which was to be spent in Ottawa and a part somewhere else, it would be important to have the city proportionately represented. But as the whole expenditure is in Ottawa and for the benefit of Ottawa, I think the ordinary rules of proportion are not necessary to be maintained. I do not think there is any difficulty on the part of the city, and I hope next year we will be able to enlarge the scope of the Bill and give the city further representation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the city acquiesces I have not a word to say. But it occurred to me that the proportion fixed last year must have been based on some principle, and that if you doubled the number of commissioners it would be only fair to do it in the same proportion.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not be justified in saying the city has acquiesced, because there has been no formal correspondence on the subject. But I have found no objection on the part of the city, and do not anticipate any.

Mr. CHARLTON. I suppose the money is furnished entirely by the government?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The city does not contribute directly. But there was an understanding between the city and the government as respects the sum of $15,000 per annum which the government were paying into the city funds for certain purposes, and it was agreed that that sum, instead of being paid into the city funds, should be diverted into the fund of this commission, and in that sense it may be said they are contributing. But the whole of the money is paid by the Dominion government.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the chairman have the same rights on this commission as he had on the old? He had two votes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There will be no change in that respect, we have not touched that point at all. I anticipate that with the large number of the commission there will be no difficulty of that nature.

Mr. SPROULE. What proportion is made in the original Bill for changing the commissioners? Do they hold office during pleasure?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The commissioners appointed by the Governor in Council hold office during pleasure, but the commissioner of the city of Ottawa is appointed by the corporation for a term not exceeding three years.

Mr. SPROULE. I expected to be able to verify a statement I made the other night because I have reason to believe it is correct, but the party from whom I expected to get information is not in the city, and therefore I could not see him so as to be able to verify the statement I made, otherwise I would probably do so on this occasion. I think this arrangement will help to tide over the difficulty the commission has experienced in the past. It can be readily seen that were there only four commissioners, one of whom was chairman, and another of the commissioners did not wish to act, or could not act, only two commissioners were really left to do the work. Now, the chairman had two votes, or in case of a tie the chairman had one additional vote and he could give it to either one side or the other, he had a double voting power. At different times it was found the commission was unworkable as constituted under the old law. By the enlargement of the number it may be that difficulty will be largely avoided. But it seems to me that unless that commission do their work more creditably in the future than they have been doing it in the past we ought to take an early opportunity of exercising more supervision over them than we have done up to the present time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have heard the suggestion from some source that it would be better to have an odd number of commissioners for reasons which have been mentioned. Possibly the difficulty of a tie may be removed by the increased number, owing to the improbability that all will attend. I do not know about that. But I have heard that suggestion made and I bring it to the attention of the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think the point may be worthy of consideration

another year. I quite anticipate that another session we will have still further legislation on this subject, but at present I have no reason to doubt that the matter will be improved to some extent by the larger number of the commission. In saying that I do not wish to be understood as assenting to all the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said regarding the work of the commission. I think he has been misinformed—of course he received his information in good faith. My information is that the work of the commission on the whole has been very well done indeed. These gentlemen have given a great deal of time and have rendered very valuable service to the city.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

THE COASTING TRADE OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 165) respecting the coasting trade of Canada.—The Minister of Justice.

On section 1,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). This is a re-enactment of the law as it is now, except that the second paragraph contains a definition of the words 'coasting trade.'

On section 2,

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I desire to move an amendment to this clause, adding the following words after the word 'ship' in the second paragraph :

Provided, that the provisions of this section shall not apply to any foreign-built British ship that has been registered as a British ship prior to the 1st day of December, 1902.

Mr. CHARLTON. I want to ask the hon. minister who has charge of this Bill in regard to the provisions imposing restrictions upon British-built vessels engaging in the coasting trade whether any corresponding restrictions exist in the British navigation laws in regard to Canadian-built vessels.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Why should we introduce this discrimination against ships of British register engaging in the Canadian coasting business when we have for our own tonnage the free use of the British coasting trade in all parts of the Britsh Empire ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. This Bill is applicable not to a British-built ship but to a foreign-built ship registered in England.

Mr. CHARLTON. A British-built vessel is not excluded by it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. Then, in regard to subsection 2 or section 2, I desire to ask the hon. minister whether that does not make a change in the rate of duty hitherto imposed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The rate of duty heretofore imposed was 10 per cent ad valorem on the hull of the vessel, and 25 per cent ad valorem on the hull, rigging, machinery, boiler, furniture and appurtenances of the ship.

Mr. CHARLTON. Having in view the desirability of encouraging the increase of the Canadian marine, I should question very much whether an increase of duty from 10 to 25 per cent on foreign-built vessels that sought admission to Canadian register is a course to be pursued which is likely to be in the interests of the country. It strikes me that 10 per cent on the hull of a vessel for duty is high enough.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The first section contains a definition of the coasting laws, and it is not very important. It is in respect to section 2 that there is a departure. That requires that a foreign-built British ship, to engage in the coasting trade of Canada, shall be obliged to take out a license for which 25 per cent ad valorem of the vessel will be charged.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This will not have an ex post facto effect will it ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, not in regard to any vessel in Canada.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I understand you have an action now going on in the court in which the contention of your department is that a vessel bought in the United States which had got British register and came over here had no right to engage in the coasting business ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That was not quite the question. The question was whether or not a vessel which went to the United States and came in here under the operation of the British Consul's certificate at Chicago was entered to engage in the coasting trade. It was held in the lower court and in the Exchequer Court that our contention was wrong, but fortunately there is such a thing as a Supreme Court in this country, and we succeeded a few days ago in getting a judgment reversing the judgment of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. CHARLTON. The judgment is that foreign-built vessels taking out a consul's certificate for the purpose of being admitted to Canadian register cannot obtain that register without paying.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No. That is the law which we have now without this amendment.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The judgment of the Exchequer Court is reversed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The judgment of the Exchequer Court is reversed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the hon. minister whether there is any imperial sanction required in regard to these proposed changes ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is provided that this Bill shall not come into force until such time as it receives the imperial sanction. The ninth paragraph says :

This Act shall not come into force until His Majesty's pleasure thereon has been signified.

That is in connection with the Merchants' Shipping Act of 1894, section 736.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is His Majesty's pleasure signified through an imperial Act, or would it mean His Majesty's pleasure signified through a Canadian Act of parliament ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The Merchants' Shipping Act of 1894 provides that:

The legislature of a British possession, may, by any Act or ordinance, regulate the coasting trade of that British possession, subject in every case to the following conditions :

(a) The Act or ordinance shall contain a suspending clause providing that the Act or ordinance shall not come into operation until Her Majesty's pleasure thereon has been publicly signified in the British possession in which it has been passed.

It is to meet the provision of the imperial Act that we have inserted section 9 of this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The question which occurred to me was whether the language used here might mean His Majesty's pleasure signified on the advice of the government of Canada. It is a very proper provision, but I want to be sure that we are expressing it in the way that the hon. minister intended.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. We are adopting the terms of the British Act. I would suggest that we might put the Bill through this stage, and I will consider the matter further before the third reading.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would suggest that it might be made to read that it shall be signified in the manner provided by the imperial statute.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We want to make it plain that it is His Majesty's pleasure as indicated by the imperial government, and not the pleasure of His Majesty's representative.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I understand the hon. Minister of Justice properly the clause empowers provincial or other governments to impose conditions as to registration ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. No, the legislature of a British possession may, by any Act or ordinance, regulate the coasting trade of that British possession, subject to the condition of the Bill being reserved for the signification of His Majesty's pleasure. That is the English Act. That would not apply to a province. That would only apply to a legislature that has power to deal with maritime matters. The provinces would not have any right to deal with this matter at all—only the Dominion.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Only the Dominion ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Only the Dominion. When the imperial Act speaks of the legislature of a British province it means a legislature having authority to deal with matters of this sort.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3,

Mr. CHARLTON. In regard to section 3 provision is made for the confiscation of cargoes the same as if goods were smuggled in the case of a vessel engaged in the coasting trade contrary to the provisions of this Act. The section reads:

3. No goods or passengers shall be carried by water, from one port of Canada to another, except in British ships ; and if any goods or passengers are so carried, as aforesaid, contrary to this Act, the master of the ship or vessel so carrying them shall incur a penalty of four hundred dollars ; and any goods so carried shall be forfeited, as smuggled ; and such ship or vessel may be detained by the collector of customs, at any port or place to which such goods or passengers are brought, until such penalty is paid, or security for the payment thereof given to his satisfaction, and until such goods are delivered up to him, to be dealt with as goods forfeited under the provisions of the Customs Act.

I would like to inquire of the hon. minister as to what the limitation would be as to what would be considered to be the cargo of a vessel. A large part of the commerce of the lakes is carried by means of vessels that are towed by steam barges, and there is also a great deal of commerce in the form of the towing of rafts. I would like to know whether a raft or vessel in tow would be liable to the provisions of this Act and the property confiscated ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I really could not answer off-hand an inquiry of that sort.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is very important to have that matter defined.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). (Translation.) I deem it my duty to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to the difference existing between our legislation respecting the coasting trade and the legislation in force in the United States. Prior to 1898, we had no passenger steamboats at St. John. At that time excursions from Canada to the United States were organized by American companies, and steamboats used to call at St. John and Iberville, at Sabrevois and l'Ile aux Noix and carried passengers to Bur-

lington or Platsburg, without the government having ever interfered. The American coasting laws were then similar to the Canadian laws; but in 1898, a statute was passed by the American Congress, which reads as follows :—

No goods or passengers shall be carried by water, from one port of the United States to another, except in American ships, 'either directly or via a foreign port,' or for any part of the voyage.

About 1900, the people of St. John organized a transportation company, the Richelieu Navigation Company, which undertook to carry passengers and excursionists from the United States to Canada and from Canada to the United States, as had been done so far by American vessels. But the United States government soon interfered, and in the course of the last season a steamboat of the company, the 'Majestic' was seized by the American authorities. The American government claimed the sum of twenty thousand dollars, because the navigation laws in the United States are much more drastic than ours are, the penalty being $20 for each passenger, whereas, under our legislation, the penalty amounts only to $400 in all. As the 'Majestic' was not worth $20,000, the American authorities felt inclined to enter into negotiations, and owing to the good offices of Mr. Myers, of Rouse's Point, the company succeeded in making an arrangement through which it got out of trouble by paying a fine of $200. I think it desirable that our legislation should be amended in the direction of the American law.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the Minister of Justice considered whether you have the right to say that one kind of British ship shall enjoy an exclusive privilege and another shall not ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is a very serious question and it was canvassed and discussed before this Bill was submitted. We launched the Bill on the assumption that we were dealing with this matter constitutionally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is also another consideration about it, which is, that apparently even if a foreign-built ship desired to engage in the coasting trade for only a limited period, nevertheless it would have to pay the full amount of duties.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. It is really a tax on foreign ships coming in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is really the imposition of a duty on foreign-built ships brought into Canada for the purpose of doing a coasting trade, even if they should be employed in that trade for only a very limited period.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We impose a tax if they come in as foreign-built ships, but if they go out and get a British register and come back again they defeat the provisions of our customs law.

Bill reported.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHARLTON. Before the Bill is read a third time I desire to move :

That the Bill be referred back to committee with a view of making the following amendment to section 3.

That the provisions of the said clause as reguards the forfeiture of goods shall not apply to rafts or cargoes of vessels in tow of such ships or vessels engaged in coasting in contravention of this Act.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Justice left the Chamber under the impression that the Bill would get its third reading, but as this is a very important amendment, I would ask that the Bill should stand over until Monday.

Mr. CHARLTON. I spoke to the Minister of Justice and he suggested the amendment, but it is a matter that he would naturally like to look into. Unless that provision is made I think serious injustice will be done by the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MARITIME STOCK BREEDER'S ASSOCIATION.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 159) to incorporate the Maritime Stock Breeder's Association. He said : This Bill is simply to incorporate a voluntary association which has been in existence for some time in the maritime provinces, and as it covers the three provinces, it could not be incorporated by the legislature of any one province.

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

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any special provision in this Bill beyond the incorporation of these gentlemen ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, it is simply to incorporate the association, which heretofore has been purely a voluntary association, and which could not do certain things they wish to do.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Have you a copy of the by-laws of the association ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The by-laws are in existence, and accompanied the Bill when it passed through the Senate. I have not a copy of them here. You can see by the Bill that they can be changed at any time.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Winnipeg immigration buildings — isolation hospital (revote), $8,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that we have just received tenders for that building, the lowest being $10,800 in round numbers. In addition to that there will be about $1,000 expended for other purposes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon. minister any idea of what the total expenditure is for immigration buildings throughout Canada ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say off-hand.

Mr. WILSON. I presume that this building will be chiefly for the accommodation of immigrants from Europe ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose so.

Mr. WILSON. If there was a little more attention given to inspecting the immigrants at the frontier, we would not require so much hospital accommodation at Winnipeg. I hope the Act introduced by the Minister of the Interior will be made stronger in the Senate, because I am afraid that as it passed this House it was too weak to do much good.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Of course, this building was asked for by the Department of the Interior. I am only the builder.

Red Deer court house, lock-up, and land office (revote), $5,700.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this whole building expected to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $8,000—by contract, of course.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How large a town is Red Deer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About 400 population. It has three churches and nine stores. Of course this vote has been asked by the Department of Justice. The late Minister of Justice insisted very strongly on every court house in my estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. This building will be used for a land office as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is a public building generally, but a court house specially.

Yorkton court house and jail, $4,400.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these all for new works ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have $4,000 in the main estimates, and this will finish the work.

Saskatoon immigration building, $1,200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you want a building there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a kind of small shed. Saskatoon is in the Saskatchewan district. There are a great many immigrants, I understand, and before they settle on their farms they have to be lodged for some time. The Department of the Interior has asked for the building.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this located upon a railway line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is on the Canadian Pacific Railway line.

Williams Head quarantine station—improvements, repairs, furnishings and fittings, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought that what we voted last year was to complete the improvements. There seems to be no end to the expenditure at Williams Head.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have a list of the items on which this money is to be expended. There is electric lighting plant, $5,000; new bath house, $1,000; quarters for saloon passengers, $1,000 ; reshingling, $1,000, and a number of other smaller items. The total cost of that quarantine station is between $60,000 and $70,000, exclusive of the wharf.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this more especially for immigrants ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there are a great many Japanese and Chinese coming from the Pacific ocean on the Canadian Pacific Railway boats, and they have to be attended to pretty carefully. However, I am only carrying out the instructions of the Department of Agriculture, which has charge of quarantine. I am a builder pure and simple, and do my best to build well.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems pretty elaborate for what is required. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture can explain the reasons for this large expenditure.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. We are constantly obliged to accommodate larger numbers of people. The vessels that come in from the Orient have to be overhauled, and whenever there is any disease found, the whole passenger list has to be put ashore. We have to provide for first and second class and steerage passengers, so that when brought ashore they will be properly accommodated. The requirements have been greater lately in consequence of the fear of the bubonic plague, which has come up within the last year or two.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has there been any trace of bubonic plague in any of the immigrants landing ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Not so far.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this finish the expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Quite sure.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite sure for this time. But seriously speaking, this is to complete it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And next year there will be repairs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be the ordinary repairs, as there are in my hon. friend's house. The best built houses need some little touching up.

Parliament and departmental buildings, Ottawa, elevator attendants, $9,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the past we had a item in the main estimates of $57,000 for heating and attendants and caretakers. I thought it was better not to mix things as they were. I am taking out this item of $9,000 for attendants from the heating item, with which it has no relation whatever. I am making it a special item. It does not increase the expenditure, but only divides the item.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does this item mean, $9,000 for elevator attendance ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will give the list if my hon. friend wants it. In the parliamentary building there are four elevator attendants at $45 per month, $2,160. East and West blocks, three elevator attendants, $1,694.88. Langevin block, one engineer and firemen, $1,260; six elevator attendants at $45 per month, $3,240. Census building, one elevator attendant, $540. Oil, &c., $105.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many elevators altogether ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Eleven.

Lighting Dominion public buildings (additional amount), $5,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is rendered necessary by the increased number of buildings. We have to provide the lighting of 226 buildings all over this country.

Rents—Dominion public buildings, $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is this additional amount necessary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because of the number of buildings for which we are obliged to pay rent. This just covers the expenditure. This is for all over Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total amount paid for rent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The total is $33,500.

Hon. Mr. FISHER.

Gas and electric light, public buildings, Ottawa, including lighting of road and bridges, $3,900.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a permanent addition made necessary especially by the increase of lighting in the Senate Chamber, together with some other items.

Port Colborne public buildings—new heating aparatus, $950.

Mr. BLAIN. What public building have we at Port Colborne ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have a building which is used for both canal and post office purposes.

Winnipeg immigration building—New hot air furnaces with connections, &c., $800.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You had a vote a few minutes ago for the Winnipeg immigration building ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That was for the office. This is for the immigration building. They are two different things, but together they occupy one piece of land.

Dominion immigrant buildings—repairs, furniture, &c., $500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What buildings are these ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to pay for small repairs and furnishings for buildings all over the country.

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Amagandus Pond—wharf (revote), $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have here a map of Nova Scotia which I will lay on the Table, upon which all the works for which I am asking money are marked.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is Amagandus Pond ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Cape Breton riding.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is any harbour or inlet in Nova Scotia that has escaped the attention of the minister I think he should mark that on his map.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the province of Nova Scotia there are many fishermen who need these works in connection with their calling, a very difficult trade indeed. The visit I paid three years ago convinced me that we could not do too much for these fishermen.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any wharf there now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will this work cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have no information upon which to base an exact estimate, but the expenditure will be small.

Mr. JOHNSON (Cape Breton). If the hon. minister will allow me I can give the committee some information as to this place. There is a stretch of coast on the Bras d'Or lakes about fifteen miles in extent, which is thickly populated all along. This wharf will be about the centre, and it is designed to accommodate people all through that district. The people are mainly farmers, but they also do a little fishing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this for the purpose of enabling them to send their produce to market, or is it in connection with their fishing operations ?

Mr. JOHNSON (Cape Breton). It will serve both purposes. It is a very necessary wharf for landing coal and other supplies that these people require.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is on Bras d'Or lake, on East bay ?

Mr. JOHNSON (Cape Breton). Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How far is it from the other new wharf you are getting built ?

Mr. JOHNSON (Cape Breton). Twelve miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How broad is East bay at that point ?

Mr. JOHNSON (Cape Breton). About ten miles.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is another wharf being built right opposite on East bay and one within four miles of the other point.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that the same method is being followed in the supplementary estimates this session as was followed last session—a principle that I regard as very pernicious—the commencement of large numbers of new works that must mean almost unlimited expenditure before they are completed. Take, for example, the items for Nova Scotia in the supplementary estimates. We are told that items for new works are usually put in the supplementary estimates, therefore, I am bound to conclude that a large percentage of these are for the commencement of new works. We have no less than one hundred items for one hundred different works in the province of Nova Scotia, where we propose to spend money to the extent of $182,700. It is true that the individual amounts are not large; but what we complain of is the commencement of so many works without any knowledge of what we shall have to add to them in the future. We do not know to what we are committing ourselves in the commencement of these works. I think we ought to have fuller information to justify us in voting these items. It is not sufficient to say that they will accommodate a few fishermen. We can go all over this country and find cases like that. We want to be sure that this money will accommodate a large number of people in some place where the expenditure will be warranted.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are asking in these estimates for a little over $180,000 for public works. I ask my hon. friend to remember that in Ontario and in Quebec we are proposing to spend a great deal more money on single works than for the whole of Nova Scotia. Each province has its peculiar requirements. The province of Quebec will require large and expensive works. Only yesterday I asked the House for $1,000,000 for that province. On Port Colborne, in Ontario, we are spending nearly half a million dollars. These are large amounts of money. In the maritime provinces there are special requirements. My hon. friend speaks of a few fishermen being accommodated. But I ask him to remember that those few fishermen are carrying on an industry that brings a large amount of benefit to this whole country. There are not only fishermen in the maritime provinces whom we must look after, but there are many other classes of people who deserve recognition and who are doing much to develop trade. My hon. friend is an old parliamentarian and a man of experience; he knows well that often by a small and judicious expenditure of money in a small town you do a great deal to benefit.

Mr. SPROULE. The comparison the hon. gentleman made is not a fair one. He speaks of large expenditures on these large ports. But these ports are the great highways of commerce and accommodate hundreds of thousands of people. These expenditures are made on great arteries of trade where the ports must be made, and where the expenditure is necessarily very large. There is no comparison at all between such expenditures and those in these small places. I do not say we would not be justified in making small expenditures for the purpose of accommodating even a few people; but what I complain of is that we are commencing works and expenditures when we do not know what the end will be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There are very few places where we have not exact information, though there may be some small places where our information may not be entirely accurate. But we have resident engineers in all the provinces. In Nova Scotia we have Mr. Dodwell and Mr. Milledge, old and able engineers. Those two gentlemen give us all the information we can gather, and it is on their information that we base our estimates.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The number of new works on this list is exceed-

ingly small. In three or four cases out of five these items are for repairs and improvements to existing works, not new works at all. There are also very few cases in which the works are at all expensive. So we are not committing ourselves to any large outlay at all.

Mr. SPROULE. From the statement made by the Minister of Public Works that the items in the supplementary estimates were usually for the commencement of new works, I concluded that the large percentage of these items were for new works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I said that all new works are in the supplementary estimates, but that does not mean that the supplementary estimates may not contain many items for other than new works.

Mr. SPROULE. I speak from our experience of last year when we endeavoured to get information as to what new works were likely to cost, and we found it very difficult to get any information. What I complain of especially is that we are committing ourselves to commencing a number of new works without any information at all of what it is likely to cost to complete them. The minister says that he is making a small expenditure here and there to accommodate a few fishermen or a few farmers. If the same principle was applied in the province of Ontario you would have four or five public works where you now have only one. But we have never considered it the proper thing to advocate the commencement of such small works for the purpose of accommodating a small number of people in different localities. We have endeavoured to make expenditures on large harbours and large ports where a great deal of trade is done and where large portions of the country are benefited. But in the maritime provinces, whether it is that your trade is not directed in large arteries or whether your bays and creeks and inlets are more numerous, you seem to have a larger number of works down there that although they do not appear to be expensive individually, still in the aggregate it amounts to considerable.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In this case the expenditure, to complete the work, from the information which I have from my officers, will not be over $3,000. In 1895, even before we took office, representations were made to the department by the people there that their fire wood supply had given out, that they were obliged to buy coal, and that they had no wharf. We could not do the work until this day, as there were so many other demands upon us. It seems to me to be a very reasonable expenditure.

Mr. McISAAC. I wish to remind the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that while he is condemning many of these items for repairs, he is criticising the administration of his own friends when they were in power. I venture to say that 75 per cent of the items for public works in Nova Scotia are for repairs to works commenced by the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. SPROULE. I made no reference to works of repairs, but I did make reference to cases in which new works were commenced without knowing what the total cost would be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We know in every case.

Mr. McISAAC. I know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) wants to qualify his utterances. He has spoken half a dozen times within the last hour and it is necessary for him to qualify what he has said. He has made a general onslaught upon all of these items. I would say to him that in my own county there are some five items for the repair of old works, and there is not one item for a new work, and that the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite are responsible for these old works, as they were initiated during their administration. Every item in the estimates for the county of Antigonish has been put in on the recommendation of the resident engineer, Mr. Milledge. The hon. gentleman is condemning his own friends while he is condemning these expenditures and trying to make capital out of the effort to create the impression in the country that this government are spending money recklessly in the province of Nova Scotia, for the convenience, as he says, of a few fishermen in the remote parts of the province. If he pursues that line of policy in regard to Nova Scotia, as he has for several years, he simply provokes us to call to mind the fact that if there is anything wrong in it at all it is in most cases in repairing works undertaken by the hon. gentleman's own friends while they were in power. I do not condemn any of these expenditures, because I think they were right, but if the hon. gentleman forces us to institute a comparison between the works undertaken by the government of the present time and those undertaken in the past by his own friends, I am quite willing to make that comparison and to show that the works undertaken since the present government came into power have been more useful than those undertaken when the party of the hon. gentleman were in power.

Mr. SPROULE. I am very sorry that I have ruffled the even temper of my hon. friend (Mr. McIsaac) in discharging my duty, but I may tell him that I will endeavour to discharge my duty in the future, notwithstanding the fact that he may get a little out of humour.

Bailey's Brook—breakwater wharf, $2,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a new work, the cost of which will

be about $5,000. Tenders will be called for the work. It is in Pictou county.

Bear river—Removal of obstructions and renewals and repairs to dropping piers, $1,700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What piers are these ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is a pier that is sometimes known as the mooring pier. It is a pier at the entrance to the river, and ships have to moor to it before they can get up the river.

Big pond—wharf (revote, $2,500), $3,100.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. minister, when we reach an item for new work, let us know, and also say how much the work will cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is one of the new works. The total cost of the work is estimated to be $3,100.

Cape Cove—restoration of breakwater, $3,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is Cape Cove ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Digby county.

Charlesville—breakwater, $2,700.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A new work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Shelburne and Queen's.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Near the boundary of Yarmouth county.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $2,700 is the whole cost of the work.

Cheverie—breakwater extension (revote), $3,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is an old work.

Church Point—repairs to breakwater, $1,800.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An old work.

Comeaus Hill breakwater—repairs, &c., $600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An old work.

Cribbon's Point—repairs to wharf, &c., $1,350.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is Cribbon's Point ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Antigonish.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Drum Head breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. BELL. What county is that in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete. The total cost is $7,000.

Mr. BELL. What county is it in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Guysborough.

Glace Bay—harbour improvements, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How much will that cost ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was formerly a coal mine at Glace Bay, but after it was purchased by the new company they ceased shipping owing to lack of water. Since then quite a large town has grown around that place and they are now desirous of having wharf accommodation.

Mr. SPROULE. What will it cost to complete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is one of these works on which we may spend much or may spend little. I suppose that for $15,000 or $20,000 we can give them fair accommodation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the nature of the improvement ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a breakwater.

Mr. SPROULE. What will the length of this breakwater be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will build about 250 feet of breakwater for this amount.

Mr. SPROULE. Will it be let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Grand river—To open channel, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Richmond.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is this open channel ?

Mr. MATHESON. The present entrance is in a rocky place and it is not straight, and we want to have it opened where there is deep water outside so that the fishermen can go in and out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And for lumber trade, I understand.

Lunenburg—dredging, $5,000.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope the hon. minister will expend that sum this year.

Mr. FRASER. Strike it out.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no, no, no.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Porter's lake—completion of outlet, $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the position of that work at present ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is now going on. It has been going on for the last two years, and this is to complete it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, I have not been on the spot, but I have never heard of much being done at Porter's lake except just before an election.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That was the old way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to be the new way. I think that the work was commenced by the present administration. How much is the total appropriation for it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The amount that will have been spent when this additional amount is expended will be $16,700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much has been expended already ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $14,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was that expended by tender or otherwise ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By day labour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why was the work not done by tender ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have had to spend only a small amount at a time. The work is being carried out very successfully.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that at one time, in the latter part of the year 1900, the condition precedent to getting any work at Porter's lake was a promise that votes would be cast for the Liberal candidate, as I was informed in many quarters. Is that what the hon. gentleman refers to, when he says that the work is being carried out very successfully ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the hon. gentleman is here, it is evident that the work was not carried out successfully in every direction. However, I do not complain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under the circumstances, I suppose I ought not to complain either.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Then, let us have the vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When does the hon. gentleman expect the work will be completed ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This fall.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The object of the work, as I recollect, was to preserve the public highway. That was one of the incidental objects, was it not ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer explains that it was to open a channel into a kind of harbour of refuge for fishermen.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Porter's lake is a navigable water, and by opening this channel, you enable small vessels to go into the lake. It will also have the effect of preventing a flooding of the whole district. The protection of the highway will be only an incident of the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What size of vessels will the channel admit ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think boats drawing about 7 feet.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Port La-Tour—addition to breakwater, $4,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the position of that work ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This work was the subject of a discussion on a previous day. It is a work on which $4,000 or $5,000 has been expended thus far. This vote will extend the breakwater a considerable distance. I think the engineers estimate that it will take $15,000 or $17,000 to carry it out to its full length.

Harbours and rivers, Nova Scotia—Round Bay—beach protection, $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does this beach protection mean ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is a case in which a small amount was expended on a work and storms destroyed it. The engineer is now proposing a different treatment, costing a little more money. The beach being damaged and broken away, the inside water, which is a harbour for small boats, is destroyed ; and the beach has to be protected from storms.

Windsor harbour—Shear Dams training dykes, and deepening river Avon, $700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is intended to empty the harbour of large quantities of mud which accumulate in the harbour. In the Avon river the tide runs as high as fifty feet and carries a large quantity of mud, and we have built these shear dams to carry off the mud.

Mr. BELL. How is it doing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Perhaps not as well as the engineer anticipates, but I am not at all much disappointed as the engineer. I was there when the work was on and never thought it would clear the harbour, but it has had a good effect.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. When the new Avon bridge was constructed, it is claimed that owing to the different method of construction the currents were changed, and deposits of mud were thrown towards

the wharfs, and the engineers are trying to send these deposits out by shear dams and training dykes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before leaving the Nova Scotia estimates I would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that there is nothing for New Harbour. I am not complaining about that, but I desire to apologize to the hon. member for Guysborough. On the last occasion on which this harbour was referred to, I made the statement that not even the hon. member knew where the harbour was. My hon. friend from Guysborough drew my attention to the fact that he actually did know where it was, and I desire to withdraw the statement I made.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. New Harbour has been found and improved and is now happy.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the hon. gentleman for admitting that he made the statement without knowledge and consenting to withdraw it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On the particular occasion referred to when we could not find New Harbour we could not find the hon. member for Guysborough either. Messengers were vainly sent out to bring him in for the purpose of locating the harbour, and at eleven o'clock at night he was discovered and the harbour was located.

Mr. FRASER. The hon. member for Halifax was under the delusion that there was no such place, and I regret that he had not attended better to his geography or he would not have made the mistake he did.

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend was in good company for there were four other members from that province besides himself who could not find the spot.

Brae breakwater, Prince Edward Island—strengthening and repairing works, $500.

Mr. HACKETT. What work is being done there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that we are strengthening and repairing the work. There are a few piles to be driven so as to make the work more solid and secure.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the hon. gentleman intend extending it. It is of no great value unless extended out further.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not intend to extend it now.

Chapel Point pier, Prince Edward Island—repairs, $1,100.

Mr. HACKETT. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In King's county.

Lower Montague, Prince Edward Island—Atkins wharf, $3,200.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This was a work that formerly belonged to the provincial government. Petitions were sent in asking us to build a new wharf and the department made up their minds to acquire it.

Tignish harbour, Prince Edward Island—rebuilding northern breakwater, $1,450.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this for new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to build the northern part of the breakwater.

Mr. HACKETT. How do you propose strengthening the pier.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The old rotten timber will have to be removed and new timber put in its place.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the hon. minister intend calling for tenders.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. decidedly not, we will do it by days work.

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—New Brunswick—Anderson's Hollow—improvements and repairs to wharf, $6,500.

Mr. FOWLER. What does the hon. gentleman propose to do at this place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This vote is applied for to make provision for repairing the present pier, the estimated cost of which is $2,500, and also putting in a groin to overcome an accumulation of sand and gravel, estimated to cost $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the work be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The repairs cannot be done by contract.

Mr. FOWLER. But the extension can be.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot make any pledge, if Mr. Shewen, the local engineer, tells me that it is better to do it by contract, it will be done in that way.

Campbelltown wharf (revote), $8,500.

Mr. FOWLER. This is a revote—no money has been spent, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No money has been spent so far.

Campobello (Wilson's beach)—repairs to and part reconstruction of breakwater, $4,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Was any money expended on this last year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, $7,400, in round figures, was spent last year. This is the work for which we asked for tenders, but, receiving none, had to proceed to do the work by days' labour.

Mr. FOWLER. How much is it supposed to cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This item will complete the work.

Cape Tormentine—creosoted timber cribwork, $10,000.

Mr. HACKETT. Will that work be done this summer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The work is going on now.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the hon. minister intend to do the dredging there that he spoke about ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I think the dredge is there now; if not, it will be there in a short time. I have instructed the dredge to go there as soon as the work at Digby is done, it will then go to Tormentine.

Mr. HACKETT. Is this under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it cannot be done by contract, as the work is in the form of repairs.

Mr. WILMOT. Where is the creosoting done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is done in the United States, but in the supplementary estimates I have a vote for the establishing of a plant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the cost of this work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is one of the works on which we can spend much or we can spend less. The cribwork was first built with native timber, not creosoted. The wood there is very bad, and it was eaten away in three or four years. In fact, the chief engineer tells me the work was not finished before it was eaten away.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this $10,000 cover the cost of the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much will the cost be ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As I say, we can spend much or we can spend less. If we were to undertake to repair the whole work, it would cost in the neighbourhood of $100,000. This is a very large work and cost, if my memory serves me, in the neighbourhood of $500,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand that the timber, not having been creosoted, has been eaten by the worms ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it was eaten away by the worms before the work was completed.

Mr. WILMOT. The hon. minister says he intends to have a creosoting plant. Where will it be located ?

Mr. FOWLER.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot tell at present—somewhere in the maritime provinces.

Great Salmon river—Groin and breakwater combined, $4,300.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that Great Salmon river on the Bay of Fundy coast ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it to be built by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Has the contract been let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet.

Little Salmon river beach protection works, $800.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that Little Salmon river on the Bay of Fundy coast also ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Partridge Island—repairs to eastern pier, $1,200.

Mr. WILMOT. Is it proposed by the government to go on with the dredging works at the entrance to the harbour ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have no dredge available for that large work. We might find a dredge, but the cost of the work with the dredges now available is so high that the government has decided to postpone the dredging of St. John harbour until the new dredge, which is now under construction, is completed.

Mr. WILMOT. Where is it being built ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the government shipyard at Sorel.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the latest-built dredge, the one turned out at Toronto, do the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That would not be available as a sea-going dredge; it is for the St. Lawrence channel.

River St. John—wharf at Oromocto, $5,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. WILMOT. Has the minister secured a site for the wharf ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have not a site yet, but we are preparing to buy one. The plans are ready for

the work, and tenders will be asked for as soon as we have a site.

Mr. WILMOT. I believe it was stated some time ago that $6,500 would be appropriated for the work.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have $1,500 in the main estimates.

Wharfs on tidal waters on the St. John river and tributaries, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Could the hon. gentleman tell me what wharfs there are in King's county ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Jenkin's wharf, Oak Point wharf, Belyea's Cove wharf and Rothesay wharf.

Mr. WILMOT. When will tenders be called for Oromocto ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There will be no delay.

Mr. WILMOT. When will a dredge suitable for St. John harbour be sent ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By the opening of next season, I hope.

Batiscan river—To continue the dredging of a channel at outlet of river, $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has been spent on that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This will complete the work, which will have amounted to $20,000. We have no dredge of our own suitable for that work, and have had to hire a dredge, for which we pay $8 an hour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister called for any offers from different people to do this work, or does he make a contract with some individual ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We do not always call for tenders. We give $8 an hour in this case, provided the dredge does 600 yards a day, and when the dredge does not do that much, we deduct the difference. The dredging costs us 30½ cents a yard. It is the cheapest way we can do the work. Next year I think we will be able to dispense with all these outside dredges.

Mr. SPROULE. How is this work supervised ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not only have we got local inspectors, but we have district engineers who oversee the work.

Mr. SPROULE. I have been told that there are places where the overseer goes around town while the dredging is going on. Who keeps account of what work is being done ? I am credibly informed that there are many instances where there is no overseer at all, and the account is kept by the owner of the dredge himself.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would be surprised to get evidence of that state of affairs. As a rule, I am prepared to say that our overseers are well chosen.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the local inspector in charge of this work a man of experience ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer informs me that this man has been with us two years and is a very able man.

Crane Island, south side, heavy repairs to wharf, $3,500.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is Crane Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the St. Lawrence, below Quebec.

Cross Point—isolated landing pier (revote), $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this contract work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the meaning of an isolated landing pier ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. An isolated pier means a block constructed which is not connected with the shore.

Mr. SPROULE. It stands out from the shore ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so. When we find that it will be too expensive to build from the shore we build an isolated block.

Maria—isolated block, $12,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As this is a pretty large item the hon. minister had better explain it.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We had $12,000 in the estimates last year. We asked for tenders and the lowest tender that came in was $24,000. Maria is one of the most important parishes on the Baie de Chaleur. There was no wharf at that place. The nearest wharf was Carleton on one side and New Carlisle on the other. It was found to be too expensive to build a wharf on the shore. Then, we made up our minds to prepare plans for an isolated block. There are regular lines of steamers navigating in those waters. It is to enable these steamers and the schooners which call there to load and unload that we are building that block. This will complete the work, and it is being done by tender and contract.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not quite understand what you mean by an isolated block. It means, I presume, that the wharf stands away from the shore ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Quite so.

Mr. FOWLER. Then how do you get to the shore—by small boats ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By boat. We have several of these in the St. Lawrence.

Magdalen Island—breakwaters, additional, $14,300.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the total expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That will complete the work. The total expenditure, this item included, will be $32,000. Plans were prepared for a more expensive work. I visited the work, myself, with the chief engineer, and we reduced the plans to a moderate sum, three years ago.

Pointe Fortune—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is a new work in this way, that there is an old work and we will include a new work in it.

Mr. FOWLER. Does this complete it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it will be a kind of repair work.

Point St. Pierre—breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this new ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, by contract. We have already a vote of $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. That will be $10,000 altogether ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Will that complete it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $14,000 is the estimate.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the work let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In the county of Gaspé. There are about 200 fishing schooners visiting that place. It is one of the most important points in the county of Gaspé from the fisherman's standpoint, and there is also considerable local trade. They have no railway in that part of the country.

Riviere aux Renards—pier, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. By contract.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In Gaspé also, on the north shore.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this a new work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is the continuation of an old work.

Mr. FOWLER. How much has been expended already ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Six thousand dollars has been spent already and this will complete the work; by contract.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, as a section of the county which I represent here is concerned in this vote, I think it my duty to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the harbour of Rivière du Loup, which is daily increasing in importance. The Fraser firm, of New Brunswick, have been building shanties and saw-mills on the shores of Lake Temiscouata, and they are exporting annually to Great Britain large quantities of lumber. That lumber has to be shipped from Rivière du Loup. But unfortunately, there is no accommodation on the wharf and their ships have to load and unload by small boats away from the shore. Of course that entails a considerable loss of time, which would be remedied if we had, at Rivière du Loup, a wharf in deep water. I know that surveys and plans have been made by the engineer, Mr. Auclair. I should be very glad if the hon. minister would kindly communicate those plans to the Chamber of Commerce of Fraserville, as also the report of Mr. Fraser, the engineer of the Public Works Department, with all the plans, maps, specifications and cost of the works, in connection with the building of a wharf at Rivière du Loup.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Mr. Tarte). (Translation.) My hon. friend has just called attention to conditions which are not peculiar to Rivière du Loup, but which exist in all the places along the St. Lawrence where lumber cargoes are handled. The ships have to load and unload by means of small boats. I should feel most happy were I able to build wharfs everywhere, but my hon. friend will easily understand that such works involve a large expenditure of money. I cannot commit myself to any such policy for the future, until I have all the desirable data and information before me.

I shall be very happy to communicate to the Chamber of Commerce of Fraserville the report of the engineer who has made the survey referred to.

St. Francois—breakwater, wharf on the south shore of the Island of Orleans, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not think it will cost more than that. The work will be of great local importance, and it is necessary also in view of the dredging operations we will carry on opposite Crane Island.

Mr. MORIN. What use will the minister have for a wharf on the south side of the island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have just said that St. Francois is a very important parish and we are going to dredge at Crane Island, which is a very stormy place, and our dredges and scows will be obliged to find shelter there.

Mr. MORIN. On the north shore there has been a wharf for a great many years and you never see any kind of boat stop there, and on the south shore there is no line of steamers at all. I have passed that place time and again and there is no traffic there. Did I understand the minister to say that Crane Island was opposite that place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No. At Crane Island there is no shelter, and our dredges and scows would be obliged to come here in a storm.

Mr. MORIN. I do not find any fault with building wharfs where they are necessary, but it is not necessary here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not given this question his best attention. He must know that there is no line of steamers on the north side of the island, and the fact is that the wharf built there by the Conservative government was badly located and was of no use at all. There is a line of steamers visiting St. Laurent and St. Jean, and when this wharf is completed these steamers will call at St. Francois.

Mr. MORIN. I cannot agree with the minister on that point, because the Richelieu and Ontario Company's steamer that leaves Quebec goes to Bay St. Paul on the north shore.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Always on the south shore. The hon. gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. MORIN. He is not.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is well known that a steamer never goes by the north channel.

Mr. MORIN. The Richelieu boats go by the north channel.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Never.

Mr. MORIN. Well, that just shows you don't know what you are talking about neither. There is a time to joke, but there is no time to say things that are not so. When I took the boat at Quebec for the Saguenay, I knew where I was going.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. gentleman went by the south channel and not by the north channel.

Mr. MORIN. I said that the Richelieu Navigation boats go by the south channel, and the minister said that this was not the case. I say it is the case. I also went from Quebec to Bay St. Paul on the north channel, on a boat called 'The Brother.'

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, that is a small boat.

Mr. MORIN. It makes no difference how big it is or how little. I say I went on the north channel and the south channel too, and you cannot fool me on that. I am not here to brag like the Minister of Justice, who thinks that he knows better than I do things I have seen myself. Well, it is for him to say it and for me not to believe him.

St. Irénée wharf—construction of head block, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the necessity for this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. St. Irenee is one of those places which is developing a large summer trade indeed, and this is to accommodate that trade.

Mr. FOWLER. Will it be done by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will this complete ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

St. John de Chaillons—improvement of harbour, $2,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister explain this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is a mistake. We have dredged there to the solid rock bottom, and now that we have reached the hard material it would require a much larger sum to go on with the work. This item cannot be used this year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then why leave it in ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It cannot be used this year, and I move that it be struck out.

Motion agreed to.

St. Laurent wharf—Island of Orleans, $4,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is this for ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. St. Laurent is one of the most important parishes on the Island of Orleans, and this is to extend the work already there.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With respect to all these wharfs in the maritime provinces,

as well as in Quebec and Ontario, is there any system of wharfages, or is the use of these wharfs given free to the public ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. When we have completed a wharf we transfer it to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and it then becomes subject to the general law. We have nothing more to do with it.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the general law ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I really cannot explain it as it is not in my department.

Mr. SPROULE. The general law, as I understand it, is simply this, that the town or municipality in which the wharf is situated passes a by-law regulating the wharfage dues, and that is ratified here. I ought to know this because I have had two or three Bills for that purpose put through the House. Where private individuals build wharfs they usually charge such wharfage dues as they see fit, and these are sometimes rather onerous on shipping. I think there should be some kind of supervision over all these charges by the government.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I only referred to wharfs built by us. The owners of private wharfs generally exact what charges they like, but there is a general tariff that applies everywhere to wharfs built out of the public exchequer.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the wharf at Thornbury. That was built out of the public exchequer aided by the municipality, but the municipality passed a by-law regulating the wharfage dues and this was ratified and made legal here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I understand that the wharf at Thornbury has been constructed by the municipality and the federal government jointly. It is an exceptional case, but I speak of wharfs which are constructed altogether out of the public exchequer. When they are completed we transfer them to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. There is scarcely one completed entirely out of the public exchequer. At Collingwood, Meaford and Owen Sound there are wharfs constructed in the same way, the municipality giving a portion of the cost and the government the rest.

Mr. FOWLER. Are there charges on all these wharfs ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Do these charges go in to the public exchequer ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What amount of wharfage charges was collected during the past year ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That I cannot say. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has charge of that part of the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I suppose he is busy somewhere in the public interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can the Minister of Finance tell us ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was between $10,000 and $11,000 received last year from all over the Dominion. They vary. Some of the wharfs yield quite a respectable sum.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are they collected with regularity.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not prepared to answer that question. The Department of Marine looks after the collections.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The wharfingers get 25 per cent on what they collect and have to make the small repairs, between $10 and $15 a year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The reason I inquire is because I have received communications now and then, stating that the people in charge of these wharfs have not remitted to the government anything on account of the wharfage dues they have received for a long time. I prefer to ask for that information in this general way rather than to take up the time of the government by moving for a special return, but we ought to have some information as to the system adopted, and find out whether or not these statements I have referred to are really founded in fact.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If my hon. friend will send me the names of the wharfs, I will have an inquiry made. He need not necessarily give the names of the complainants.

Mr. SPROULE. The wharfs to which the government appoint wharfingers only represent very few of the total number. As a general thing the municipalities receive assistance from the government to build the wharfs and then get the revenue themselves, and are supposed to keep them in repair, but may put the revenue into the municipal exchequer.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. In my short experience, I have come across some cases of the kind referred to by the hon. member for Halifax, and we are making a general review of the whole situation. Twenty-five per cent is

allowed the wharfingers, and in some cases where the revenues are very small, they are allowed as high as 50 per cent. In others where the revenue is large, they are paid a salary. I am having the whole matter looked into and will be able to give the House full information next session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Considering the enormous expenditure on these wharfs, the sum of $10,000 or $12,000 seems to be a very small amount to be received from them in the shape of revenue. Some general system should be devised for the collection of the wharfage dues. A rigid system should be applied to all wharfs alike, because otherwise one part of the country may be getting the benefit of these wharfs for nothing, while in another part the wharfage dues may be exacted regularly and systematically. This is a matter which demands the immediate attention of the hon. Minister of Marine in order that a thorough system be applied all over the country without any discrimination in favour of any particular locality.

Amherstburg, Ontario—dredging (revote), $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this by contract or day's work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We will try to do it with our own dredge. There are boulders to be removed there also.

Big Bay, Ontario (North Keppel), wharf—repairs, $500.

Mr. SPROULE. What wharf is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is in North Grey. It is to replank the wharf, and this sum is applied for by the resident engineer.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not the one struck out in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is not the same work at all.

Burke's Falls' Magnetawan river—wharf, $4,500.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will this be let by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Burlington channel—repairs to piers—To complete works under contracts (additional revote, $20,000), $50,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this intended to complete it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this will complete the work now under contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend knows that the port of Hamilton is becoming more and more important on account of the large smelting operations there. The port is composed of a large bay, the entrance to which has been made by two long jetties. Unfortunately, they were built in wood and have to be repaired without delay. We are simply rebuilding the principal structure.

Mr. SPROULE. In wood again ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, I was afraid to ask parliament for concrete. When I started the work years ago, I was younger than now, and was afraid to ask parliament for the larger amount which would have been required if the work had been done with concrete. Moreover, the foundations of most of those works in Ontario have been laid in the quicksand and without the care that we take now. They have foundations only twelve feet deep. In other words, we can not dredge near the jetty without endangering it. We are obliged to make a tunnel in the middle of the stream.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this contract let ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, and the work is going on.

Callendar—repairs to wharf, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Where is this ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. On Lake Nipissing, at the terminus of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Cobourg—repairs to piers and dredging, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to complete the work.

Collingwood—dredging, $45,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What condition is Collingwood harbour in now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I gave an explanation on the main estimates, but I do not mind stating the case again. The channel we have dredged into the harbour is now 110 feet wide and 20 feet deep. We are deepening it to 200 feet, so as to allow the large ships that are seeking that harbour to come in and out without danger.

Mr. SPROULE. Will you make the channel 200 feet wide for the whole length ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, only the entrance where there is danger of the waves throwing the boats against the sides of the dredged channel.

Mr. SPROULE. When does the hon. minister expect this money to be used up ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We expect this to be spent during the next fiscal year. I may say that Mr. Boone, who is carrying on that work, is well equipped. It has been carried on with great success,

and the result, my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will agree, is very satisfactory. Large shipyards are being built at Collingwood, new lumbering operations, and so on. That little town is growing up pretty fast.

Mr. SPROULE. The work is a very important one, as the place is going to be a very important place. Because, as the hon. minister says, new works are springing up. The largest meat curing establishment in the Dominion is there, and shipyards, saw mills, iron works and other large establishments are being provided. The place is growing very rapidly, and the work carried on by the government has been much needed. Has the hon. minister taken into consideration the application of the people of Collingwood with regard to their dry dock? Their dry dock was built many years ago, but it is now too short and there is not enough depth of water to accommodate the large ships that use the harbour. I understand that the government give two per cent on the cost of dry docks built, but the people of Collingwood feel that more is required. Dry docks are very costly, and they are not a very paying property. I think the government should give more assistance to provide a dry dock at Collingwood. Has the minister considered the question, and has he decided to do anything?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is a law on the statute-book to the effect that when any private corporation is desirous of building a graving dock they may submit their plans to the government, and when these plans are approved they may enter into a contract with the government, and then they become entitled to a guarantee of two per cent for twenty years. Mr. Long, from Collingwood, or rather the Northern Navigation Company, applied for that subsidy, which, after I had examined the plans, I recommended my colleagues to grant. That is the present position of the question. I am confident that with the two per cent subsidy the company will be able to go on, although I am not quite sure of it. I fully recognize the great importance of it or rather the great necessity of having a grain dock on the lakes capable of accommodating the large boats navigating those waters. So far as I am concerned, and if there is a hitch in the matter, I shall be glad to do all I can to overcome it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the government would not be doing too much if they double the guarantee and made it four per cent, for it is very difficult to get men who have money to put it into such enterprise. Therefore, a great many boats are now compelled to go away for repairs, because they cannot get into the dry dock we have. With regard to the channel that has been made, I am told that it is answering the purpose very well, and the people feel extremely grateful for it. Towards the close of navigation last year they began to get in with large boats, loaded with grain, and I have no doubt that there will be an important trade in that line to Collingwood and also to Meaford—Meaford especially because of the important work done there, and because they have a good elevator at Meaford. They have an elevator at Collingwood also, but not quite so good as that at Meaford. In both places they have been able to take advantage of their harbour during the last year owing to the expenditure made—a wise expenditure, I quite believe. There will be a very important trade done there, not only during the present season but for the future also we hope.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sooner the people of this country realize the great benefits to be derived from the improvements and equipment of their harbour the better. Unfortunately, perhaps, there are not enough public men who give their attention to that important question. I think that every harbour on Georgian Bay should be fully equipped, and I have no doubt that when that is done there will be trade for them all.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure there will.

Georgian bay—Pointe au Baril route—improvement of the Devil's Elbow channel between Parry Sound and Killarney, $3,000.

Mr. McCORMICK. What is the nature of the work to be done there? Is it to be cribwork, blasting or dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Blasting and the removal of shoals. I do not think it is necessary to have any cribwork there. This is a most dangerous part, and I am carrying out the work at the request of the Navigation Company.

Goderich harbour works, $6,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the hon. minister doing there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are completing the repairs to the jetties in the inside of the harbour. Goderich is also getting a large traffic, I am glad to say, and the money spent there for repairs has been well invested.

Mr. SPROULE. With Dan McGillicuddy as superintendent.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Well, he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not objecting.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am glad that the hon. gentleman is satisfied.

Hilton, St. Joseph's island—wharf repairs, $1,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that a private dock?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, a public dock.

Huntsville—new wharf, $3,500.

Mr. McCORMICK. Does the hon. gentleman intend to do that work by contract?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Midland harbour—wharf, $10,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is a work to accommodate the public generally. The citizens without distinction of party have applied to me and I could not resist their request. Midland is a thriving town and the corporation is going to give us the site. There is only one site on which to build the wharf now and the town has bought it and offered it to us.

Orillia—new wharf, $3,000.

Mr. SPROULE. This is where the ladies attacked the hon. gentleman with their seductive smiles and he succumbed to them.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I stand ready to be captured again.

Mr. McCORMICK. I would like the minister to come up to Parry Sound, a town which he has neglected very badly. Perhaps the ladies there will be able to induce him to build a dock.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the new work to be done at Orillia?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is an ordinary wharf, costing $5,000 or $6,000. The work is let by contract.

Penetanguishene—dredging, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any dredges on Georgian Bay?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Unfortunately we have no dredges there.

Mr. SPROULE. I spoke last night with reference to a gentleman who is writing to me that he has a splendid suction dredge that he would be glad to bring out any time the Minister of Public Works required it. It is only in the case of the government having no dredges of their own available that I would recommend bringing in American dredges. Rather than have these places suffer for want of such a work, I think the minister would be quite justified in hiring a dredge from any source.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I may say that a suction dredge would not do in this place. They can only work in soft material and at Penetanguishene it is hard material.

Port Elgin—repairs to landing pier, extension of breakwater and dredging, $5,000.

Mr. SPROULE. $5,000 will not go far here. What kind of work are you doing there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The chief engineer is afraid that this amount of money will not be sufficient to accomplish the objects both of completing the pier and doing the dredging. It will complete the pier, and we will have to draw on our general vote to carry out the dredging. It is intended to let the contract to build the pier.

South Nation river—improvements at the pitch off, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand this is for the purpose of preventing the flooding of the land. The question has been raised whether, if the government adopts the principle of doing this kind of work here, other places in the country will not apply for the same assistance. I think the government will have other applications.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I grant it is a bad place in which to do this kind of work. There are one or two items that are remnants of past days. I admit that the principle is wrong. But this river is navigable, at least I was drawn into this work on the representation that it is a navigable river. But this will not appear again.

Lake St. Francis outlet—construction of guide pier and dredging (revote, $1,200), $6,500.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that where the St. Francis river empties into the lake?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Winnipegosis—dredging channel at mouth of the Mossy river, $4,500.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see any item here, but I would like to ask the hon. minister what he is doing now with the St. Andrews' rapids. Is the work going on there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have an item in the main estimates, but I am sorry to say that the contractors are not going on very speedily with the work. I instructed my officers a few days ago to give notice to the Messrs. Kelly Bros. that they would have to go on with the work or the contract would be taken off their hands.

British Columbia — Anderson and Kennedy lakes—clearing outlets, $3,500.

Mr. EARLE. How much of this is being spent at the outlet of Kennedy lake?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have spent, up to 31st December last year, $5,000 in round numbers.

Mr. EARLE. Will that complete the work?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. EARLE. On both lakes?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Hardy bay—wharf, $2,000.

Mr. EARLE. Is this the amount that the hon. minister said would surprise me when I would see the supplementary estimates for British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope I did not say that this would surprise the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EARLE. I am surprised at the smallness of the amount, because on the west coast of Vancouver island there are no wharfs and there should be some expenditures on that part of the coast. The steamers running on the west coast of Vancouver island have, with one or two exceptions, where there are private wharfs, to land their passengers by small boats. More money can be spent with a greater advantage to the settlers at various points on the west coast of Vancouver island.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. All I can say is that this is only a beginning. My hon. friend (Mr. Earle) has been a long time in parliament. If he had applied in past days, I have no doubt he would have received more than has been spent there. This is the first demand for wharfs that has come to me. It is a beginning. I do not want to encourage anybody to come, but if there are legitimate requests from British Columbia they will be treated just as liberally as I always endeavour to treat legitimate demands that come to me.

Mr. EARLE. Would the hon. minister consider a request coming from me as a legitimate request ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will be only too glad to consider in the most friendly and favourable manner any demand that may come from my hon. friend who is an old and respected member of this House.

Mr. EARLE. We will see another session. There are several places where the hon. minister can spend money to good advantage.

Some resolutions reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business on Monday ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There are one or two Bills yet standing on the Order paper ; we will take these and then proceed with Supply.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 12, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. T. B. FLINT (Yarmouth) moved that the fourth report of the Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament be concurred in.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure) moved in amendment :

That after the words 'Civil Service Act' at the close of the third paragraph of the report, the following words be added : 'And that the salaries of the said officials be continued as at present, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the aforesaid Act.'

He said : I am requested by the chairman of the Printing Committee, who is unavoidably absent, to explain that the object of this amendment is to cover the case of three clerks who are at present employed in the Printing Bureau, in the distribution office, and who have been up to this time under the control of the committee. By the report of the committee, they are to be placed under the control of the Secretary of State, and to come within the purview of the Civil Service Act. The amendment is to meet any objections which may be raised by the Auditor General to the payment of their salaries.

Mr. A. A. C. LaRIVIERE (Provencher). Do I understand that by this resolution these officers will be debarred from any increase if they were held to be otherwise entitled to it ? I can understand the object or the motion in providing that the salaries shall not be decreased, but I do not think the officers should be deprived of their title to an increase if the committee should recommend it and the government grant it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). I think the object of this resolution is to assure these officers of their present salaries in the transfer from one branch to the other. I do not think it would have the effect of preventing an increase, but that will have to be looked into. Of course, there can be no intention of interfering with these officers getting any reasonable and proper increase that they would otherwise receive.

Amendment agreed to ; and motion, as amended, agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). In moving the adoption of the second report of the Joint Committee on the Library of Parliament, I am desired by the committee

to bring to the particular attention of the House one feature of that report, which is the following : It was ordered, in the interest of the library, and for the greater convenience of the members, that rule 118 of the House be strictly carried out. That rule provides :

> At the first meeting of the Joint Library Committee at every session of parliament the librarian shall report a list of the books absent at the commencement of the session, specifying the names of any persons who have retained the same in contravention of either of the foregoing rules.

As a matter of fact, this particular rule, as well as other rules framed for the government of the library, in the past, have been more honoured in the breach than the observance. The committee have discovered that irregularities on the part of members of parliament in relation to the library are not at all infrequent. The chief irregularities may be stated as follows : Want of promptness in returning new books during the session of the House ; keeping useful books that are not new for an undue period ; taking out books by members for strangers, and mailing the same all over the country ; and retaining of books of reference during many weeks of the session, this being directly contrary to the specific rule. The fact is, that at the present time, a very large number of books which should be in the library are not there, and a very considerable number of books that were owned by the library, and that should be there, have been lost, and a considerable expenditure has to be entailed in buying again these particular books. But the most serious phase of the matter is that books which are required during the session by members are not to be found in the library. Just to show the House the extent to which some of these irregularities have been carried, let me give a list of the number of books not returned by ex-members of parliament and present members. I may say that this is by no means a complete list. The committee were informed that one ex-member of the House had twelve books away from the library, contrary to rules ; another had 17, another 6, another 20, another 11, another 9, another 11, another 39, another 13, another 14, and still another 39, making an average of 19 books to each of this list of twelve ex-members. All of these books have been out of the library for years and are in reality lost to the library. Taking the present members of parliament, one has 7 books out, another 11, another 13, another 10, another 5, another 7, another 22, another 20, another 18, another 7, and still another 7. Thus twelve members have an aggregate of 135 books out, or an average of 11 each. These books have been out of the library in each case more than a year. The Library Committee have thought proper to bring this matter directly to the attention of the House, and to give the House specific and distinct notice that the rule which I have read, and which is to be found in the rules of the House of Commons, shall next year be strictly enforced. The librarian will be required to furnish a list at the first meeting of the committee next session, and steps will be taken to give the list of delinquents such publication as may then be deemed to be, in the interests of the library and the members of this House, necessary and advisable.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I am not going to say anything in opposition to the report or the suggestions contained in it, because I think they are in the right direction. I want to refer to what has been the experience of some members in the past, which may result in an injustice being done them. Sometimes reports are sent out from the library that books are held by members although these books were returned during the session. Either through accident or carelessness these books when returned were not credited to the members against whom they were charged. I know that that has been my own case several times. I know of cases in which the books were never taken out of the House of Commons but simply used in the House and then sent back and not credited. Then sometimes the books may be mislaid in the library and it is not known to the members who returned them whether they were credited to them or not. In many instances there are mistakes of that character, which do a great injustice to members who remain charged with books which were returned.

Motion agreed to.

SABBATH OBSERVANCE.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to inquire of the government whether a report that a detachment of troops will be called out on the 24th of May for drill and march into the country on the Sabbath, 25th of May, some five miles from the city and camp there, is correct or not ? I heard this matter alluded to yesterday in some of the Sunday pulpits. If any intention of that kind exists, I beg to bring the matter to the attention of the government and ask the reconsideration of the order, if it has been made. Such a step would antagonize the sentiment of a very large portion of the inhabitants of Canada, and as this is a Christian nation and we profess some regard for Sabbath observance, I rise to request that consideration be given to the question.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Unfortunately, my hon. colleague the Minister of Militia is not here at the moment and I cannot answer for him as I know nothing about the matter, but I will call the attention of my hon. colleague to it when he comes.

CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). There is a matter I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia and I take this opportunity of doing so, although he is not here at present, in order that it may be brought to his notice when here. I believe that the House understood, from the explanation given by that hon. Minister, some weeks ago, that the Coronation contingent was to be thoroughly representative of the active militia, mounted police and the various contingents which have served in South Africa. Recently I have been given to understand that the representation would be confined to the members of the active militia and mounted police force and Strathcona Horse. If that report is correct it leaves out the members of the second contingent, the first mounted rifles, the Royal Canadian Dragoons, and the Canadian Artillery. In case the rumour is correct, I would like to say that the second contingent was certainly the most thoroughly representative contingent that went to the front. It was drawn from all parts of Canada and it was the only one that was so drawn. The first contingent did not include any representatives from the North-west. The Strathcona Horse came entirely from the west, but the second contingent was drafted from all parts of Canada, and I should think that that contingent is entitled to representation at the Coronation as well as the others mentioned.

GASPE WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata) moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 102) to incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.

Mr. T. CHASE CASGRAIN (Montmorency). I have a few observations to make on this Bill. I have given notice of some amendments, which I will move at the end of my remarks, to certain clauses. This does not at all do away with the general objections I have to the Bill. The interests affected by the Bill are great. I have already explained at some length that the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company have been in possession of this line of railway since July 1st, and are the owners and trustees of the railway under the deed of trust passed in 1894 and also under the Railway Act. These people have advanced about £100,000 sterling and are entitled to a pledge and lien on the railway and to all the privileges which the Railway Act and their deeds give them at present. The principal reason for which I still oppose the passage of the measure is this, that I have no confidence in the possibility of the promoters of this Bill carrying the enterprise to any satisfactory result. Although there may be political differences between three of the promoters, who are members of this House, and myself, I venture to say that personally we are very friendly, and I would have nothing to say against them as members of the House or individuals, but on the other hand, when I look at the list of promoters, and find that it includes names of Mr. Guité, of Maria, Mr. Michael Connolly, Mr. Carter, of Gaspé, I cannot see how it is possible for a company organized as this is to carry to any practical solution the objects for which this incorporation is asked . We are told that the country for which this railway is to be an outlet contains about 15,000 inhabitants. It is quite evident that unless very large subsidies are voted towards this undertaking, the company will not be able to get from that section of the country the material aid necessary to carry its enterprise to a successful issue. The consequence will be that the enterprise will be tied up in the hands of a company which has not the financial standing necessary to carry it through successfully, and this will practically prevent the formation of any real bona fide company able to carry out this project and build the railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin.

The railway is needed, everybody admits that; it is a crying necessity that this railway should be built. The bondholders are interested in seeing the railway carried out and built, because the railway as it exists now, running from Metapedia on the Intercolonial railway to Paspebiac, cannot have that earning capacity it would have if a railway were built between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin. If a good solid company were formed there is no doubt the railway would be built, and therefore the lien, privilege and rights of the bondholders would be protected. Now I would call the attention of the House to the fact that there is a charter already existing under the statutes of Quebec for a railway from Gaspé Basin to some point on the Intercolonial railway, to Causapscal or some other point. This railway was incorporated by I. Edward VII., in the last preceding session of the Quebec legislature. Since this company was incorporated nothing whatever has been done, but there is the charter. Now the House is going to give a charter to another company, there will be two charters; this will prevent any substantial men from going into another company without getting these two companies out of the way. Therefore the lien, or rights, and the hypotheque of the bondholders will be practically of no avail until some good, solid and substantial company is formed. It is true that the Bill as it comes before the House now from the Railway Committee has been amended and improved to a certain extent. But there are still, as I have pointed out, grave objections to its passing. However, in case the Bill is referred to the committee, I wish to move the following amendment, of which I have given notice :

That the said Bill be referred back to the Standing Committee of Railways, Canals and

Telegraph Lines, with instructions to amend the Bill as follows : 1. By inserting after the word 'shareholders' in section 9, line 22, the following, 'of the company interested and of the bondholders thereof.' 2. After the word 'stock' in the 24th line, the following, 'and bondholders holding at least two-thirds of the bonds.'

Hon. gentlemen will see at a glance the object of this amendment, and I believe the House will concur with me in saying that this amendment is rendered necessary by the position in which the bondholders are placed. The ninth clause of the Bill reads as follows :

The company may enter into an agreement with the Bay des Chaleurs Railway Company and the Atlantic and Superior Railway Company, or either of them, for the lease or purchase of their lines of railway, or of either of them, as also the franchises, surveys, plans, work, plant, material, machinery and other property belonging to the said companies or either of them, or for an amalgamation with such company or companies, on such terms and conditions as are agreed upon, and subject to such restrictions as to the directors may seem fit; provided that such agreement has been first approved by two-thirds of the votes at a special general meeting of the shareholders duly called.

Now, under the deed of trust the bondholders have also the right to vote in ordinary meetings, they supersede the shareholders ; and I propose to put these words after the word 'shareholders' in this line :

Of the company interested——

Because there are two companies, it must be specific :

Of the company interested and of the bondholders thereof.

Now again it goes on and says :

At which meeting shareholders representing at least two-thirds in value of the stock are present or represented by proxy.

I propose to add after the word 'shareholders' 'of the company interested and of the bondholders thereof' holding at least two-thirds of the bonds. I think the House will see this is a fair proposition, and that there can be no serious objection to putting this in so as to protect the bondholders if the Bill is to pass, to protect them effectively against anything that may be done against their interests, either by the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company or by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, or the directors thereof. Also :

3. By erasing the words 'and no prescription or statute of limitation should be urged against the payment of said claims by the company, and no valid title shall pass to the company until said claims have been paid to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council.

Now, as to the first part of this amendment, I want to draw attention to the fact that the Bill as amended provides not only for a voluntary sale or lease of the railway, but also for the sale by authority of justice, by sheriff's sale. In the latter case prescription has been running against a great many of these claims—which it has been stated amount to about $70,000 or more. The prescription has been running under the law of Quebec, under the Civil Code of Quebec ; and this law practically amends the Civil Code of Quebec to the extent that it does away with the prescription, which, under our code, in these cases of wage earners and of boarding housekeepers and hotelkeepers, is acquired by two years. This is done away with, this law amends the civil law of the province of Quebec to that extent. I point out to the House that I do not think any private railway company coming before this House with such an amendment to the civil law of Quebec, can expect their request to be adopted. I call the attention of those who are responsible for the legislation in this House to that very serious question. If it can be done upon this private Bill, upon this measure which is to incorporate a private company for the building of a railway, it can be done on any other measure that comes before this House. It is a bad precedent to which I call the attention of the law officers of the Crown. As to the second part of the amendment, it is explained by the amendment which I will move in a short time, that is, as to the payment of the claims. I have provided for that by another section. The section as it stands now simply provides that the company shall pay the claims, and that no title shall vest in the company until the claims have been paid to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council. I have substituted another clause, which I think will meet with the approval of the promoters of the Bill, and particularly of those who are interested in the payment of the claims which are provided for by this Bill. To subsection 4 there were added the following words :

But nothing in this section shall in any way affect the rights of the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company and of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway Company.

I propose to substitute for that the following saving clause :

Provided that nothing in this Act shall in any way affect the rights of the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company and of the Baie Des Chaleurs Railway Company.

The House will see that I have substituted for the word 'section' in this saving clause, the word 'Act.' Now, it may be said that the rights of the bondholders are sufficiently protected. I do not see it in that light. When the credit of the country is involved all due regard should be given to the rights of the creditors, and every precaution taken to save their rights would be a saving also of the credit of the country. If it can be said that by legislation the rights of the bondholders who have ad-

vanced their money for a railway enterprise such as this can be wiped out, if the security which this country generally offers for such advances in money, can be wiped out, the credit of the country will be diminished to that extent. Then I also propose that the following should be added to section 9 of the Bill :

No valid title shall pass to the company until the said company shall have deposited in the hands of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the sum of $100,000 in cash, to be used and employed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to pay the overdue balances in settlement of the claims mentioned in subsection 4 of the next preceding section. Upon and after the depositing by the company of the said sum, the Minister of Railways and Canals shall appoint a commissioner, who, after investigation, shall pay to the creditors and claimants the said claims, or so much thereof as may be due, and the remuneration or salary of the said commissioner shall be paid out of the said deposit ; the balance of which, if any after deducting the amount paid out, and the said remuneration or salary, shall be refunded to the company.

The Bill provides for the payment of outstanding balances due for labour, board and materials supplied and furnished for the construction and operation of the railway. These bondholders took possession of the railway in July, 1900, and no claims are now outstanding for the operation and maintenance of the railway against the bondholders ; and a thing which has been unheard of in connection with this railway is that ever since the bondholders have been in possession the railway has been operated to the general satisfaction of the community, and there is not one farthing due for anything in connection with the railway, for supplies, work or board bills, or anything like that. I hold in my hand a copy of a certificate given by the controller of the Post Office Department, in which he says that the mail service has been carried on entirely since July, 1900. This shows that the bondholders are acting in good faith, that they are doing what they are bound to do in carrying out their obligations towards the country. The Bill as passed by the Railway Committee provides, as I have said, for the payment of the outstanding balances due by company before the bondholders took possession of the road. It is said that no title shall pass to the company until these balances have been paid to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council, but I will call the attention of the House to the fact that it will be in the interest and to the advantage of the company to get these claims settled for as littlte money as possible, and that this has already been done in connection with this very same railway. They were forced under the law of Quebec to pay these outstanding balances and claims, and people have been fleeced because the company, naturally, has every interest in paying as little as possible of these outstanding balances, and in getting rid of them for as little money as they can take out of their pockets. I call the attention of the government and of hon. members who are specially interested, and particularly the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil), that if the amendment which I propose is adopted, then there can be no such dealing with these people ; they will be paid every cent which is due them. I propose that a deposit shall be made with the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, that a commissioner shall be appointed by him to pay these claims, and that it is only on his report, after he has made an investigation, that these claims have been paid by the company, that the title shall pass. It seems to me that this is an amendment which should commend itself to those who are interested in the payment of these claims before the company takes possession of the road. I have a precedent for this. Some time in 1889, or 1890, a certain part of a subsidy which had been voted by the provincial House, amounting to $28,000, which was due in claims, was to be paid by the government of the province of Quebec, and a commissioner was appointed by the then government, who went up there, paid all the claims, or paid part of the claims to the extent of $28,000 which were outstanding at that time. It seems to me that this is an amendment which should fairly commend itself to those who are really interested in seeing that these people shall be paid. I would ask that when this Bill is sent back to the Railway Committee, these amendments be made to it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair). Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was under consideration by the Railway Committee the disposition of the committee, as I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) will allow, was to see that in every respect the rights of the existing bondholders, and of every existing creditor having claims upon it, were recognized and protected in the fullest degree. It was the endeavour of the committee to attain that end, and when the amendments had been made the hon. gentleman who has now given notice of some amendments to the Bill as reported was asked if they were satisfactory to him, or if he had any suggestions to make, in order to still further secure and protect the rights of the people he represents. The hon. gentleman, at that time, was not able to offer any further proposition, and the Bill therefore went through.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I said then that I could not, at the moment, on an important Bill of this kind, say that these amendments were satisfactory. When the Bill was passed, I said that I reserved my right to offer any other amendment, which after due consideration I thought should be made. That was the understanding.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Quite so. I do not think I have misstated the hon. gentleman's position. I say the hon. gentleman was not then able to make any further suggestion. I do not say that it is not proper for him to make the suggestion which he has made now, but I want to dispel any impression that the hon. gentleman's remarks may have left upon the House, that the committee were in the slightest degree indisposed to adopt any amendment necessary to secure the rights of the parties he represents. That was the feeling and desire on the part of the committee. I think myself that the hon. gentleman is quite within his right and is quite free, notwithstanding anything that occurred before the committee, to suggest whatever he may regard as important in further protection to these rights. It may well be that he might fairly expect that some of his clauses should be adopted by the House. In the first place he wants to have inserted the word 'bondholders,' meaning that the bondholders should be consulted as well as the shareholders of the company in order that the concurrence of a proper proportion of them should be had before any agreement should take effect for the transfer of this company to the present company. That is not an unreasonable proposition. It may be that it would be a little cumbrous to give to the shareholders who, the hon. gentleman says, have been superseded by the bondholders the same voting power, but I do not see at the moment how you could very well set aside the shareholders, and as I am at present advised I would be disposed to think that it would be proper to add the bondholders, leaving the shareholders their present rights in that respect. As one member of the committee, I would vote for that, so that the bondholders may be able to protect themselves in as much as they have superseded the shareholders, and in as much by legislation of this parliament they have been placed practically in control of one of the railways at least.

I do not think that the third clause is as clear as the hon. gentleman assumes it to be. He would urge that no prescription or statutory limitation should be urged against the payment of claims by the company. He thinks it improper to insert that clause in the Bill, and he further contends that it is beyond our constitutional powers, because in his opinion we would thereby be amending the Civil Code of the province of Quebec. I may be wrong in the hasty conclusion I have arrived at on that point, but I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. We are simply providing here as respects certain claims which are mentioned in this section ; which are not the claims of the bondholders or of those who hold securities and have priority on the property of the company, but which are claims enumerated in the Bill and which are mentioned as claims for labour, the boarding house claims, material and supplies furnished for the construction and operation of the railway. Those claims are being dealt with not as a matter of legal right, but we are simply recognizing that it would be proper to attach as a condition of the transfer of these railway properties, after the prior securities have been dealt with and before this company shall take over this railway property either at judicial sale or by agreement, that the particular claimants named here shall be paid in full disregarding any prescription which might militate against their recovery in law. We attach that as a condition to the transfer of the property. We are not interfering at all with anybody's legal rights, and we do not profess to interfere with the Civil Code of Quebec. We simply impose a condition upon the transfer of this property and if that condition is too onerous the company need not comply with it. If they are willing to take the transfer under this condition, they can do so, but if they are not willing they need not do so. I cannot agree that my hon. friend is right in asking that we should say that the company which takes over this property, shall only be asked to pay what claims are not barred. That would be the effect of his amendment if we adopted it. I would therefore think that clause 3 of the amendment should not pass.

I see no objection to clause 4 of the amendment, but I think it unnecessary, because the only section of the whole Bill which attempts to deal with the rights of creditors, mortgagees, or others is the ninth section. However, if the hon. gentleman thinks that his position and that of this clients would be any stronger. I would not hesitate to change the word 'section' into the word 'act.'

The 5th clause of the amendment is :

> That no valid title shall pass to the company until the said company shall have deposited in the hands of the Minister of Railways the sum of $100,000 in cash.

I think that is unnecessary. My hon. friend has no concern at all with regard to the claimants who are referred to in the last section ; he is particularly concerned on behalf of the bondholders, and if there is any conflict of interest, that conflict would be between the bondholders whom he represents and these claimants whom he does not represent.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; I am here to legislate and make good law.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I do not at all wish to make any disagreeable reference to my hon. friend in the matter, but I rather understood him before the committee to say, that he was speaking for the bondholders and acting for them, which I thought he might properly do. Did I not correctly understand that ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. Certainly, but that does not preclude me from amending the Bill in any proper interest when it comes before the House.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I perfectly understand that, but I rather drew the inference that as the hon. gentleman was representing the interests of the bondholders in a professional way outside of his being a member of parliament—and perhaps before he was a member of parliament—I could not help thinking that his interest as representing the bondholders would be rather in conflict with the interest of the other claimants. However, I do not know that is germane to the question, and I shall not dwell on it. If those who are anxious for the right of these claimants referred to in the latter portion of the section, have thought it necessary to seek this provision. They are content that it should be left with the Governor in Council, the Minister of Railways or the Railway Committee to ascertain just what claims there are outstanding. By the usual methods—public advertisement, I presume, they would invite anybody and everybody who had such claims to send them to the department. Then the department would examine into them, and endeavour to adjust them, and having ascertained the gross amount of claims, the duty would necessarily devolve upon one or other branch of the government to see that the claims were fully paid before a declaration should be made to the effect that they had been paid, and before a valid title could pass to this company. Therefore, I do not think it would be necessary to adopt the fifth clause of my hon. friend's amendment. My hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Préfontaine) has an amendment which he thinks of proposing to my hon. friend's fourth amending clause, and which is a little more specific than anything contained in the Bill, and to which he (Mr. Casgrain) might perhaps give his assent. But, with the exception of the third and fifth clauses, I can see no objection to my hon. friend's amendment being adopted by the House. Do I understand the motion of my hon. friend to be to refer the Bill back to the Railway Committee?—because he has given notice to refer it to the committee of the whole House. We cannot refer it back to the Railway Committee now; but if he will accept the suggestion I make, we might refer it to the committee of the whole House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In view of the statement of the hon. minister, I will not insist on that portion of the motion, to refer the Bill back to the Railway Committee. I understand that the hon. minister does not object to three of the amendments I propose. Of course, when the Bill goes to the Committee of the Whole, I presume these amendments will be adopted.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has asked the House to send the Bill to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to do certain things. He cannot expect those of us who do not agree with some of his propositions to agree to the whole of them; and if he would consent to eliminate the 3rd and 5th clauses, and instruct the committee to adopt the others, there might not be any objection to his motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. For the purposes of this motion I will agree to that.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the only motion in order now is to refer the Bill back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. We cannot now pass a motion giving instructions to the Committee of the Whole House. That would not be regular.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Of course, we could not give instructions to the Committee of the Whole House to do certain things which they are perfectly competent to do. I had to make this motion, which is the only one that is in order at this stage.

Mr. SPEAKER. The regular procedure will be, if the hon. minister does not want the Bill referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, to withdraw the motion before the Chair.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I cannot withdraw my motion. I am right.

The PRIME MINISTER. The motion is out of order. The order of the House is for the House to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion in my hands is a motion to refer the Bill back to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. That motion is in order.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Before that amendment is disposed of, I wish to explain how this matter stands in so far as the county of Bonaventure is concerned. It is needless for me to say that the chapter of railway history connected with what is known as the Baie des Chaleurs Railway is one of the dark chapters of railway history in Canada, and is well known not only to the members of this House, but to all those who have followed the trend of public events during the last 15 or 20 years. In 1874 the Hon. Pierre Fortin, who then represented Gaspé in this House, and one of the best men the province of Quebec has produced, invited this parliament to consider the advisability of building a railway along the Gaspesian peninsula, along the north shore of the Baie des Chaleurs, to connect with the Intercolonial Railway at Metapedia. After some years of consideration the government of Canada acceded to the proposition, considering it only proper that the 40,000 or 50,000 people who inhabited Gaspé and Bonaventure should have communication with the Intercolonial Railway. In 1883 or 1884 the policy of the government

was changed, and instead of the government itself building this railway, the task was handed over to a private corporation. That private corporation started building the road in 1885, and up to this day, in the year 1902, only 98 miles have been built, some 28 miles of the latter portion having been built by a new company formed some four years ago by a gentleman well known to the members of this House, Mr. C. N. Armstrong. The position in which the county of Bonaventure is now placed is this. Both of these portions of the railway have been built, but large sums of money are owing to labourers along the line, and to various people for right of way, supplies, materials and boarding house claims. The county of Gaspé, and the county of Bonaventure as well are anxious that this railway undertaking be completed, in order that, like the rest of the Dominion of Canada, they may have the benefit of railway facilities they being the only two counties in the whole Dominion deprived of railway communication. In 1890 this Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, of which Mr. C. N. Armstrong was the guiding star, unable to meet its obligations, handed over the road to the trustees for the bondholders, who took possession on the 3rd July, 1900. Since then these trustees have kept the road in operation and paid their men as they went along, but they have shown no disposition to extend the road towards Gaspé Basin, and have not paid one cent of the overdue debts for labour and boarding the men and materials furnished. My position and that of the hon. member for Gaspé is this: We want this enterprise to go on and the people to be paid. I am not a promoter of this Bill. I knew nothing about it until the notices appeared in the 'Canada Gazette.' I knew nothing of the object of this company until the Bill was submitted to this House. As the Bill was originally drafted, I was certainly opposed to it, and so was my hon. friend from Gaspé, because no provision was made in it for an extension of the road to Gaspé Basin, for the payment of overdue claims, and because power was given the company to build a parallel line to that running along the shore of the Baie des Chaleurs. I received instructions from the county of Bonaventure, represented by its county council, in the shape of a series of resolutions adopted the 12th March last. I may say that that county council is composed of the mayors of all the municipalities, the leading men of the county, recruited from both political parties. These are the instructions given me as the the representative of that county, and these I have endeavoured to have followed out carefully and minutely in the two sittings which the Railway Committee held to consider this Bill as well as before the sub-committee of railways. These resolutions are as follows:

That whereas, many notices of Bills for charters to construct railways in Gaspesia have been published,

Whereas the interior of Gaspesia is quite improper for agricultural and lumbering purposes,

Whereas the railway on the coast of Gaspesia has many times been acknowledged by both governments to be of public interest.

Whereas this shore railway, the only one necessary and even useful to our region, though begun 25 years ago does not even extend further east than New Carlisle,

Whereas, that shore line from Paspebiac to Gaspé and even from Gaspé to Matane on the coast would pass through already flourishing parishes, the inhabitants of which are in great need of railway communication for the sale and exportation of the products of the farm and fisheries.

Whereas, at last session the trustees of the bondholders of the Atlantic & Lake Superior Railway were empowered to construct three miles of railway to extend the railway to Paspebiac,

Whereas, the same trustees are petitioning the government for an extension of time, though they have till the last day of December, 1902 to construct three miles of railway,

Whereas, the Government Engineer in Chief, has reported that the share of the subsidy which, according to the last budget, was to be paid to the labourers, had been earned and an Order in Council been passed authorizing that payment,

Therefore, be it resolved, that this council pray both the federal and local governments,

1. Not to subsidize any company for the construction of railways through the interior of Gaspesia,

2. To bind the Gaspé and Western Company to commence work on its line at Paspebiac toward Gaspé and not at Fraserville, in the year following the sanction of its Bill, otherwise that the Bill be declared lapsed for that portion of its line,

3. If that company be empowered to buy the Baie des Chaleurs and the Atlantic & Lake Superior Railways, to insert into its Bill a clause binding it to pay the debts due by the Baie des Chaleurs and the Atlantic & Lake Superior Railway Companies, and their contractors and subcontractors to the labourers and local merchants for work, material and bonds supplied for the construction and operation of their lines, as it had been done at the federal session of 1900, for the Bill of the short line to Gaspé, and be it,

Resolved, that this council pray the federal government:

1. Not to grant an extension of time for the completion of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway to Paspebiac; two years should be considered long enough to construct three miles of railway even in Gaspesia,

2. To complete that piece of road as government work, by the day or otherwise, if the trustees do not construct it within the time specified in their Bill.

3. To appoint a commissioner to make a payment to the labourers and others of the subsidy already earned.

These were my instructions and in what position did I find myself at the opening of this session? Last session, after a great deal of trouble on my part and that of members of the government, to whom I am very thankful, we succeeded in getting parliament to adopt a Bill reviving the powers

of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway and vesting those powers in the trustees of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway. The subsidy which had lapsed for the last thirty miles of road was also revived on three conditions of payment :

1. To the Hamilton Bridge Works Company in payment for bridge superstructures on the said section of railway, when furnished and erected by that company, not to exceed $35,000 ;

2. For the completion of the road-bed and works incidental thereto ;

3. Towards payment of overdue balances, pro rata, in settlement of claims for labour, boarding-house claims, and material and supplies furnished in connection with the construction of the said section of railway ; in all not exceeding 30 miles.

What was my great surprise at the opening of the present session to see what I considered an absolute breach of faith on the part of the trustees of the Atlantic and Lake Superior ? I learned that a Bill had been introduce in the Senate by which the Act of last session was entirely done away with. They were relieved of the obligation of building three miles of the road, and they ask an extension of time for five years. As there was some doubt raised concerning the nature of the Bill introduced in the Senate and adopted by that body, I shall read it :—

1. The trustees of the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, appointed by virtue of a deed of trust vesting in them the property of the company, shall, notwithstanding any limitation of time contained in any Act, have all the powers for construction, completion and operation of the undertaking of the company as were conferred originally on the company by the Acts relating to the company and by the Railway Act ; but the said powers shall not continue beyond the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and seven, when they shall cease as regards any portion of the undertaking not then completed.

The county was placed in this position. It wants this road to go ahead and the arrears paid. The present company are not paying these arrears and do not wish to proceed with the extension of the road. I asked to have a clause inserted in that Bill providing that if the Gaspé and Western Railway should be incorporated, it should have no rights whatever in the county of Bonaventure until it acquired the Baie des Chaleurs Railway, either by judicial sale or otherwise. That clause was inserted.

My second instructions were to have a provision inserted requiring the work to be commenced at Paspebiac within twelve months and that section extended to Port Daniel, the last parish in the county of Bonaventure, within those twelve months. That condition was inserted. My hon. friend from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) also had a clause put in the Bill providing that the work in Gaspé Basin must be completed in three years.

What possible objection can the Atlantic and Lake Superior Company have to the Gaspé and Western Railway undertaking to pay those claims, if it chooses to do so. If the Gaspé and Western Railway undertake to pay these claims let it do so. My hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain), in opposing this Bill tooth and nail before the Railway Committee and defending the rights of the bondholders, completely overlooked the rights of the poor people, the rights of the labourers to be paid the claims due them in the county of Bonaventure. I would not have this Bill go through under any circumstances unless these claims due in Bonaventure are paid, and I may say that these claims are largely owing to Conservatives who were employed in the construction of that railway by Mr. C. N. Armstrong. I am not standing up to-day for claims held by Liberals only in the county of Bonaventure, but claims held by Conservatives as well. It is a matter of justice and fair play that these claims should be met, and these conditions having been inserted in this Bill under the instructions I have in my hand, my duty is to ask parliament to allow the Bill to go through. But the hon. member for Montmorency, after having been worsted in the Railway Committee, after having stood up in that committee solely for the rights of the bondholders, comes up now and asks us to insert a clause requiring this new company to deposit $100,000 before it can proceed with this undertaking.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we were dealing with the Bank of Montreal or with the Canadian Pacific Railway or with the Grand Trunk Railway, or some other great concern of that nature, such a clause would be very reasonable. But is not the primary object of my hon. friend from Montmorency, having failed to have killed in the Railway Committee, to burden this new company with such conditions, that it will be unable to take over this work and construct the line ? We provide in this Bill that the road must be extended to Port Daniel within twelve months. The people of the eastern part of Bonaventure insist on having that portion of the road built. My hon. friend from Montmorency has a number of very warm friends in that portion of Bonaventure. There are parishes there in which a majority of votes were cast against me, but I am standing up here for the rights of those parishes, as I am standing up for those of the parishes that gave Liberal majorities. I ask the hon. member (Mr. Casgrain) to declare before this House whether he is looking first after the interests of the people of Bonaventure or is merely seeking to defeat this Bill in the interest of the bondholders. I do not object to the rights of the bondholders being secured. I want them to be protected. But they are in possesion of the road at the present moment, they have the first lien upon it, and the laws of the country protect them. But the unfortunate people who, for fifteen long years were exploited

by the railway ring which did such injury to the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé have no protection, and it is to this parliament and to this government that they look for the protection of their interests. I hope, therefore, that hon. members on both sides, taking this into consideration, will see to it that nothing is inserted in this Bill which will in any way jeopardize the claims of the unfortunate people who have been so badly treated for the last fifteen years.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I shall not detain the House long, as I wish to say only a few words in explanation of the position I have taken on this question since its inception. Early in the session, I received from my electors in the county of Gaspé the same instructions that my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) received. I received a petition, and also resolutions which had been adopted by the county council and the different local councils asking me to oppose the two Bills which had been surreptitiously introduced in the Senate by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. I had to oppose the two Bills, and I am glad to hear that the company has decided not to press for the adoption of these measures this year. Had the Bill been pressed by them, they would have been defeated in this House. As to the present Bill, the Gaspé and Western, I occupy the same position as does my hon. friend from Bonaventure. The county of Gaspé is the only county in the Dominion, with the exception of Charlevoix, deprived of railway communication. The Bill which is now before us, the Gaspé and Western, contained as at first presented, a clause which, if it had remained there, would perhaps have caused the defeat of the measure. Under that clause, the promoters would have been empowered to locate this railway in the interior of the peninsula of Gaspé. My instructions were to oppose the Bill on account of that clause. The people want the railway along the shore, and the promoters having agreed to build the railway along the shore, as near as possible the parishes situated along the Baie des Chaleurs, and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, my electors are now perfectly satisfied. They have also joined with the electors of Bonaventure in asking the promoters that a clause be inserted by which the labourers in the county of Bonaventure should be paid. And I may say that many of these labourers are now residing in the county of Gsapé. This amendment having been accepted by the promoters, together with other changes introduced by my hon. friend from Bonaventure and myself, the Bill is acceptable to both counties. I may say also that, in order to protect ourselves, we have asked the promoters to add to the board of provisional directors the names of Mr. Guite, ex-M.P., and Mr. A. T. Carter, warden of the county of Gaspé. With such a guarantee, this Bill is perfectly acceptable to my county, and I give it my fullest support and hope that the proposed amendments of my hon. friend from Montmorency will not be seriously discussed, because, if the promoters of this railway, besides the obligation imposed upon them by the amendments, were bound to deposit $100,000, they would be quite unable to go on with the work. I say that the obligations we have placed upon the company to pay the debts due by Mr. Armstrong and his associates, to build the section between Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin along the shore, to begin the work within one year and finish it within four, are as much as the company can undertake. To add a deposit of $100,000 can only be a means of defeating the object of the Bill.

Mr. BALL (Nicolet). As I am compelled to be absent, later on, I present now an amendment to this motion :

That the said Bill be not referred to Committee of the Whole House, but that it be referred to said committee this day six months.

The reason why I ask the House to give this Bill the six months' hoist is that the measure originated in a curious manner, as I am going to explain to the House. In 1897 a company was formed to build a railway from the Atlantic to Lake Superior, and that was the name of the company. The directors of this company were : Hon. J. J. Thibaudeau, Hon. Wm. Owens, Henry Hogan, of the St. Lawrence Hall, R. Audette, president of the Quebec National Bank—the man who applied some days ago for $50,000—R. Préfontaine, Geo. Ball, L. H. Fraser, London, and R. E. D. Fleming, London. At that time there was a contract made between the late government of Mr. Flynn and the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, whose board of directors was composed of the gentleman I have just named. Then the government asked the company to add three directors to be named by the government, which directors were : Wm. Baker, Cape Town, on the Baie des Chaleurs, Charles Chaput, Montreal, and Hon. J. W. Larue, Quebec. It was stipulated in this contract that the government would hold the company liable for the interest on the $8,000,000 arising from the bonds of the company, the government assuming the responsibility for the payment of this interest for a period of 20 years. The road was to be built from one end to the other according to the charter. Unfortunately, not long afterwards the Flynn government was defeated, and replaced by the government of the Hon. Mr. Marchand. Mr. Marchand took with him as two of his colleagues, Mr. Duffy, as Minister of Railways and Public Works, and Mr. Archambault, as Attorney General. So when the company wanted to compel the government to fulfil the contract the latter pretended that the contract was illegal. They waited some time, and at last, forced more by their own friends than by

the company, the government decided to refer the question to the Court of Appeals. During that session I had the honour to represent my county in the legislature of Quebec. As I say, the government at that time referred this question to the Court of Appeals to decide. Mr. Flynn, the chief of the opposition, was named by the company to defend their case, while Mr. Archambault and Mr. Duffy represented the government. Now, Mr. Speaker, when you compose a cabinet you generally take the most able and educated men for Minister of Railways and Attorney General—something like what we see in this Dominion government. The premier of the Dominion government always chooses a wise man to be Minister of Justice. Well, these two able and educated men, Mr. Flynn and Mr. Archambault, pleaded the case of the government as well as they could, but their case was so weak that the Court of Appeals unanimously compelled them to fulfil their engagement towards the company. I say unanimously, but not quite, because on one point, though not an important point, there was one dissident. Mr. Justice Ouimet did not agree with the five or six other judges on one point; and the Hon. Mr. Duffy told me personally that Judge Ouimet had more brains than all the other judges together. Well, I think he is wrong. Anyway, when we saw the necessity of going on with the enterprise we presented a petition of right to get the consent of the government to sue them and compel them to fulfil their engagement. But we never succeeded in getting that permission from the government. During that time the company was so confident that they would get justice from the government that they undertook to build 20 miles of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway.

I may say that the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company previously bought the Baie des Chaleurs and Great Eastern Railways. My hon. friend (Mr. Casgrain) asks me to be short. If it were in French I might put it in a very few words. I want the House to understand my position. I think I have a right to speak here. I do not speak often, and I think I have a right to have my say without any lesson either from my friends or any one. To build twenty miles of this road the Banque Nationale put up $50,000 and the directors agreed to endorse notes to try and build that road. When we found that the government would not do anything to help finish the road, or to pay for the labour, or for anything else, we decided to sell part of the Great Eastern Railway from Montreal to Quebec and put everything on the Baie de Chaleur Railway. We decided to sell part of that road. I think I said something last session about this. I suppose it would not be out of place to refresh the memory of hon. gentlemen. As the mayor of Montreal then, who was a director of our road, had great influence with this government, and being looked upon as a future minister, we thought we would take him to approach the government and obtain subsidies for the South Shore Railway, the road whose Bill was before the House the day before yesterday and whose line runs from Sorel to Lotbinière or Lévis. He was to get also subsidies for the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway from Caplin to Gaspé Basin, not from Caplin to Paspébiac. At that time this company's charter had not lapsed nor had the subsidies. There was 100 miles of road from Caplin to Gaspé Basin for which subsidies had been granted by the local government: $4,000 per mile. But what occurred then? We sold the road to the South Shore Railway Company as you know. Subsidies were granted from Sorel to Lotbinière for the South Shore Railway—$60,000 or $70,000 was to come out of these subsidies to pay the company the price of the road. Subsidies were granted, as I say, but instead of granting subsidies for the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway to Gaspé, parliament granted subsidies to Paspébiac and they granted the rest of the subsidies to a road without naming that road.

They applied for a charter for this road in 1890, but it was not granted. I have a copy of the Bill in which the road is named the 'Gaspé Short Line.' This Bill seems to be for the same purpose, but the same names do not appear in the preamble. I am informed that when the previous charter was put through parliament the names which appeared upon it were obtained as a result of asking the permission of the parties. I cannot say the same as to the names that appear in the Bill under discussion—the Gaspé Western, because I remember that the other day at the committee the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) asked permission to withdraw one name because the person whose name appeared did not want to go into the project. He said: I put his name in the Bill and I thought it would be all right but he did not want to go into it. I must suppose that quite a number of the names appearing in this Bill were inserted in the same way. When Mr. Mullarkey, who is a railway man and follows government business, found out that his name had been inserted in the Bill without his permission he protested, and this shows that other names have been used without the permission of the parties. They put the names in for the purpose of carrying the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, with your permission. The hon. gentleman refers to one of the promoters—Mr. Mullarkey of Montreal. The facts are as follows: When the Bill was introduced I was opposed to it; I wanted some amendments inserted, and I wanted to get some names added to the names of the promoters, so I took it upon myself to put in the name of Mr. Carter, warden of Gaspé, and the name of Mr.

Mullarkey, a prominent railway man of Montreal.

Mr. BALL. That is not a question Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BALL. What question does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) want to ask me ? That shows that these fellows are all alike. They stole our road and now they would steal the floor from me.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman referred to me as being one of those fellows, and as having stolen his railway. I do not know what he means by this, and I think it is not parliamentary language.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ball) will have to withdraw these expressions.

Mr. BALL. I am not a parliamentarian, and I may very often contravene the rules of the House, because I do not know them. I am at an age where we learn with difficulty. But I am always ready to be shown the proper course in discussion, and withdraw any remark that should not have been made. I now wish to refer to the sale of the Great Eastern Railway. The product of that sale was to go to pay the creditors.

Mr. SPEAKER. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we are now discussing the Gaspé and Western Bill, and I do not see that it has any connection with the sale of the Great Eastern.

Mr. BALL. Well I don't know the rules well, and so I have to try and get around them some way. I want to show the House that these gentlemen are not working altogether for the labouring men.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine himself to the discussion of the question before the House.

Mr. BALL. Ce que je veux dire, c'est que ce bill a originé dans l'iniquité; I wish I could say it in English, but I cannot. The proceeds of the sale of the Great Eastern went to the ex-mayor of Montreal (Mr. Préfontaine) and he was to distribute it to the labourers and creditors. Well, I may say that no labourer and no creditor got anything. The ex-mayor of Montreal took all the money and put it in his pocket, and gave nothing to anybody, and he resigned as director of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company, and said Armstrong was a rascal. He could not be in the same place with Armstrong, because Armstrong was such a rascal. He got the subsidies to go as far as Paspebiac, with the prospect of a future charter and that is why we had the Bill of 1890. They thought they would succeed better by calling it the Gaspé short line running over the hills. Numerous petitions from the electors of Gaspé and Percé district came here asking that the railway should pass along the shore, and so this year they changed their minds and decided to run the lines along the shore, and so this year they changed their minds and decided to run the lines along the rivers so as to make the people believe that they were going to build the road and that the company was very rich and going to buy out a syndicate and pay all the merchants and the labourers. They feel very bad about the poor people and they are crying all the time that they are out of their money. During the whole session they have been sympathizing with the poor people down there, but you will find that they will never pay these poor people. I do not know whether I have permission to say it or not, but I want to state that they seem to be very much afraid of Armstrong. I will make a parallel with him and another gentleman who is here in this House, the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Raymond Prefontaine), and when there are some Bills to be passed this gentleman goes around and says : 'Don't you pass that Bill, because Armstrong is in it ; or, help me with this Bill because Armstrong is opposing it.' That is the way some Bills are carried here, and some Bills are killed. I was at the funeral of three of them yesterday ; the Atlantic and Lake Superior, the Great Eastern and the Montreal Bridge. It was said that Armstrong had something to do with these Bills, and so they were sent to the Cimetiere des Innocents. Well, I think this present Bill should also be killed, but should not be placed with the innocents, as it is too guilty. I do not say that all the Liberals, but generally speaking the Liberal party is against Armstrong. If Armstrong passes on one side of the street they pass on the other, and if Armstrong is in town they say : 'There is some bad scheme going on because Armstrong is at the Russell.' Would you know the reason why they are so down on him ? I will tell you : It is because Mr. C. N. Armstrong once had a contract for the building of the Baie des Chaleurs Railway and he had some subsidies coming to him from the Quebec government. He obtained $100,000 from the government. $100,000 was a big cheque, but what did he do ? Did he put it in his pocket and give nobody else anything ? No, he did not. What did he do with it ? He gave about three-quarters of it to a man of the name of Pacaud, in Quebec, whom every one knows. And for what purpose ? To help the Liberal party in their election against the Conservative party. That is where the $100,000 or nearly all of it went to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is that so ?

Mr. BALL. Yes, it is so. Part of it went to pay friends notes and the balance went that way. That is the pure truth.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is not in order. The discussion of that question is not germane to the debate.

Mr. BALL. I want to make a parallel. I am tired of that man saying Armstrong here and Armstrong there. I say Armstrong is a great deal more honest than the fellow who decries him. I regret that the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Raymond Prefontaine) is not present, because I would say more. In order that you may not think that I wish to speak until the time expires, I shall resume my seat.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have been appealed to, to withdraw the amendment, and I do so on the understanding that if the amendments which I proposed are not adopted in Committee of the Whole, then I will move them on the third reading.

Amendment withdrawn.

Main motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 9,

Mr. CASGRAIN. I propose to amend this clause by inserting after the word 'shareholder' in line 22 the following: 'Of the company interested and the bondholders thereof;' and also after the word 'stock' in the 24th line: 'And bondholders holding at least two-thirds of the bonds.'

Amendment agreed to, and section, as amended, agreed to.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

ORTHODOX RUSSO-GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 140) An Act to incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and Aleutian Islands, and each of the parishes and missions of the said church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. When this Bill came before the House on different occasions I raised some objections on several grounds. First of all, we are asked to incorporate in Manitoba and the North-west Territories a church body whose members have never petitioned this parliament for incorporation. I can readily understand that such a community may need incorporation in order to organize and maintain their respective parishes in connection with their church work, but at the same time I think that the roundabout way in which this Bill has been introduced in this House is not at all regular. We had a petition presented to this House by the Right Rev. Mr. Tikhon, of San Francisco, California, claiming to be a bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and the Aleutian Islands, asking to be incorporated as a corporator sole, that is to say, as a corporation having the absolute privilege of controlling, not only the spiritual church matters, but the temporal matters as well in connection with this church. By the Bill subsequently introduced, the prayer of that petition is fully granted, and the most reverend gentleman—as he is called in the Bill—is incorporated a corporation sole, with powers as defined in the Bill:

> 2. The corporation sole may receive and hold property of any kind for the uses and purposes of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, including the uses and purposes of any parish and mission, institution, college, school or hospital now or hereafter connected with the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church, and it may receive any devise by will, gift, deed, conveyance of land or any estate or interest therein, and sell, alienate, mortgage or lease any lands, tenements and hereditaments held by it.

Now, we have on different occasions, and even during the present session, incorporated bishops with similar powers. We incorporated, for instance, the bishop of Moosonee, by a Bill passed last week, but we knew that he was a bishop of the Church of England, we knew his status, as set forth in the recital of the Bill for his incorporation, and we knew he was a British subject, a resident in one of the dioceses, that his diocese was a missionary one entirely, in the northern part of the territory of Keewatin, and that he could not have around him a personnel or a council capable of administering the affairs of his church. We therefore very properly granted the prayer of his petition. But in this case we are granting the privilege of a corporation sole to a gentleman who is living in the city of San Francisco, who has no connection whatever with the people of the North-west except that he happens to be the chief official of the Greek Church, appointed by the Czar of Russia over that church. I said on a former occasion that I had no objection at all to providing machinery whereby the members of that church could go on with their own church work, and organize their missions and parishes, so long as the people themselves would have the administration of those missions and those parishes in their own hands and themselves asked for such privileges. But though the Bill was discussed in the Standing Orders Committee at great length and in the Private Bills Committee, we have never had any petition or information whatever with regard to the wish of the people most interested in this measure. No one came to represent those people and their views, and let us know their wishes and their wants. But in spite of all that, we have the Bill which is now before this committee and one which is not at all the Bill which was first introduced, owing to the multitude and variety of the amendments made to it in the Private Bills Committee.

In fact, Sir, I am surprised that such an important Bill should have been so amended

without it being reprinted and put in the hands of members of the House, so that they might be in a position to study the case. This Bill provides that this Rt. Rev. Bishop of San Francisco, shall be, as I have said, a corporation sole. But when I drew the attention of the Committee on Private Bills to the danger of granting such extensive powers to the gentleman who was a non-resident and who lived so far away from the parties interested in this measure, an amendment was introduced providing that any act, deed or conveyance affecting the properties of the church or any of the parishes in connection with the church—that is affecting their temporal affairs—should be countersigned by no less a gentleman than the Consul General of Russia, who lives in the city of Montreal. And, later on, a clause was added to the Bill providing that the corporation sole shall have and maintain a head office in the town of Edmonton, in the district of Alberta, in the North-west Territories.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For what purpose is the office ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. In order to receive service of any process of court that may require to be served on the church in general. So, Sir, you will see that, for the sake of establishing parishes and missions in the North-west, and having such an organization as this, it is proposed by the Bill to incorporate a bishop living in San Francisco and having a Canadian office in the town of Edmonton, with the obligation upon him of getting all the instruments in connection with temporal affairs countersigned by the Consul General of Russia, in Montreal. It is the most absurd piece of legislation ever introduced in this parliament. And, as I said before, it is introduced without the knowledge of the people directly interested in this legislation—they do not know the first thing about it. We are going to impose a very extensive, I may say absurd, piece of machinery upon them for the control of the temporal affairs in connection of their church, and without their having asked for it. I am sure that if hon. members would consider this matter in an unbiased and impartial way, they would see that I was right in opposing the introduction of such legislation without first consulting the parties who were directly interested.

Now, what is the position of this clerical gentleman to whom we are giving control of matters in connection with the Greek Church ? The Galicians belonging to that faith who live in Manitoba and the North-west are people from Austria. So far as nationality goes they were Austrians in their own country. And, now, we are to put them under the control of a bishop living in San Francisco, who has been appointed by the Czar of Russia Bishop of North America and the Aleutian Islands for the State Church of Russia. And, on the other hand, we are exacting the signature of the Russian Consul General in Montreal to legalize any instrument that may be executed by this bishop—a Consul General who has nothing in common with these people, as they do not belong to his nationality, except merely that they happen to profess the same religion as he does. This, if it were carried out, would be a very bad piece of legislation, to my thinking. I have no objection to recognize the Russian-Greek Church or any other Greek Church, and to give people belonging to that faith the privilege of having their churches, their parishes and their missions. But what I object to is the machinery whereby these temporal affairs of the church will be administered. We do not know what troubles may follow. Orders may come from St. Petersburgh to these people, on some conscientious pretext to do this or do that, or refrain from doing this or that. We already have enough trouble with the Doukhobors, who, under conscientious pretext, are not willing to abide by the local laws of our country. They do not want to register their lands, they do not want to register their marriages, they do not want to do many things that are obligatory upon good citizens in this country. Who is to tell us that, later on, orders will not come from the church officials of the Greek Church in St. Petersburgh to their adherents, imposing duties upon them which will compel them to choose between their church membership and their citizenship ? But, apart from that altogether, I say that we ought to be very careful. There is more importance in this measure than appears. We are told: This is only a private Bill and we can amend it next year. Well, Sir, if there is such a feeling that we may require to amend it next year, I believe it will be far better to put the Bill off until next year, and then prepare and pass a measure that will be satisfactory to the people concerned and satisfactory to the country to which they have come to live. Perhaps I may be taxed with partiality in dealing with this matter. Sir, I have on every occasion endorsed and approved measures concerning other faiths than my own; because I, for one, recognize the fact that we live in a free country, that we ought to be liberal to others, even if we cannot think as they do. But, in this case, it is not a question of faith—it is a question of business, a question of property, yes, even a question of justice. I say that this parliament has no right to impose on a class of the community legislation for which they have not asked, and which we have no proof that they will accept.

Now, there is something very peculiar in the action of this right reverend gentleman in regard to this matter. In the petition that was presented before this parliament, and in the Bill as passed by the Private Bills Committee, he represents himself as the bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Creek Catholic Church for North America and the Aleutian

Islands. Since this Bill passed the committee, a book has come into my hands called the catechism of the Orthodox church; and in opening this little catechism—which I do not intend to read to this House—I find that this official book of the church is distributed with the blessing of the most Reverend Tikhon—the very same reverend gentleman who is asking for an Act of incorporation in this Bill—the most Reverend Tikhon, Bishop of the Orthodox Greek-Russian Church of North America. Now, Sir, if I go to the States, I find that in California the name of the church there is the Greek-Russian Slavonian Orthodox Eastern Church and Benevolent Society. That is the church over which this right reverend gentleman is presiding. If I go to Seattle, in the state of Washington, I find there that the church is known as the Greco-Russian Orthodox Church of St. Spiridomus. Well, when we come to Manitoba and the North-west Territories we find there are two classes of Galicians, the one calling themselves Orthodox-Greeks, and the other commonly styling themselves Greek Catholics. The Greek Catholics are a branch of the Roman Catholic Church, they call themselves Greek Catholics because their rite is the Greek rite; they do not follow the Latin rite. The others styling themselves Orthodox Greek, belong to the Greek rite also, but in connection with the Church of Russia.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. One part of them inclines to the church of Russia, and to what church does the other half incline ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The church of Rome.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let them call themselves what they like, that makes no difference to us.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. What I object to is that this reverend gentleman introduces the word 'Catholic' into this Bill, and asks us to acknowledge him under a designation that he does not use in any other country.

Mr. BELCOURT. Nobody has a monopoly of that name.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well you have not, I am sure of that.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is all right. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question, all jokes aside ? Do not the Episcopalians call themselves Catholics ? Answer that, yes or no.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well, the Episcopolians call themselves Catholics, but they do not ask me to admit that they are Catholics. I call myself a Catholic, but I do not compel any one else to call me a Catholic. At the same time, while Episcopolians call themselves Catholics—and I believe that they are using that privilege—they never asked this parliament to confirm them in their right thus to call themselves. They are liberal, they allow others to call themselves whatever they choose ; and we, with the same liberality, allow them to call themselves whatever they choose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Supposing the Episcopalians did ask parliament to give them that name, would you object to it ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Well, yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I do not object to them calling themselves whatever they choose, I grant them the privilege of calling themselves Catholic if they believe that they are so. Mr. Chairman, I see that I am treading on very delicate ground, and I regret it, because I wanted to object to this Bill at first on its general merits ; I did not want to go into these questions of theology or orthodoxy, on the contrary I wished to avoid them, and heretofore I have never mentioned them. But here this right reverend gentleman is known under a different name in San Francisco, and he goes to the North-west, where there is a mixed community, and asks us to acknowledge him a a Catholic. Well, as a Catholic I object to that.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We are Roman Catholics, they may be Catholics.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This gentleman may be a Russo-Greek Catholic.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am a Presbyterian Catholic.

Mr. SPROULE. The argument used by the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the committee (Mr. Lariviere) might be turned against himself and applied with equal propriety against the church which he represents. He objects that this church is controlled by a foreign power. So is the church of the hon. gentleman controlled by a foreign power, but does he object to that. We had something to say on that subject in connection with the Jesuits Estates Bill. But the arguments used by the hon. gentleman apply with equal propriety, with equal force in every instance, to the church to which the hon. gentleman belongs himself. With reference to the statement that the notice was not given, I think the usual notice was given ; everybody had notice that desired to have notice. With reference to the question whether any other church should call themselves Roman or Roman Catholic, except the one church, I think there is more than one church calling themselves Catholic.

An hon. MEMBER. Only one.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that hon. gentlemen may think that they alone have a right to the name, but that does not prevent others

from using the name, as they certainly do. In my judgment therefore that is no serious objection to the Bill, and I do not think the argument which the hon. gentleman addressed to the House has any great force in it.

Hon. Mr. COSTIGAN. I do not propose to go into a discussion of this question on its merits. But the question was asked from my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) what objections there were to the use of the word Catholic in the title of this Act of incorporation. Well, I do not know that there is any serious objection, there does not appear to be in the House at any rate, and no Catholic ought to object to that word in any Act of incorporation when he sees the great popularity of that name to-day. It appears to me there is a good parallel between this case and a Bill I accidentally heard discussed in the legislature of my own province some three years ago. We have in the province of New Brunswick and in the maritime provinces, and all over Canada, a very prominent body of christians called Baptists. They were known as the Baptist Church. Some years ago they divided and formed two churches, Baptists still, but two distinct bodies. One portion, dissenting from the older body, took the name of the Free Christian Baptist Church and sought and obtained an Act of incorporation under that title. That new body divided again. A clergyman by the name of Osser, I think, differed in opinion from the majority, or, perhaps, as he claimed the minority of that body—I am not discussing that point—and he and his followers applied to the legislature of New Brunswick for an Act of incorporation. In asking for that Act of incorporation they wished to be designated by the name of the Free Baptist Church. While there was not much in the matter as they were Baptists too and no one could object that they should call themselves Baptists, when they came to the legislature for an Act of incorporation it was not the Catholic members that interfered but it was the Protestant members of the House. There was a very small number of Catholic members in the House and the whole debate was taken up by the Protestant members. They took the ground that while they were quite willing to give them an Act of incorporation, the use of the words 'Free Baptist' in the Bill would create confusion, and it was something that they had no right to use because the word 'Free' was in the Act of incorporation of both other branches of that same church. While they gave them their Act of incorporation, they would not consent to the use of the word 'Free' as proposed in the Bill. Therefore, I think my hon. friend can very well say that so far as the Galicians are concerned, being two distinct bodies so far as their religious belief is concerned, with this body applying for a charter to be incorporated into the Orthodox-Russo-Greek Catholic church for North America and the Aleutian Islands. I do not see why this House should add anything to its title in giving the charter that is sought for now, I think it would be very simple to leave the word 'Catholic' out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The only objection which was taken to the Bill in the New Brunswick legislature was that this new church proposed to call itself the Free Baptist and in so doing was in reality calling itself by a name which was used by one of the other branches of the Baptist Church. This division of the church was called the Free Baptist and the fact that it was using the word 'free' was objected to. It was the prefix that caused the trouble. In this case the name of the church is the Russo-Greek Catholic Church. There is no danger of any other body being confounded with that. I do not know whether our good friends the Episcopalians would call themselves the holy Catholic Church or not.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They do it in the church service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is the prefix that they used that caused the trouble.

Mr. COSTIGAN. The word 'free,' of course, was in the Bill which was before the House under consideration at that time, but the denomination that complained was not called the Free Baptist Church but it was called the Free Christian Baptist Church. They did not take the whole name, they used one word which was used in the title of the other church. In this case they are simply using a word here which does not belong to them.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. As to that point I have the catechism of the reverend gentleman who is asking to be incorporated under the name that he is known by, and there is no word 'Catholic' there, and in the United States where he has a legal status there is no word 'Catholic' in his title. Here he is known as the Most Reverend Tikhon, Bishop of the Orthodox Greek-Russian Church in North America. Why should he assume the name of Catholic because he crosses over the boundary and why should he ask to be called a Catholic.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville. (Translation) Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word or two in connection with the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver). From a mere perusal of this Bill, I think that two objections may be raised against this measure. And first of all, what strikes me is that it deals entirely with provincial matters. I do not see any reason why the right reverend bishop should not have petitioned the Manitoba legislature or the legislature of the North-

west Territories. The powers he is asking for are under the control and jurisdiction of the provincial legislatures. As a matter of fact, what the Bill deals with is as to whether that Greek bishop may possess property in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. That is a question of civil law which is within the purview of the powers of the provincial legislatures; and from the fact that this Bill originates from the west, and is promoted by an hon. gentleman from the North-west Territories, I fail to see why this parliament should be more competent to deal with it than if we were called upon to deal with a petition coming from any bishop from the province of Quebec or Ontario. No bishop from Ontario or Quebec would ever think of coming before us and petitioning this parliament to obtain such powers, but would go before the provincial legislatures, which have adequate powers and jurisdiction to deal with this class of subjects. As I said, I do not see that there is anything in this Bill which warrants the promoters of it coming before this parliament, as it is a matter of property and civil law, which is relegated to the provinces.

Another objection which may be opposed to the passage of this Bill is this, that this reverend bishop is asking to be incorporated as a corporation sole. That is the most serious objection which can be urged against this Bill. We are asked to confer upon a stranger, who is a non-resident, who is not a British subject, all the powers and rights of a public corporation. Does it not strike you that such a demand is contrary to the whole scheme of our legislation? When we have to deal with a company incorporated by letters patent, are not the directors of that company, or at least a majority of them, required to be British subjects? Under this legislation, a stranger, who is living in San Francisco, is to be given the powers of a public corporation. I have no hesitation in saying that such a provision is at variance with the whole scheme of our legislation, and that we are creating a very bad precedent.

Let us take, for instance, the corporations which we have in the province of Quebec: Is not the government entitled to know what use they are making of their funds? Is it not a fact that the imperial government went to the length of inquiring as to the way in which the property of the Sulpicians was disposed of, and whether a portion of their revenues was sent over to Paris? Under this Bill, you are going to incorporate as a corporation sole, a gentleman who is living in San Francisco, and you are going to allow that stranger, who is a non-resident, because he is called upon to govern a church, to enjoy all the powers of a corporate body. I say again that such a Bill is contrary to the whole scheme and spirit of our legislation, and that, if we were to pass it into law, we should be encroaching upon the rights of the provinces.

Mr. CHARLTON. I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the definition of the word 'Catholic' as contained in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, an authority in the United States and an authority universally received wherever the English language is spoken:

> Catholic—Universal or general.
> This epithet, which is applicable to the whole Christian church, or its faith.
> Not narrow minded, partial or bigoted; liberal; as, catholic tastes.
> Catholic epistles, the epistles of the apostles which are addressed to all the faithful, and not to a particular church; being those of James, Peter, Jude and John.
> Catholic. A person who accepts the creeds which are received in common by all parts of the orthodox Christian church.
> An adherent of the Roman Catholic Church; a Roman Catholic.

So we see by this, that this epithet or designation is applicable in the broadest sense to all churches; to all Christian believers, and indeed to all broad liberal tastes, and the argument raised by my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) is one which I think he need not have troubled the committee with to such an extent. I do not think that any particular significance attaches to the use of this word 'Catholic' in connection with this Bill. It is merely a claim on the part of this church which applies for incorporation here that they are a Catholic, broad, liberal, true Christian church. That is their opinion, and whether we dissent from that opinion or not I do not know that we are debarred from allowing them the use of that title, which under this definition is so general in its character.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not expect to meet with opposition to this Bill at its present stage, and I am more than astonished at the character of the opposition. I take exception to the innuendo of the member for Provencher, that there was something remarkable or underhand in the introduction of this Bill. The House well knows that whatever might have been the intention of the promotors, certainly owing to the vigilance of the member for Provencher, there was no such thing as getting the Bill through its various stages without every one being thoroughly aware of all its provisions. Not only so, but it will surprise the House to know that the very objections that the hon. member has just urged: as to the introduction of the name of the Russian consul; as to the provision for accepting service of notice at Edmonton; in fact every one of these provisions which he alluded to as peculiar and upon which he asked the House to throw the Bill out, were introduced to meet the objections raised by the hon. gentleman himself in the Private Bills Committee. He was a member of the sub-committee which drafted

these amendments, and it was fully expected by myself that when he had become a party to the amendments made by that subcommittee he would be content to allow the Bill to pass through this House. I am unable to characterize the position taken by the hon. member. I am sure I would be ruled out of order if I attempted to characterize it as I submit it deserves. In regard to the objection that the bishop is a non-resident, I may state that when the hon. member raised that objection in the committee, I said : 'Well if the dropping of the provisions regarding the incorporation of the bishop will remove your objections, we will incorporate only the parishes and missions.' It is an absolute necessity to the religious welfare of these people, as they understand it, to have the privilege of holding property in these parishes and missions. There can be no reasonable objection to that. The hon. member then objected to the name of the church. The committee was of opinion that they could meet his objection on that point, and also as to the incorporation of the bishop, and I fully understood they had met it. Allow me to point out that the Bill as introduced was an exact copy, so far as it would apply, of the Bill incorporating the Church of England bishop of Keewatin. In the original Bill, the church was referred to as the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church. The hon. gentleman objected to that name being used, and so we inserted in the Bill the words: 'The body commonly known as.' That was done in order to remove any possibility of parliament declaring that these people were either Catholic or Orthodox, It seems to me that once we assumed the position of merely giving them the name they ask for and carefully guard ourselves against any responsibility as to endorsing the rightful use of that name, we surely met all reasonable objection. We certainly met the objection which the hon. member raised at the time. As to the hon. gentleman asserting that as a Catholic he would refuse to accept that name in the title; let me state that I have here something that may ease his conscience. We often hear it said that certain people are more loyal than the King, and the hon. gentleman is more loyal to his church than the legislature of the Catholic province of Quebec ; for I find that in the statutes of Quebec 1868, chapter 55, there is an Act to authorize the ministers of the church 'calling themselves the Catholic Apostolic Church in the province of Quebec to solemnize marriages, &c.' Now, if the legislature of the province of Quebec finds no objection to the use of that title just as we are using it here by inserting the words, 'The people calling themselves'; surely there can be no objection to our doing so, and certainly we are not violating any man's conscientious scruples in doing so. So far as I am concerned, I would be the last man in this House to interfere with any one's conscientious convictions, and I have spoken for the purpose of relieving myself and relieving other members of the House from the imputation which the hon. member (Mr. LaRivière) so unjustly cast upon those who are advocating a measure of the simplest justice to a strange people who are in our country at the present time.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Two nice questions seem to have arisen under this Bill. One has been raised by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Demers) as to the power of this parliament to make a corporation sole of an entirely foreign body. Here is a bishop living in San Francisco, and we constitute him a corporate sole in Canada. Have we the power to do that ? The next question is that we are creating two corporations—a corporation aggregate and a corporation sole for the one purpose of exercising rights in Manitoba and the Northwest which come under the definition of 'civil rights and property' and so appertain to the provinces. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver) has missed altogether the point of the objection of my hon. friend (Mr. LaRiviere). He does not seem to see that this Russo-Greek Church which seeks incorporation has two leanings—one to the old Greek Church of Constantinople, and the other to the Latin Church of Rome. My hon. friend from Provencher wants to protect those who have a leaning towards the Church of Rome from the sole control of the Greek bishop of San Francisco and the Czar.

Mr. OLIVER. I take the liberty of saying that the hon. gentleman has entirely misapprehended the point of the hon. member from Provencher, and I call on the hon. member for Provencher to put him right.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. You had better explain your objection. I do not see it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. member for Alberta understands the point well enough. I asked the hon. member when he was on his feet what leaning the other half of the church had. He said towards the Latin Church of Rome. The moment the hon. gentleman said that I saw at once the object he had in this Bill. My hon. friend from Provencher did not want to give the control over the parishes and churches of this portion of them in Manitoba and the North-west Territories to any foreign potentate, like the Czar or the Bishop of the Greek Church. He wanted, if any powers were given at all, to give to his bishop at least equal powers to those claimed by the parties seeking incorporation. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to the power of this parliament to create a corporation sole of any person who is altogether a foreigner in this country, especially one whose sole object is the interference with civil rights and the possession of property in the provinces.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the Minister of Justice replies, I would like to point out that

in the nature of things there is no such purpose in this proposed incorporation as has been indicated by the hon. member who has just sat down. The words which are used are used for the purpose of defining that this bishop and church shall not have any control whatever over any person who has even a leaning towards the Latin Church, the Church of Rome. The words 'Orthodox Russo-Greek' are used so that there shall be no question or mistake on that point. I decline to be understood as attempting to be a party to any transaction whereby an advantage would be taken——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not accuse the hon. gentleman ; far from it.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman accuses me of doing it without knowing that I am doing it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I accuse the hon. member of not understanding what the ground of my hon. friend's opposition to the Bill is.

Mr. OLIVER. I must admit that I do not understand my hon. friend's opposition to the Bill ; but I point out that there is no such ground of opposition as that stated by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I will explain it to my hon. friend. There is a matter which I did not want to bring before the House ; but as I am compelled to do it, I will do it. Not far from the hon. gentleman's residence, near Edmonton, there was a concession of lands granted to a section of Catholic Galicians to build a church, and they did build a church, three trustees being appointed for the purpose, and the money being supplied by the Roman Catholics. Since then the three trustees have been induced to join the Greek Church, and have transferred the church to the so called Orthodox Greek Church. They have stolen the property of the Roman Catholics, and the matter is now sub judice. The very people who have prepared this Bill, and who want this parliament to recognize these Orthodox Greek Church people as Catholics, in order that they may retain this property which belonged to the Roman Catholics, are the solicitors against the Greek Catholics.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member is making a very broad statement. There has been a dispute between the two parties following the Greek rite in that part of the country. It is a case of Greek versus Greek. They both follow the same rite, but the one acknowledges the jurisdiction of the Pope and the other acknowledges the jurisdiction of the Czar. The circumstances are very much as stated by the hon. member for Provencher, except this, that it is the lack of such definite name and standing as is provided by this Bill applied to one or other of these bodies that makes the confusion that has occurred there possible. If the one body is incorporated under one specific and definite name——

Mr. CASGRAIN. It will get the church.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. It will be possible then for those who object to that body to prove that they do not belong to it ; but it is very difficult for them to do so now, because neither of them have any name or standing in law, or the right to own property in this country.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Do you mean to say that those under the jurisdiction of the Roman Catholic Church have no legal right at all ?

Mr. OLIVER. They certainly have no recognized legal right given to them by statute in this country.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. It is not a different church at all. It is the Roman Catholic Church, and the Roman Catholic Church has rights, and can exercise them at any time.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. That is just where he is not very well informed. These people are not members of the Roman Catholic Church. They are members of the Greek Church united with the Church of Rome. They have their own ecclesiastical organization separate from the Church of Rome, under the headship of the Pope.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask who appoints the bishops of the people of whom the hon. gentleman has just spoken ?

Mr. OLIVER. I take it that they are appointed by the Pope. But allow me to point out that there is in Galicia a Roman Catholic organization distinct from the organization of the united Greek Church, although occupying exactly the same territory.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is it not a fact that in the notices given by the bishop, before coming to this House, a different title was given to him from the one he assumes in the Bill ? I was present in the Standing Orders Committee when that question was discussed.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not. The title in the Bill is the title asked for in the notices.

Mr. BELCOURT. It seems to me that a great deal more trouble and fuss is made over this Bill than it really warrants. It is a matter of business, not of religion at all. I am not going to follow the example given by the hon. member from Provencher and indulge in religious dissertations. Not being very well informed, I might fall into some such egregious blunders as he has. Parliament does not recognize this particular church any more than it does any other religious body which has come here in the past asking for incorporation. The objection made here was made in the committee by my hon. friend ; and in order to meet his objection, these words were put in the Bill : 'The bishop of the religious community com-

monly known as the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America.' In passing this Bill parliament does not in any way recognize that this is an Orthodox church or a Russian church or a Greek church. We simply recognize these people by the title they claim for themselves. The defining words in this Bill are 'Orthodox Russo-Greek.' There are people who call themselves Catholics, qualified by another adjective. The Roman Catholics cannot complain if the word 'Catholic' is used, but they can complain if the words 'Roman Catholic' are used. In order to meet the objection which is made by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that this is an alien seeking incorporation in this country, the committee took great pains to limit the purposes for which this incorporation was granted. Looking at sections 2, 5 and 3 the House will at once see that the bishop himself, though he is constituted a corporation sole, is constituted for certain purposes only, which are well defined in section 2:

> For the uses and purposes of any parish and mission institution, college, school or hospital, now or after connected with the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church.

These are the powers he gets and no other. He cannot engage in business or do anything beyond what is mentioned in the four corners of the Bill.

In order to prevent this bishop from abusing his powers, in order to prevent his doing what the three trustees, of whom the hon. member for Provencher has spoken, have done, in order to prevent his taking over the property with him to another church, say the Catholic Church or any other church or disposing of the same for purposes other than those mentioned in the Bill, the committee required that whenever he shall convey property belonging to his church, he must do so in conjunction with the other trustees mentioned in the Bill. He has no other powers than those defined in the Bill, and they are clearly limited to the purposes mentioned in section 2.

I am not prepared to say that the objection made that this is properly a subject for provincial legislation is not a good one.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does this Bill invest this corporation sole with any property at present owned by the church.

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all. I am glad the hon. gentleman reminds me of that, because the matter to which the hon. member for Provencher has made reference, namely, the disposition of the property by these three trustees. That matter is now sub judice, and the passage of this Bill would not affect it in the slightest degree. If any one can show me that it does, I will support the Bill. That matter to which the hon. member for Provencher refers is now in the courts, and this Bill has nothing to do with it.

I was saying that the subject is perhaps one which should more properly be dealt with by a provincial legislature. It is one which concerns exclusively property and civil rights. But I do not suppose that this society, which is asking for incorporation, should be treated differently from others. We have incorporated the Synod of the Diocese of Saskatchewan.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. When?

Mr. BELCOURT. In 1884. We also have incorporated the Roman Catholic Diocese of Ottawa.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is an exceptional case. It has jurisdiction in more than one province.

Mr. BELCOURT. Also the Episcopal corporation of Pontiac.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. That is likewise an exceptional case.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The first case mentioned by the hon. gentleman, the Diocese of Saskatchewan, we have jurisdiction over entirely, because it is in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BELCOURT. We incorporated the Union of the Methodist churches.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The bishop of Pembroke is in the unorganized territory over which we have jurisdiction.

Mr. BELCOURT. That may be. I am not dissenting from that view. I think that the powers of the Dominion parliament are brought into requisition in some cases when resort should have been had to a provincial legislature, but I thought at first sight that the cases I mentioned were cases in point. There is the Union of the Methodist churches, also incorporated in 1884. The present Bill may properly be a matter for provincial legislation, but we have created precedents to the contrary, and it seems to me that we ought not to make an exception in this case. As regards the name, the question for us to decide is whether the one chosen is likely to lead to confusion. If not, I cannot see any objection to it, and I propose to deal with this Bill as I would with that of any ordinary corporation seeking incorporation for business purposes. No one in the committee pointed out that there was any danger of any confusion. As far as I am concerned, being a Catholic, and a good one, notwithstanding the doubts expressed by the hon. member for Provencher, I cannot see why a Roman Catholic should have the slightest objection to this name. How anybody is going to confound the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church with the Roman Catholic Church is something beyond my comprehension.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. My hon. friend introduced into this House a Divorce Bill, and since then I have some doubts about his orthodoxy.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). This Bill, if I understand its title, refers more especially to Manitoba and the North-west Territories. Why was this legislation not sought for in the legislatures of Manitoba and the Territories ?

Mr. OLIVER. For the same reason that legislation is now on the statute-book for the incorporation of the bishop of Ottawa, because this diocese covers two provinces. He could have secured incorporation in each province. In this case the Bill covers Manitoba and the Territories, two different provincial organizations, and therefore we come here for incorporation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I have been appealed to in connection with this measure. I do not intend to discuss it from an ecclesiastical standpoint, because I recognize my limitations in that direction. It is proper for us to consider what this Bill is likely to lead us to before we vote in favour of it. When it first came up in the House, I thought that perhaps the proper course would have been to refer it to a select committee in order to ascertain whether or not we have any precedents in this country for a Bill of the sort. The right of a foreigner, an alien, to petition parliament is not recognized in the English system. My hon. friends will all remember the Cretan and the Boulogne cases. But in this country the practice has grown up of receiving petitions from aliens. As far as I can judge, that practice dates from 1878. On March 11th of that year, the attention of Mr. Speaker Anglin was called to a petition from some United States citizens interested in the Connecticut Mutual Insurance Company, praying for amendments to the Insurance Law, and after a very brief statement by Mr. Mackenzie, and without any discussion at all, Mr. Speaker Anglin decided that the petition would be received. It would appear from the brief debate, as reported in 'Hansard,' that those who spoke were under the impression that that was the English practice. I can state most emphatically that it is not. However, that practice, which was then initiated, has continued down to the present, and I suppose it would not lie in my mouth to claim that it should not be carried out in this instance.

But here is what I wish to direct the attention of the House to—that the petitioner here is not a foreigner who comes in here with certain British subjects to ask for incorporation. This is not a corporation aggregate at all, but a foreigner residing in San Francisco who will continue to reside there, and who asks you to create him a corporation sole with all the privileges of a corporation sole, he continuing to reside beyond your jurisdiction. That is the position you are placing yourselves in by adopting this Bill. Now, it is said the property is in your jurisdiction. But let us realize what the corporation is. A corporation aggregate is a person distinct and separate from the persons who compose the corporation. When the corporation is formed it is not merely the individuals who form it but a definite body that results from the bringing together of these persons. And if a corporation of that sort is formed in our country it resides here and is dealt with under our law. But here you have a corporation which is a fictitious person and distinct and separate from the individual incorporated ; but where that individual is the corporation remains. Now, what is this going to lead us to ? Here is this person residing in San Francisco, who would not have the right to be elected as a municipal councillor in this country, and whom you could not clothe with that right unless you amend the Naturalization Act ; and yet you are going to make him a corporation enjoying all the privileges in this country that are thus conferred.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Any set of foreigners could be made a corporation.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. Yes, a set of foreigners can be made a corporation since 1878, in consequence of the ruling of that time. But the foreigners could not be created a corporation in England; and under the Joint Stock Companies' Act a set of foreigners cannot be created a corporation, the majority of the directors must be residents of this country. But I state these facts, and it is for the committee to consider them. My own view is that the Bill might have been more carefully considered by the Special Committee chosen for the purpose of dealing with it. I have not given the matter sufficient consideration to justify me in saying I have a fixed opinion on the subject, and to advise the committee either to adopt or to reject the Bill. This is a matter which ought to be carefully considered, and more careful consideration should have been given to it than I have been able to give to it. But these are my impressions, and, for what they are worth, I communicate to the committee.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The ingenuity of the gentleman who is opposing the passing of this Bill is certainly very remarkable. My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. LaRivière) is known in the province from which he comes as a very able and ingenious man——

Mr. LaRIVIERE. Thanks.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. ——and he has given sufficient proof of his claim to that reputation in connection with this Bill; because, on every occasion when we have had this Bill before us, he has had an objection, and always a bran new one, and very plausible and very arguable objection. To-day he has brought forward an entirely new objection. And the proof of my hon. friend's ingenuity is still further

seen in the fact that no two members of the House, apparently, agree as to what his objection really is. As to the point raised by the Minister of Justice, I desire to say a word. When the statement is made that the House is asked to incorporate a foreigner residing in San Francisco and give him power to hold property, he still residing outside our jurisdiction, that statement, naturally, is likely to startle the House. But, if the words 'outside the jurisdiction' be technically correct, substantially, I submit to my hon. friend, and in the sense in which the House would naturally understand it, they are not correct. For, as I understand it, provision is made in this Bill—my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong—for service upon the corporation in the North-west Territories. Thus, the only object of having a resident in the North-west Territories is served by the fact that the Bill provides for the service of process in the North-west Territories, and, to all intents and purposes, with this provision inserted, the courts have jurisdiction to the same extent, in the same way and quite as effectively over this corporation, and in relation to any property that the church may hold, as if the bishop resided in Calgary or Edmonton. So there can be no substantial objection to incorporation on that ground. Now, so far as the suggestion is concerned that this ought to be reconsidered or sent again to a special committee, I submit that that is an unfair point to present at the present stage. When this Bill first came before the House, it was suggested by the hon. member for Provencher that the petitioner for incorporation was an alien, and that he resided in San Francisco. Thus, the House was then seized of that fact. Later on, the Bill came before the Committee on Private Bills, which is the proper committee to consider these questions. That committee discussed the objections raised by the hon. member for Provencher, dealt with them as has been stated by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), met the objections one after another, provided for service upon the corporations within the North-west Territories, and reported the Bill to us so that it might receive the sanction of the House. And I submit that no person could listen to the discussion that has taken place upon this Bill without being satisfied that an unfair attempt is being made against these parties. I do not mean unfair in the sense of being outside the rights of members of parliament, but as being in the direction of depriving these people of the right of incorporation in such a way as to treat them differently from others who come here seeking a similar right. I submit that these people have the same right as others to assume a corporate name. And it makes no difference whether we personally approve of that name or not. If the hon. gentleman and others split off from the church to which he belongs, and desired to assume another name, no one would object to that; and if they asked parliament for the incorporation of the ecclesiastical body thus created no objection would be taken. It has been done scores of times in legislatures all over the British dominions. I submit that this will be the first time where any unfair and invidious distinction has been shown, and where people who simply come asking the right to hold property in accordance with the law have been denied that right by the law-making body. For, let it be understood that all that these people ask is the right to hold property in a corporate capacity. As was said by the hon. member for Alberta, who promoted the Bill before the Private Bills Committee, he was willing that the name of the bishop should be struck out and that the right to hold property should be given to the parishes or to a local organization. The committee did not accept that, but thought fit to report the Bill in its present form. Therefore, if the House or the committee refuses the Bill at the present time it will be taking the ground practically that it will refuse these people the right to hold property in a corporate capacity, a right which has not been refused to others and which should not be refused to those who are associated as a religious body under any name they choose to assume.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot oppose this Bill, for the excellent reason that all the heads of the Roman Catholic orders reside outside this country. First, the head of our church does not live in this country, but in Rome. The heads of the Jesuit order live outside of this country, the heads of the Sulpician order live outside of this country—the heads of nearly all Roman Catholic orders live beyond our jurisdiction. The head of the Russo-Greek Catholic Church lives in San Francisco. I do not see any difference whatever between the Roman Catholic orders and this Russo-Catholic Church so far as the residences of the heads are concerned. I for one, as a Roman Catholic, do not see any objection to the Bill. As to the name, my hon. friend, on second thought, will admit there is nothing in that. There are many other churches who call themselves Catholic, and I do not see any objection to that. We are Roman Catholics, let us call ourselves Roman Catholics, and let us be proud of it, if we wish to. But let other people call themselves what they like. It is no shame to us if these people call themselves Catholics.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. The Minister of the Interior has charged me with opposing this Bill at almost every stage. Well, I did not oppose it merely for the sake of opposition. The fact that this Bill has been amended in almost every clause to meet my objections, is a proof that I was right in opposing it when it first came before the House. If I had wished to kill the Bill, to prevent its

passage, I could have done so on the second reading, because the Bill was read the second time under a suspension of the rules. Though I knew my privilege, though I knew I could have stopped the second reading, I did not avail myself of that privilege nor prevent the legislation going through the House. My opposition to the Bill was not with a view of preventing its passage, because when I could have prevented its passage I did not do so. Now, in answer to the Minister of Public Works, let me say that my contention is this : This right reverend gentleman, Bishop Tikhon, who is living in San Francisco, is known under the name of the Bishop of the Orthodox Greek Russian Church in North America. This is his title in the catechism he has published, and that he sends to the flock with his blessing.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Read it.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I will send it over to the hon. gentleman. Now while this church is known under the name of the Orthodox Greek Russian Church in San Francisco, in Seattle, and in fact everywhere else where it has parishes in the United States, why, after it crosses the boundary, should it assume that subtitle of Catholic in addition ? Why should it change its name when it comes across into Canada ? It must have been done for a purpose. I say if that is the official name of the bishop in the United States, I do not see why he should come here and ask to be incorporated under some other name. Evidently there must be some reason for it, he must have an object, and I think, I put my finger on it when I said a little while ago that there were two branches of the Greek Church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories. It was only to avoid a conflict between the two that I asked that this word ' Catholic,' which he does not bear in the United States and elsewhere, should be left out of the Bill, and that he should be acknowledged under the same title as he gives himself in one of his official books, the catechism published in San Francisco in 1901.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Under what name is it known in Russia ?

Mr. OLIVER. When the hon. gentleman said his name was so and so in San Francisco, he said it was something else in the state of California. Now what name is it in the state of California ?

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I said the church was incorporated in San Francisco under a different name.

On section 7,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is an eighth clause. With regard to the eighth clause it is quite true, as the Minister of the Interior has said, that you could give this corporation a domicile in this country, although the person constituting the corporation may live outside the country. But it does not seem to me that the eighth clause does that very effectually.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I had not time to read the amendments, as they were just handed to me when I was speaking. I was told the provision had been made by the committee. It may be it is not effectually done.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think it is very effectual. It says :

> The corporation sole shall have and maintain a head office at the town of Edmonton in the district of Alberta, and service of legal process at such head office shall be good and sufficient service of such process upon the corporation sole.

Well, the corporation sole may maintain a head office—that is an expression I never before heard of in connection with an ecclesiastical corporation—the ecclesiastical corporation is to have a head office in the town of Edmonton. However, passing by that curious word, suppose the ecclesiastical corporation does not happen to have a head office at Edmonton, where are you under this Bill ? The clause has not been drafted with sufficient care. It should go further and provide that in the event of the corporation sole not opening a head office in the town of Edmonton, service upon the corporation could be effected by service of process upon a priest or some person connected with the corporation in that particular district ; otherwise this clause 8 is of no service whatever. Or service might be effected by letter addressed to it, or by publication. The clause in its present shape is absolutely ineffectual, it seems to me ; and I would suggest it should be amended by stating that the domicile of the corporation shall be at such and such a place in this country, and that the head office—call it that—should be opened in that particular place, and that in default of such head office being opened, service on the corporation can be effected by service upon some priest, or by posting up the service in the town hall, or something of that kind.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Or that it shall have a registered address.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But it may not have a registered address.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It may be required to have.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If you do require it, it may not observe that provision. You must have a provision that the service of the process may be made by posting it up, or by advertising it in the newspapers, or something of that kind.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is a matter of procedure.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But it must be dealt with by this Bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think it is necessary, because if the head office is stated to be at Edmonton, it will be for the provincial court to determine the manner of making a service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman's argument is sound that the provincial courts can deal with the matter, it is perfectly clear that this parliament should have nothing to do with it. I do not know whether there is any procedure in the province of Manitoba or in the North-west Territories to cover a case of this kind. So far as the province of Nova Scotia is concerned I can say that there is no procedure that I am aware of to cover a case of this kind, and I suppose we are not to pass this Bill with an understanding that this provision is ineffectual unless we know something about the procedure of Manitoba and the North-west Territories. I do not think we should leave it to provincial enactment. We are doing a somewhat extraordinary thing when we incorporate a person who not only lives but proposes to live outside of the jurisdiction. It may be all right, but let us provide that he shall have his domicile inside the jurisdiction, and also provide some effectual mode of service upon him within the jurisdiction.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. As a member of the committee which suggested this amendment to the Bill I may say that perhaps the wording may yet be somewhat improved. I think if the hon. member who has made this suggestion would agree to an amendment providing that a registered letter addressed to this corporation at the town or city where they happen to have their head office under this Bill would be a sufficient service the objections would be removed. Personally, I feel, that as long as this country recognizes the right to grant incorporation to these religious and semi-religious bodies, entitling them to hold property, I do not see why it should refuse to do so in this case. As there is a considerable number of these people in the North-west Territories, I think they should have the same privileges as all other people in this country and that an Act of incorporation should be given to them so that their religious bodies may be entitled to hold property for their own purposes. I agree with the suggestion made by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that it should be made clear that the only power we give under this Bill is the right of these people to hold property, and that carries with it the right to sue and be sued. This ought to be perfectly clear as the hon. leader of the opposition has pointed out. If any person has a claim against this church it must be perfectly clear that nothing in the Bill shall allow them to evade the laws of the country. The desire of the committee was that they should receive this Act of incorporation without doing an injustice to any other person, and that they should be held amenable to the laws of the country the same as any other person or corporation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) to understand me as objecting to the incorporation of any religious association. I thought at first that possibly there might be some objection to this Bill, because it would, as far as property is concerned at least, confer jurisdiction upon this bishop over persons who, though, perhaps of that particular church, nevertheless were under the jurisdiction of bishops appointed from Rome. I thought there might be something in that but I am not so familiar with these subjects as some hon. gentlemen who have spoken, and therefore, there seems to be nothing in the suggestion which has been made.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Mr. Chairman, I think this discussion has shown that we should not go farther with the Bill, and therefore, I move, Sir, that you leave the chair.

Motion negatived.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR moved :

That section 8 be amended by adding the following words : 'Service of any writ, bill, legal process, notice or document whatsoever may be effectively made by mailing a copy thereof, duly registered, to the corporation by its name, as set forth in the first section of this Bill at the town of Edmonton, and by posting a copy thereof in the office of the Territorial Court in the said town of Edmonton.

He said : The mailing of a copy is not regarded by the legal profession as a very effective service, but the posting of a copy in the office of a clerk of the court is regarded as an effective service, because it will give notice to the clerk of the court and to lawyers doing business in the place where the notice is posted.

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Chirman, I think I can make a suggestion which will cover the objection of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). I suggest that the usual clause be put in that if the construction of the diocese is not commenced within two years and completed within five years and 15 per cent of the capital expended the charter shall lapse.

Section, as amended, agreed to, and Bill reported.

Mr. OLIVER moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LaRIVIERE. I beg to move, if I can get a seconder :

That this Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be read a third time this day six months.

Mr. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). I will second that amendment.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. LaRivière).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Hackett,
Archambault,	Kaulbach,
Bazinet,	LaRivière,
Bernier,	Lavell,
Bourassa,	Lavergne,
Bourbonnais,	Lefurgey,
Brock,	Lemieux,
Bruneau,	Loy,
Casgrain,	McLennan,
Champagne,	Malouin,
Costigan,	Martineau,
Delisle,	Morin,
Demers (St. John),	Murray,
Dugas,	Robinson (Elgin),
Ethier,	Rosamond,
Fitzpatrick,	Turcot,
Gauvreau,	Turgeon.—34.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Barker,	Lennox,
Belcourt,	Lewis,
Birkett,	Logan,
Blair,	Macdonald,
Borden (Halifax),	Mackie,
Boyd,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Calvert,	MacLaren (Perth),
Campbell,	McCormick,
Cargill,	McCreary,
Charlton,	McEwen,
Christie,	McGugan,
Clarke,	McIntosh,
Copp,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Douglas,	Matheson,
Dyment,	Morrison,
Earle,	Mulock,
Erb,	Oliver,
Farquharson,	Préfontaine,
Fielding,	Proulx,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Flint,	Riley,
Fowler,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Galliher,	Scott,
Gilmour,	Sifton,
Girard,	Sproule,
Gourley,	Stewart,
Hyman,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tarte,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Tolmie,
Johnston (Lambton),	Tolton,
Kemp,	Tucker,
Kendall,	Ward,
Kidd,	Wilmot,
Lang,	Wilson,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Wright.—71.
LeBlanc,	

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. LaRIVIERE.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 127) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George M. Depew.

RELIEF OF SAMUEL NELSON CHIPMAN.

Bill (No. 163) for the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman (Mr. Flint), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On the preamble.

Mr. CHARLTON. This Bill which I have in my hand entitled 'An Act for the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman' calls upon me as a member of the House to act in a judicial capacity. I was not present at the trial of this case; I heard none of the testimony; I do not know whether that testimony was properly presented and duly weighed or not. I do not suppose that there is a member of this House who is called upon to act in a co-ordinate capacity with the Senate in this matter who is in a position to exercise judicial functions in this case properly. Of course I shall not move that this Bill shall not pass, but I protest as I have often protested against the method of granting divorces in this country. I say that we are not in a position to act judicially in this matter and that it is a scandalous thing—I use the word advisedly—it is a scandalous thing that this practice is adhered to in this Dominion of Canada. If a divorce is to be granted at all, of course the law must define what is the cause and what is the offence that will warrant the granting of that decree. If a divorce is granted because the provisions and requirements of the law have been transgressed, it is a question of evidence as to whether the party applying for the divorce is entitled to that divorce. I repeat that I know nothing about this evidence; I am in no position to act on this evidence as a judge ought act. The evidence comes to me in a sense in a hearsay way; I have not heard the evidence; I have not seen these parties arraigned ; I have not heard these parties questioned; I do not know what the method of carrying on this trial was, and I again repeat that if a divorce under any circumstances is proper to be granted; it should be granted by a legal tribunal. The whole system we have been pursuing in the Dominion since confederation is on a false basis, and I shall avail of the privilege, if I am spared another session, to bring a resolution before this House affirming the principle that the method of granting divorces in Canada is not a well-founded and proper method, and that if divorces are to be granted at all the law should define clearly what is the offence that will warrant the granting of the divorce, and that the

case shall be referred to a proper legal tribunal.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Union Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Ingram.

Bill (No. 144) to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Securities Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 167) respecting the Royal Marine Insurance Company.—Mr. Marcil (Bonaventure.)

THE DOMINION ASSOCIATION OF CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS.

Mr. GALLIHER. I would ask leave to present the 10th report of the Select Standing Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills regarding the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants, and move that it be received.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not desire to offer any opposition to the Bill. I was present a short time at the meeting of the committee this morning. There was a discussion going on between parties interested on each side and there seemed to be a desire to arrive at a satisfactory compromise. Was such a compromise reached ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I think so.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that there is a great deal of opposition to the Bill. I have had a number of telegrams and communications with reference to it. It is claimed that there are already companies chartered under this same title, and objection is made to any other company being chartered under that name. I was not able to attend the meeting this morning, and I do not know what decision was arrived at, but if no satisfactory decision was reached between those who are opposing and those who are promoting the Bill, it should stand over for further consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question before the House is whether the report be received or not.

Mr. BELCOURT. As being in charge of the Bill and present at the committee, I may say that the subject was fully considered in committee, and so far as I understood, all the objections which any of those interested had to make were withdrawn.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Were there any amendments made ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think so.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I was present at the meeting this morning. I had been undecided how I should vote on this Bill, but when I saw such eminent counsel as Mr. Blake and Mr. Thomson, of Toronto, and many others, who appeared before the committee, come to an agreement among themselves and allow the Bill to pass harmoniously without an objection at all, I made up my mind to support the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member have leave to present the report.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BELCOURT moved that Bill (No. 160) to incorporate the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants be placed on the Order paper for immediate consideration, and that the House go into committee on the said Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought there were some amendments to be made to satisfy those who were opposed to the Bill.

Mr. GALLIHER. As chairman of the committee, allow me to inform the hon. gentleman that in the committee this morning the suggestion was made that certain names be added from the province of Ontario, but after due consideration, the parties on both sides practically came to an understanding, and the Bill passed without any amendment whatever except some amendment of a clerical kind in the punctuation. The Bill went through without opposition, and the parties who were present to suggest amendments, said everything was perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did those who were representing associations, incorporated under provincial laws, assent to the Bill in its present shape ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to repeat the question put by the hon. the leader of the opposition. Is it understood that the parties objecting to the Bill have withdrawn their objections ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I understand so.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If it is clearly understood that those who appeared before the committee have withdrawn their objections, I have no more to say.

Mr. CLARKE. I may say to the hon. Finance Minister that I have seen the gentleman who acted for the parties opposed to the Bill, and he says that all the objections have been withdrawn on the understanding that clause 3 is amended by making some changes in the punctuation as it appeared in the original Bill.

On section 3,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This clause appeared to have been subjected to some amendment in the punctuation. I do not know that there is very much use in changing the punctuation. I would suggest that the words 'such others' be struck out on the fourth line and in place thereof be substituted the words 'any other persons.' This makes better English and the meaning clearer.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

QUESTIONS.

SHIPMENTS OF MUTTON.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Is the government aware that Ebenezer Wheatley, of Charlottetown, P.E.I., made two shipments of mutton in November, 1898, from Halifax to London, in cold storage, by ss. 'Halifax' and ss. 'City of St. John,' of the Furness-Withy Company's line?

2. Is the government further aware that both of these shipments reached their destinations in bad order, the meat being rotten, and was ordered to be burned by the health authorities of London, at the expense of the shipper?

3. Were the boats of this company subsidized by the government, and required to provide cold storage; and if so, under whose supervision was it done, and what guarantee was held by the government that such cold storage would be efficient?

4. Is it the intention of the government to see that Mr. Wheatley is indemnified for his loss on those shipments?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher):

1. No.

2. No.

3. Yes. The subsidy was granted under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture.

4. A clause in the steamship companies agreements states that neither the government nor the steamship owners shall be responsible for the cargo in cold storage from any cause whatever, but that every reasonable precaution shall be taken by the steamship companies to protect the cargo. The report with regard to this contract made to the department was that the Furness-Withy Company were not providing the accommodations as agreed, and they were required to refund a portion of the amount.

P.E.I. RAILWAY—SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR.

Mr. HACKETT asked:

1. Were tenders, by public advertisement, invited for the construction of the railway from Southport to Murray Harbour in the province of Prince Edward Island?

2. If so, was it by notice in the public press or by posters?

3. If by notice in the press, in how many papers was it inserted? What were the names of the papers, number of times inserted, and dates of issue?

4. How many tenders were received, the names of tenderers, and the amount of their offers, respectively?

5. To whom was the contract awarded?

6. Does the contract include the entire cost of grading, bridge building, track laying, ballasting, erecting station buildings, and all other expenses incidental to completing the line?

7. When will said railway be complete, according to contract?

8. Has the government decided as to whether the southern terminus of the railway will be at Murray River Bridge or Murray Harbour south?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair):

1. Yes, tenders were invited for about 11½ miles of the branch railway on the Prince Edward Island Railway from Mutch's Point towards Murray harbour, on the 15th of December, 1899.

2. By newspaper advertisement.

3. It was inserted in five newspapers in New Brunswick and five in Prince Edward Island. The names of the newspapers are as follows: New Brunswick, 'Telegraph,' St. John; 'Globe,' St. John; 'Gazette,' St. John; 'Railway News,' St. John; 'Transcript,' Moncton. Prince Edward Island, 'Patriot,' Charlottetown; 'Examiner,' Charlottetown; 'Guardian,' Charlottetown; 'Pioneer Journal,' Summerside; 'Islander,' Charlottetown.

Number of times advertisement was inserted is as follows: St. John 'Telegraph,' seven insertions; St. John 'Globe,' seven insertions; St. John 'Gazette,' seven insertions; St. John 'Railway News,' one insertion; Moncton 'Transcript,' eight insertions.

Advertisements sent out from Moncton on 15th December, 1899, up to and including 23rd December.

In Prince Edward Island newspapers, advertisements inserted from 15th November, to 18th December, 1899, as follows: 'Patriot,' Charlottetown; 'Examiner,' Charlottetown; 'Guardian,' Charlottetown; every other day or fourteen insertions each. 'Pioneer Journal,' Summerside; 'Islander,' Charlottetown; weekly, or four insertions each. The 'Transcript' published the advertisement on the following dates: December, 1899; 15th, 16th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd and 23rd. In the information received from Moncton, there is nothing to show the dates of insertion in other papers.

4. Five tenders were received as follows: From George E. Full, Willard Kitchen, John W. McManus, J. B. McManus, Thomas Campbell. I cannot tell the hon. gentleman what any of the offers would be. There was a schedule of prices, which have not been made up, or which I have not been able to procure from Moncton.

5. To John W. McManus, but on account of severe illness and consequent inability to conduct the work, the contract was cancelled, by Order in Council, and was awarded to the next lowest tenderer, W. Kitchen.

6. The contract does not include tracklaying, ballasting, nor erecting station buildings, but it covers the cost of grading, bridgebuilding and all other expenses incidental to completing the line to subgrade.

7. The date for completion named in the contract is December 31st, 1900, for the 11½ mile section, but it has been extended to July, 1902.

8. No, the government has not fully decided where the southern terminus of the railway will be.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I would like, in order that I may understand the answer, to ask the minister whether he said that the prices were not made up yet in these contracts ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I said they had not yet been received from Moncton, though I had called for them. I put off answering the question hoping to receive them, but have not received them yet. I presume that they would be made up in order to decide the tender, but I have not the information from Moncton.

NEWCASTLE POST OFFICE—RESIGNATION OF MR. RICKARD.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. Has William Rickard resigned the position of postmaster at Newcastle, Ontario ?
2. If so, when was such resignation received ?
3. Has his resignation been accepted ?
4. If so, when ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). Mr. William Rickard, postmaster of Newcastle, Ontario, tendered his resignation of that office on the 3rd of March last. He wrote again on the 29th April, urging the acceptance of his resignation, and it was accepted on the 2nd instant.

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, 1902.

Mr. ROSS (Ontario)—by Mr. Schell—asked :

1. How many immigrants have come to Canada from January 1st to May 1st, 1902 ?
2. How many arrived each month since January 1st, 1902 ?
3. What is their nationality ?
4. In what part of Canada did they settle ?
5. Has the government any knowledge of the amount of money brought into the country by said immigrants ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton).

1. 24,122.

2. January, 1373 ; February, 1,997 ; March, 7,583 ; April, 13,169.

3. British, 5,164 ; Continent of Europe, 7,478 ; American, 11,480.

4. Returns to the first of May are not complete. Up to the first of April the proportion is approximately as follows :—Maritime provinces, 4 per cent ; Quebec, 9 per cent ; Ontario, 12 per cent ; Manitoba, British Columbia and the Territories, 75 per cent.

5. The value of settlers effects entered at customs ports during the first four months of the present calendar year is $1,261,289, which, according to the records, are almost entirely those of immigrants from the United States. Thus the average per head, including men, women and children, is over $109. The amount of money in the possession of immigrants from the United States is not of record, but correspondence in the department shows the amount is considerable.

Regarding the amount of money possessed by immigrants coming from the British Isles and the Continent, the department has no means of ascertaining definitely the amount possessed by them. In connection with bonuses paid, the only class regarding whom there is a restriction as to money are those who come from a portion of Austria and with respect to them it is found that for the past two years the amount possessed by them, as shown by the returns of moneys exchanged at the seaport from which they sailed, averages from $50 to $200 each. If all Continental and British immigrants are possessed of a similar average, which is a reasonable conclusion as many of those who come from England as well as other countries are possessed of a very large amount of money, the total amount possessed by those who have arrived during the past four months at Canadian seaports and who were destined for points in Canada, would be not less than $1,264,200.

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION.

Mr. GOURLEY—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

1. Are any negotiations pending between the government of Canada and that of Newfoundland, looking to the province of Newfoundland entering the confederation ?
2. Has there been any correspondence on this subject between the said governments or any member thereof on this subject since the last session of this parliament ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There is no correspondence now going on between the government of Canada and that of Newfoundland looking to the province of Newfoundland entering the confederation. There has been no communication, either through the government or any member thereof.

MEDALS FOR THE 'ROTHESAY BLUES.'

Mr. GOURLEY—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

(a.) Have any petitions been received by the government in reference to granting medals to the 'Rothesay Blues,' a volunteer rifle company with headquarters at Truro, who were en-

gaged in active service during the Fenian raid of 1866, or were called out for that purpose ?

(b.) Has the government had any correspondence with any officer or member of that company in reference to granting such medals ?

(c.) Has any application been received for such medals ; if so, from whom ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). So far as the records in this department show :—

(a.) No.

(b.) Yes.

(c.) Yes. From Lieut. George Albert Layton.

MEDALS FOR THE 2ND COLCHESTER REGIMENT.

Mr. GOURLEY—by Mr. Clarke—asked :

(a.) Have any petitions been received by the government in reference to granting medals to the 2nd Colchester regiment, who were called out for active service during the Fenian raid of 1866 ?

(b.) Has the government had any correspondence with any officer or member of that regiment in reference to granting such medals ?

(c.) Has any application been received for such medals ; if so, from whom ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). So far as the records in this department show :

(a.) No.

(b.) Yes.

(c.) Yes. From Major W. S. Hamilton, Capt. James Hamilton, Lieut. James Hamilton, Sergeant Aaron Boomer, Sergeant Charles Moore and Privates Alexander Boomer, Thos. Boomer, Isaac Brinton, John A. Brinton, William Clarke, James Densmore, William Augustus Hamilton, Charles C. Lockhart, James McLellan and Ezra Stevens.

SAMUEL CLEGG, PETERBOROUGH.

Mr. WARD asked :

1. Does Samuel Clegg, of Peterborough, hold any position under the government, either in the Department of Public Works or Railways and Canals ?

2. If so, in which department ?

3. What is the date of his appointment ?

4. What amount has been paid him for salary and expenses since appointed ?

5. What amount has been expended under his superintendence since appointed ?

6. What are the particulars of work done, and cost of the work at each place ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. (Hon. J. I. Tarte).

1. Yes.

2. Employed and paid by both departments.

3. 1st March, 1901.

4. Salary, $1,600 a year, half paid by each department.

Amounts paid by Public Works Department : Salary, $866.66 ; expenses, $40.47. Total, $907.13. Report on works done to 30th June last at page 225 part 4 of Annual Report.

5. $1,330.85.

VISIT OF DR. SEWARD WEBB, TO PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. HACKETT asked :

1. What amount was received by the government for the conveyance of Dr. Seward Webb and his party from Charlottetown to Summerside over the Prince Edward Island Railway in the autumn of 1901 ?

2. Was Dr. Webb's party carried by a special train ?

3. On what day of the week was this train used ; and if on Sunday, who authorized the working of this train on the Sabbath day ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Hon. A. G. Blair).

1. No charge was made for conveying Dr. Seward Webb and his party from Charlottetown to Summerside over the Prince Edward Island Railway in 1901, as a matter of usual and ordinary courtesy between railways.

2. Dr. Webb's party was carried by special train.

3. The train was run on Sunday on the authority of the general manager.

POSTMASTER, BATHURST TOWN, N.B.

Mr. EMMERSON—by Mr. Campbell—asked :

1. Is the Postmaster General aware that the postmaster at Bathurst Town, N.B., Mr. Henry Bishop, allows persons outside the government employ to use the post office as a place of business ?

2. Does the Postmaster General know that the post office at Bathurst Town is kept closed from 12.30 until 2 o'clock every day, to the inconvenience of the public ?

3. Does the Postmaster General know that the postmaster at Bathurst Town frequently permits outsiders to lounge for hours inside the delivery and assorting room, and in touch with mail matter to and from the office ?

4. Does the Postmaster General know that the postmaster, as agent for American club men, frequently absents himself from his office without leave, and leaves the same in charge of a young girl or boy, who are incompetent ?

5. Is the Postmaster General aware that, as a result of the postmaster of Bathurst being agent for American fishing clubs, the post office has been the scene of several unseemly broils between the postmaster, the river guides, and American anglers ?

6. Should these charges be formulated, will an investigation be granted ; and if proved, will Postmaster Bishop be dismissed ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock).

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. No.

In regard to the sixth question any charges made against the postmaster will receive careful consideration.

JUNIOR JUDGE FOR LEEDS AND GRENVILLE.

Mr. SPROULE asked :

1. Has a junior judge been appointed for the united counties of Leeds and Grenville ? If so, who ?

2. If no appointment has been made, is it the intention of the government to make an early appointment there, and whom ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). No one has been appointed to the vacant judgeship. An appointment will in all probability be made in the early future.

THE COASTING TRADE OF CANADA.

On the order for :

Resuming adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick that Bill (No. 165) repecting the coasting trade of Canada be now read a third time, and the proposed motion of Mr. Charlton in amendment thereto,

Amendment negatived, and main motion agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

HALIFAX INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL, AND ST. PATRICK'S HOME, HALIFAX.

Bill (No. 152) further to amend the provisions of chapter 183 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the Halifax Industrial School and St. Patrick's Home at Halifax, (The Minister of Justice), read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What change was made in respect to the age of offenders ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). The only change made is to increase from sixteen to eighteen years the age at which a boy may be incarcerated. and to decrease the period of incarceration from two years to one. At present the period may be not exceeding five years and not less than two. The change makes it not less than one year.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the effect of the section repealed ?

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. The original statute, section 62, of chapter 183, was amended by section 35, of chapter 37, of the statutes of 1890. Section 35, chapter 37, of the statutes of 1890 provides :

Section 62 of the said Act is hereby repealed, and the following substituted therefor :. 'No such sentence shall be pronounced unless or until provision has been made by the municipality, within which such conviction is had, out of its funds, for the support of boys so sentenced, at the rate of not less than sixty dollars per annum for each boy.'

The legislature of Nova Scotia has provided that the maintenance of these boys or girls, as the case may be, shall be contributed half by the municipality and half by the province.

Bill reported; read the third time, and passed.

FRUIT MARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 136) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—The Minister of Agriculture.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I may say that I am quite willing to move that these amendments be agreed to, but, in consequence of these amendments, I think some verbal alterations will have to be made in section 10. The first amendment is to section 2 of the Bill, which was passed by this House. In addition to the words 'No. 1' the senators want to put in 'or XXX' which I think is quite right. That comes in the fourth line of section 6 of the original Act. Then, the senators, move in amendment to section 10 to strike out the word 'inspectors.' Section 10 of the Act says:

Every person who wilfully alters, effaces or obliterates wholly or partially, or causes to be altered, effaced or obliterated, any inspector's marks on any package which has undergone inspection, shall incur a penalty of forty dollars.

I have no objection at all to that, but I wish to insert, after 'who' in the first line of section 10, the words 'not being an inspector,' so as to provide that an inspector may efface certain marks when he finds that they have been wrongfully placed upon a package. Otherwise this amendment would interfere with section 9 of the same Act. I therefore move :

That these amendments be concurred in, but that in section 10 of the said Act, in the first line, after the word 'who,' the words 'not being an inspector' be inserted.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—STRIKE AT KINGSTON LOCOMOTIVE WORKS.

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

Mr. E. F. CLARKE (West Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to direct the attention of the Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Mulock) to the dispatches which appeared in the morning papers as to the continuation of the strike amongst the employees of the loco-

motive works at Kingston. I notice a dispatch in the Montreal 'Gazette' to-day dealing with the matter, and it is as follows :

Ottawa, May 11—(Special).—A report which comes from Kingston is to the effect that aliens are being imported into that town to take the place of striking machinists in the locomotive works. It is said that these aliens are employed on the locomotives which are being constructed there for the Intercolonial Railway. The attention of the government will probably be called to the report to-morrow.

In this morning's 'Citizen' there is a more lengthy despatch, as follows :

Kingston, May 11—(Special).—No settlement has yet been arrived at between the striking machinists and the Kingston locomotive works. The company, contrary to the provisions of the alien labour law, is importing foreigners to take the place of the strikers to do work on government contract locomotives. Ralph Smith, M.P., president of the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, was agreed upon as arbitrator of the conflicting interests, but the company refused to be bound by his decision; therefore, Mr. Smith refused to act further.

Mr. Robert Glockling, of the Ontario Labour Bureau, has been here at the instance of Hon. Frank Latchford, Minister of Public Works, to endeavour to bring about a settlement, but has been unsuccessful. Mr. Glockling, it is said, has reported to his minister that the company is entirely to blame, and if a speedy settlement is not made, the chances of the Liberal candidate, Mr. E. J. B. Pease, for re-election, are decidedly slim.

Mr. Arthur W. Holmes, organizer of the International machinists' union, is still here looking after the interests of the strikers.

It is understood that the Minister of Labour, Hon. Wm. Mulock, will step into the breach at the solicitation of the machinists and depute Mr. Mackenzie King, Deputy Minister of Labour, to visit the city to enforce the alien labour law, and also strive to effect an immediate settlement of the differences.

I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the government or the hon. Minister of Labour what special effort has been made to prevent the importation of aliens into Kingston to do work in connection with these locomotives, and if their attention has been drawn to the fact that aliens are coming in, and also to know if the hon. Minister of Labour has moved in the direction of sending his deputy up to try and bring about a settlement of the dispute which so unhappily exists between the machinists and their employers. It seems to me, that, in view of the fact that the government gave a contract for twenty locomotives, without tender, to the locomotive works at Kingston, they are specially called upon to see that in carrying out a contract of this kind, union wages are paid to the men engaged in the work. If the statements made in both of these papers are true, I submit respectfully that it is a duty incumbent upon the government to see to it that the men who are out on strike for a fair wage shall not be handicapped by aliens being permitted to take their places in contravention of the Alien Labour Act. I would like to have a statement from the First Minister, or from the Minister of Labour, as to what has been done already and as to what the government intend to do in the future in reference to the matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Hon. Wm. Mulock). The government has received no information from any source that there is any infraction of the Alien Labour Act, at Kingston or that such infraction is intended. Neither the government nor any member of it, nor the Department of Labour, has beeen asked to intevene by either party for the settlement of the dispute, and until invited it would not be likely to produce any good results should the department intervene.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

THE COMING INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker. Before you leave the Chair I would like to refer to the subject of the approaching conference in London at which all the representatives of the self-governing colonies are to meet in conference with His Majesty's government. The correspondence which has taken place between the Canadian government and His Majesty's government has already been brought down, and it has been referred to in parliament on one or two occasions. I think it well to refer to the terms of that correspondence, and to point out certain facts in connection with the attitude which the Prime Minister has taken with respect to the subjects which are to be discussed. The first document which appears on the file brought down to the House, is a letter from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the Governor General and is as follows :

My Lord,—It has become my duty to inform you that the Coronation of His Most Gracious Majesty King Edward VII. has been fixed to take place on the 26th of June, 1902. It is His Majesty's desire that the great self-governing colonies of the empire should be represented on this occasion by their leading statesmen, and I have accordingly to request you to be so good as to convey to the Premier of Canada our invitation, on the part of His Majesty's government, to visit this country in June next. It is not anticipated that the duration of the actual ceremonies in connection with the Coronation will extend beyond a few days, but it would probably be convenient to Sir Wilfrid Laurier to arrive in England a few days beforehand, and His Majesty's government hope therefore that he will consider himself their guest for a fortnight from the date of his arrival. It would be an additional satisfaction to them if Sir Wilfrid Laurier should be accom-

panied by some lady member of his family. It will be readily understood that on an occasion like this it is necessary that all arrangements should be made some months in advance, and without therefore desiring to press for an immediate answer, His Majesty's government would be glad to learn at Sir Wilfrid Laurier's early convenience whether it will be in his power to accept their invitation. The question of representative detachments of troops from the various colonies is also under the consideration of His Majesty's government, and whenever a decision has been arrived at on this subject I shall address you in a further despatch.

The next document is a cablegram from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the Governor General, dated London, Jan. 23, 1902, and is as follows :

Mr. Chamberlain to Lord Minto.

London, January 23, 1902.

It is proposed by His Majesty's government to take advantage of the presence of the premiers at Coronation to discuss with them the questions of political relations between the mother country and the colonies, Imperial defence, commercial relations of the empire and other matters of general interest.

Should your ministers desire to submit definite proposals or resolutions on any of the above questions or should they wish to suggest any further subject for discussion, I should be glad to be informed of purport by cable in order that the other governments can be communicated with.

With view to proposed conference, hope your premier will be able to remain for a short time, say three weeks, after ceremony, as the guest of His Majesty's government.

Please telegraph reply. Despatch follows.

(Signed) CHAMBERLAIN.

To that the following answer was sent by His Excellency the Governor General, on February 3, 1902.

Lord Minto to Mr. Chamberlain.

Ottawa, February 3, 1902.

Referring to your despatch of the 27th December, my government accepts invitation extended to Prime Minister to attend Coronation. He expects to sail about 10th of June, accompanied by Lady Laurier, but exact date cannot yet be fixed.

Referring to the several questions mentioned in your despatch of 23rd January, the only one which in the opinion of my ministers, gives promise of useful discussion is that of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire. The political relations now existing between the mother country and the great self-governing colonies, and particularly Canada, are regarded by my ministers as entirely satisfactory, with the exception of a few minor details, and they do not anticipate that in the varying conditions of the colonies, there can be any scheme of defence applicable to all.

In the opinion of my ministers, there is thus but a limited range of subjects upon which the contemplated conference can be productive of useful action. Nevertheless my ministers realize the desirability of taking advantage of every opportunity for the discussion by the public men of the mother country and the colonies of questions of Imperial interest, and Canada's representative will be prepared to give respectful consideration to any proposals that may be submitted by His Majesty's government or by the representatives of other colonies.

It is to be noted that the despatch promised by the communication from the Secretary of State for the Colonies of the 23rd January, 1902, has not yet arrived in Ottawa so far as I understand the situation. I made inquiry in regard to that only a few days ago, and I was informed by the right hon. Prime Minister that no further communication had been received from the imperial government up to that time. Now, the government of Canada have laid it down in their answer to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that there is practically only one subject on which any useful discussion can take place, and they state that that subject is the question of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire. I do not know whether or not the answer which has been sent by the government has had the effect of breaking off the correspondence with the imperial authorities on this subject. One would be inclined to take that view, inasmuch as the despatch promised in the cable message of the Secretary of State for the colonies has not yet arrived.

With regard to the various subjects mentioned by the Colonial Secretary as suitable subjects for discussion, I wish to say, so far as the question of imperial defence is concerned, that there seems to be no reason why this government should not discuss that question with the imperial authorities. As I have pointed out before in this House and in other places, I am ready to uphold as strongly as any one, the necessity of the control by Canada of the expenditure of our public moneys and of the question of imperial defence relating to Canada. But holding this view, I see no reason why we should not be open to discuss that question with the imperial authorities. There are three possible futures before this country. One is existence as an independent nation ; another is absorption in or annexation to the United States of America ; the third is a continuance of the relations which at present exist between Canada to the mother country. The last is the future condition of this country to which I for one look forward as likely to be permanent ; and so long as the tie which binds us to the mother country continues to exist, it seems to me that we must take into consideration the question of the defence of this country ; and in connection with that, there is no reason why we should not at least discuss with the mother country, when invited in a courteous way to do so, the question of imperial defence.

We must not shut our eyes to the fact that we participate in all the benefits and advantages resulting from the existence of the British army and navy and the influence which they make felt throughout all the world. We, as British subjects, hold ourselves entitled to the protection of the Brit-

ish flag in every corner of the world. While that condition of affairs continues, while we enjoy these rights, while we have the advantages which the British consular system gives us, there seems no good reason why we should not at a conference of this kind say to the mother country in a courteous way that we are prepared, while reserving to ourselves all possible liberty of action, to discuss that subject or any other subject which the mother country suggests for consideration.

Coming more particularly to the subject which this government say they do propose to discuss at the conference, that is, the question of the commercial relations between the different portions of the empire, I wish to take the time of the House for a few moments in reviewing the position which the two great political parties in this country have taken during the past five or six years with regard to that question.

In the first place, I take it that all public men in this country have conceded that it would be a great advantage to Canada to enjoy a preference in the markets of the mother country. I could weary the House, if I desired to do so, with very voluminous extracts from the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with regard to that subject; but I will content myself by referring merely to one or two which I have under my hand. In the campaign of 1896, the Prime Minister, in speaking of preferential trade, said:

> Just see what a great advantage it would be to Canada if the wheat, cheese and butter, which we would send to England should be met in England with a preference over similar products of other nations. The possibilities are immense.

The present Minister of Customs, on the 27th of April, 1897, in this House said:

> Every one will admit if Canada can obtain a preference in the markets of Great Britain, Canada would be very glad to receive it, and every legitimate means put forward to secure that would be hailed with pleasure by both sides.

The hon. gentleman who sits for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said in this House on the 23rd of March, 1896:

> If we could have preferential treatment in the English market for our breadstuffs, a preferential treatment sufficiently pronounced to amount to a substantial advantage, it would be a dream that would go a long way towards reconciling the people of this country to such an arrangement.

That is an arrangement, as I understand it, for preferential trade within the empire. Then, the present Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) has more than once, I think, expressed his view that a system of preferential trade would be of advantage to this country; and the present premier of Ontario, the Hon. George W. Ross, has in very strong terms on more than one occasion dwelt at great length upon the considerable advantages that would accrue to this country from a preference in the markets of the mother country.

Now, granting that such a preference would be of advantage to this country, the next question that presents itself to our minds is as to the practicability of procuring such a preference as part of a scheme of mutual preferential trade within the empire. The record of the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches is not a very consistent record with regard to that particular branch of the subject. Up to a recent period the right hon. leader of the House, speaking for the party he leads, expressed the belief that this was an entirely practicable scheme. For example, on the 17th of March, 1896, shortly previous to the election at which his party came into power, he used the following language:

> My hope is—nay, my conviction is—that on the 23rd June, the Liberal party will be at the head of the polls, and that it will be the Liberal party with its policy of a revenue tariff that will send commissioners to London to arrange for a basis of preferential trade.

It is quite clear that the right hon. gentleman, having these views and making that pledge to the country on behalf of his party, thought it was perfectly practicable to secure and carry out a scheme of preferential trade within the empire. He entertained the same opinion even at a later date, because on the 19th of July, 1899, in this House, he used the following language:

> I say at once it is the duty of the government of Canada by all means in its power and as soon as it is possible to do so, to get preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain.

The Minister of Finance and the hon. member for North Norfolk, in 1896 and 1897, expressed their belief that the obtaining of such a preference was impossible, but they were not in a position to speak for the Liberal party in the same way in which the Prime Minister spoke; and therefore we must assume that up to 1899, at least the Prime Minister regarded the proposition as a practicable one.

The next question is to what extent and in what way has the government carried out the pledge which was made by the leader of the House in the campaign of 1896, immediately before the election at which his party came into power? Let us run very briefly over the legislation which has taken place with regard to mutual preferential trade since that date.

In 1897, the government introduced legislation by which a preference was offered to 'all countries throughout the world which admitted the products of Canada on terms which on the whole are as favourable to Canada as the terms of the Canadian reciprocal tariff are to the countries to which it may apply.' This legislation was put forward in debate by some members of the government as not being a preference to the mother country at all, but as a step towards

free trade and nothing more. For example, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, speaking on the 26th of April, 1897, said :

> But I say with respect to the offer we now make that it is not a preferential offer at all in the true legal sense of the word. That offer is open to all the world. The Americans may avail themselves of it and so may the Germans and the Belgians. The whole world are welcome to avail themselves of it.

Afterwards in the same debate, he said :

> I tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. McNeill) that this is an offer of preferential trade to all countries that are qualified to come in.

His whole argument went to show that this really was not an offer of preferential trade to the mother country, but a step towards the accomplishment of a policy of free trade in this country.

Sir Louis Davies, then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, took the same ground. He said :

> The premier took that stand which the Finance Minister took, which every member of the cabinet took and holds to-day, that these treaties did not apply and did not bind Canada. The premier took the stand, which is now carried out in every customs-house in Canada, that these treaties do not bind Canada, and that German and Belgium goods are not entitled to preferential treatment because of these treaties. You cannot read anything of that kind into this proposal, and it is a violently forced construction to say that the resolution does. . . . . It attaches no terms which are not common to Great Britain and to all countries.

The view which the right hon. gentleman himself put forward in the debate did not quite agree with that which his colleagues expressed and which I have just quoted. The right hon. gentleman said on the 28th of May, 1897 :

> We had to look around in the world as to see what countries would be admitted under this preferential tariff, and having looked over the world, from the one pole to the other, we saw only one nation in a position to take advantage of that tariff, and that was Great Britain and possibly New South Wales

In this connection, I may say, that it was pointed out to the government on that occasion that the German and Belgium treaties prevented this government from passing that legislation in such a way as to exclude those countries from the preference. The right hon. gentleman admitted that this legislation was intended practically as a preference to the mother country, but the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding), the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Sir Louis Davies) and other members of the government stoutly insisted this was not the case, and, therefore, that the German and Belgium treaties offered no obstacle whatever, and as a proof of the soundness of their views they pointed to the fact that the custom houses in this country were then granting the preference to goods from Great Britain and were denying it to goods from Germany and Belgium. It is needless to reply that the view of these hon. gentlemen proved to be entirely unfounded, and this government was finally compelled to refund to the importers of goods from Germany and Belgium, imported before the German and Belgium treaties were denounced, every dollar of additional duty which had been collected on these goods over and above those collected on imports from Great Britain. In short the law officers of the Crown pronounced against the view put forward by this government, and the goods imported from Germany and Belgium became, until the treaties were denounced, entitled to the benefit of the preferential tariff. The German and Belgium treaties were denounced by the imperial government, and in the following year, 1898, as a result of that action, the preference was put in a shape, which the government in 1897 said they did not intend it to assume. It was put in the form of a preference to certain named portions of the British Empire and such other portions of the empire as should enact tariffs which, on the whole, were as favourable to Canada as was the tariff of Canada to the products and manufactures of these particular countries. In that position the tariff stands at present.

Having thus granted a preference to the mother country, let us look at the results both as regards the mother country and our trade relations with Germany and Belgium, more particularly Germany. In the first place, the German government has continued to extend to all portions of the British Empire, except Canada, the most-favoured nation treatment, which admits the products of those portions of the empire under the minimum German tariff, while the products of Canada are subjected to the maximum tariff of that country. So far as we know from any documents ever laid on the Table of this House, this course has practically been assented to by our government. In fact the hon. Minister of Finance, in reply to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Bell) last year, almost justified the action of Germany in excluding Canada from the more favoured nation treatment. I wish to point, if it has not already been brought to the attention of this government, to what was said by Lord Salisbury when he caused these treaties to be denounced. In the language of Lord Salisbury, those treaties were denounced in the general interests of the empire—a fact to which the attention of this government does not seem to have been directed—but the result of the denunciation of those treaties, in the general interests of the empire, has been to exclude Canada from the benefit of the most-favoured nation treatment, which to every other portion of the empire has since been granted by Germany. There can be no doubt about that, and it is a remarkable thing in this connection that we are obliged to go to the papers laid before the parliament of Australia for the purpose of getting informa-

tion on this point. We have asked this government in vain on more than one occasion to lay the papers relating to this matter on the Table, and it is only by going to the papers laid on the table of the Australian Senate, as far back as November, 1901, that we are able to understand the situation with regard to this particular subject and other cognate matters which directly affect the interests of this country. To get the necessary and proper information, which will enable us to understand whether or not the action of this government has been in the public interest, we are obliged to go to other colonies or to the imperial parliament itself. And this information which we are thus obliged to seek ought to have been laid on the Table of this House long ago. What do we find ? We find that Lord Salisbury—I am quoting from documents laid on the table of the Australia Senate in November, 1901—in his despatch instructing the minister at Berlin to denounce this treaty, uses the following language :

Beyond this the provisions of article 7 of the treaty of 1865 quoted above constitute a barrier against the internal fiscal arrangements of the British Empire, which is inconsistent with the close ties of commercial purposes which subsist and should be consolidated between the mother country and her colonies. Under these circumstances Her Majesty's government find themselves compelled to abrogate the treaty which is no longer compatible with the general interests of the empire.

That makes it clear if words can do so that the imperial government, in denouncing this treaty, took the ground that they did so, not especially in the interests of Canada, but in the general interests of the empire. Further than that, he says in the same despatch referring to the same article :

No such article is contained in the treaty of 1865 between Great Britain and the Zollverein, and the consequence is that certain of the British colonies which are all comprised within its operations find themselves committed by treaty to a commercial policy which is not in accordance with the views of the responsible colonial ministers or adequate to the requirements of the people.

In the despatch to the minister at Brussels, the same language is used. He says :

And thus the provisions of article 15 of the treaty of 1862 quoted above constituted a barrier against the fiscal arrangements of the British Empire, which is inconsistent with the close ties of commercial intercourse which subsist and should be consolidated between Great Britain and her colonies. Under the circumstanstances Her Majesty's government find themselves compelled to terminate a treaty which is no longer consistent with the interests of the British Empire.

So it is plain from these documents, laid on the Table of the Australian Senate, that the treaty was denounced, not specially in the interests of Canada, but in the general interests of the British Empire. Further than that, we find a statement in the despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Governor General of the Australian Commonwealth, which is significant, perhaps, in this connection. On the 25th February, 1901, Mr. Barton presented a memorandum to His Excellency the Governor General of the Commonwealth and asked him to communicate that memorandum to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I will not read the memorandum, but I may say, in a few words, it was for the purpose of ascertaining what would be the probable result if the Commonwealth of Australia should enact a tariff granting a preference to the mother country. The inquiry was whether or not it would result in the Commonwealth of Australia being excluded from the most favoured nation treatment by the German Empire. And the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in dealing with that question in the despatch to the Governor General of the Commonwealth of Australia, uses these words :

A copy of the correspondence will be forwarded to the Governor General of Canada with the request that he will ask his ministers for a report as to the consequences of the action taken by them not merely as regards their trade with Germany, but also as regards their trade generally with the rest of the world.

And I suppose that a communication of that kind has been received by this government, and that an answer has been sent to that communication. But we can only know the fact of such communication having been received and an answer having probably been sent by referring to documents that, three months ago were laid on the Table of the Australian Commonwealth, and which, at the commencement of this session, should have been laid on the Table of this House. It would be interesting to know what the answer of the government is with respect to this question. I presume that this government has received the request of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and has sent some answer, but this House, up to the present time, is absolutely ignorant on the subject.

Now, let us see on what grounds the action of Germany has been based in excluding Canada from the treatment that Germany extends to the rest of the British Empire. The despatches are not upon the Table of this House, but upon the Table of the Senate of Australia. I will not trouble the House with reading the despatches in full, but may quote a line or two from them which indicates as distinctly as possible that the denunciation of these treaties and the consequent result that the preference of 1897 extends to Great Britain and other portions of the empire and not to Germany and Belgium are solely responsible for the circumstance that Canada, at the present time, is excluded from the advantages of the most favoured nation treatment by Germany. Since the denunciation

of the treaty of 1865 between Great Britain and Germany, the latter country has granted to the United Kingdom and to other British colonies the same advantages as are granted to the most favoured nations, but has excluded Canada by name from such advantages, and has assigned as the reason that Canada—and now I quote the language of the German Chancellor—

> Has accorded to imports from Great Britain customs advantages which she is not prepared to extend to imports from Germany.

Now, what does that amount to? It amounts to this—that Canada is excluded from the favoured treatment accorded by Germany to other British colonies. Yet that has been occasioned by the denunciation of these treaties, which denunciation was carried out, as Lord Salisbury stated twice in his despatches, not in the interests of Canada but in the general interests of the empire. Would you not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that a fact such as that would have justified this government in making the strongest possible protest in being thus excluded by Germany from the treatment which she affords to the other portions of the empire? Would you not suppose that not only this government but the imperial government as well, would have taken the strongest and most vigorous measures to assert that a policy of this kind adopted in the general interests of the empire, should not be made occasion for excluding one portion of the empire from the benefits that other portions receive? These treaties may have been denounced at the instance of Canada, but not of Canada alone, for, if I remember the facts correctly, Canada had the support of other portions of the empire in the position she took. As a result of the denunciation of these treaties and of the legislation proposed by this government in 1898, Canada is excluded from the most favoured nation treatment, and remains excluded until this day—and remains excluded, so far as any information before the House shows, without a single word of protest by this government, without a line of which we have knowledge from any official document, making the vigorous remonstrance which should have been made as soon as these facts came to the attention of the government.

But this is not the worst of this matter. The government so framed their tariff of 1898, following in that respect the lines of the tariff of 1897, that Germany, while holding up this Canadian preference to imports from Great Britain as a reason for excluding us from her markets, has practically enjoyed a great measure of the advantages of the very preference of which she complains. We are excluded by Germany from the advantages of the most favoured nation treatment and are subjected to the effects of the maximum tariff of Germany. Yet Germany, at the same time, is sending her goods to Great Britain in large quantities, and these goods, after receiving in the mother country the addition of a small percentage of work and some trifling additions of material, are coming into Canada by hundreds of thousands of dollars worth every year under the advantages of the preferential tariff. It seems to me that this is a very serious condition of affairs. It is one result of the policy of this government with regard to preferential trade, but it is not the only result, as I am about to point out. The next result of the making of this preferential tariff in 1897 was this:

The right hon. gentleman who leads this government went to London in 1897, and he delivered a number of speeches in various cities of Great Britain, more particularly in London, Liverpool, Manchester and Glasgow, and also at Birmingham, I think. He went to England after having been elected upon his pledge to this country that he would send commissioners to the mother country for the purpose of securing preferential trade wthin the empire. Yet, while in Great Britain he took the ground there that we did not desire preferential trade at all, that we had no desire whatever for any preference in the markets of the mother country. Now the language of the right hon. gentleman in Great Britain, which has been often quoted, is as follows:—

> I claim for the present government of Canada that they have passed a resolution by which the products of Great Britain are admitted on the rate of their tariff, at 12½ per cent, and next year at 25 per cent reduction. This we have done, not asking any compensation.
>
> There is a class of our fellow citizens who ask that all such concessions should be made for 'quid pro quo.'

And that was an expression which the hon. gentleman used in a great many speeches on the other side, I am only quoting one.

> The Canadian government has ignored all such sentiments.
>
> We have done it because we owe a debt of gratitude to Great Britain. We have done it because it is no intention of ours to disturb in any way the system of free trade which has done so much for England.

I could quote from a great many speeches of the hon. gentleman on the other side, if there should be any denial on the subject, in which he said that free trade was to be upheld in Great Britain at all possible hazards, that Canada did not desire anything in the world which would in any way affect the stability of free trade in the mother country, and that Canada generally speaking did not desire any return whatever for the preference which we had given to the mother country. Well, the right hon. gentleman continued:

> What we give you by our tariff we give you in gratitude for the splendid freedom under which we have prospered. It is a free gift. We ask no compensation. Protection has been the curse of Canada. We would not see you

come under its baneful influence—for what weakens you must weaken us.

I am sure that when my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works realizes the full force of that language he will experience a shock which will incapacitate him from any further work in this House for two or three weeks at least. The right hon. gentleman thus deliberately renounced the intention he had expressed to the people of this country that he would do his utmost to procure a system of mutual preferential trade within the empire, and as a part of that system, a preference for Canada in the markets of the mother country. He did that without any mandate from parliament. Parliament had not passed upon the subject at all. He did that coming fresh from the people in a campaign in which he had given his pledge that he would do his utmost to secure this preference. And so far as we were able to judge at the time, he even did this without any mandate from his colleagues; because, if report is to be believed, some of his colleagues were not particularly pleased at the very extreme way in which he expressed himself on that occasion with regard to this matter. The hon. gentleman, on his return to Canada, took an entirely different position. You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that in England he said he did not desire any preference in the markets of the mother country, he did not desire any return for the preference we had given her, that we had done this as a free gift. The right hon. gentleman came back to Canada and went to Toronto, and what did he say there? He told the people of Toronto that the reason he did not make any attempt in the mother country to obtain a preference, was, not because he did not want it, but because he knew he could not obtain it—a very different reason altogether. His language at Toronto was reported as follows:

> If I had thought I could have obtained for the products of Canada preferential treatment in the markets of Great Britain, not only would I have been wanting in patriotism, but I would have been wanting in reason, I would have been simply an idiot if I had not obtained such preference for the products of Canada.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> The treaties have been denounced, there is nothing in the way now, the coast is clear, the ground is ready for discussion.

While the hon. gentleman's position as expressed by him in Great Britain was that Canada did not want any preference, his position as stated in Toronto was that he did want a preference very much, but that he did not make any attempt to obtain it because he knew that he could not get it.

Now apparently the expression of opinion which he gave in Great Britain during 1897, is that which is entertained by some members of his cabinet up to the present time, because I notice that the Minister of Agriculture, on two or three occasions during the past year—I am quoting from newspapers sent out under his own frank to members of parliament, and I assume they contain a correct statement of his utterances—the Minister of Agriculture has taken upon himself in Great Britain during the past year, to tell the people that we wanted in return for this preference no preference in the markets of the mother country. 'Canada asks for no preference,' was what the hon. gentleman stated in Liverpool on one occassion. He repeated the same thing in Manchester: 'He was not going to ask for any advantage in their markets' and so on. So the view which the right hon. gentleman expressed in 1897 seems to be the view of some of his colleagues at least even as late as 1900, because we have the Minister of Agriculture expressing that view to the people and the statesmen of the mother country during that year. Now would it not have been worth while for the hon. gentleman to have made some effort at least in the line of obtaining this preference in 1897? What have we been told with regard to the disposition of the mother country towards us at that time? Why, we have heard the statement over and over again in this House and in this country, that the granting of this preference to the mother country caused the people and statesmen of that country to be very well disposed to us, to such an extent that we had practically a preference in the British market by reason of the fact that British consumers looked for Canadian goods instead of goods from other countries. Well, some figures which have been given to the House during the present session on the budget debate indicate that there was really nothing whatever in that idea. As a matter of fact, while imports to Great Britain from other countries have increased during the past years, imports from Canada in exactly the same articles have decreased during the past years. If the people and statesmen of the mother country had that favourable sentiment towards Canada in 1897, was it worth while for my right hon. friend to take the ground that he did, and to mislead the people in the mother country by telling them that Canada did not want any preference? The right hon. gentleman surely might have stopped short of that; he might at least have told the people of the mother country that he was elected upon a pledge to do his utmost to obtain a preference for Canada in the markets of the mother country, and that, provided the people of the mother country were willing, he was ready to discuss that question with them, and to do everything in his power to obtain that great boon for Canada. The hon. gentleman was very generous in giving away something which really did not belong to him. He was bound to protect Canada's rights in that respect, but he had no mandate from this country he had no mandate from this House, and I venture to think he had no mandate from his colleagues to give away the rights of

Canada in that respect by making the statement which he did in the mother country.

Now, since the right hon. gentleman took that course, the Liberal-Conservative party in this House have on various occasions affirmed its belief in the advantages of mutual preferential trade. On the 30th day of March, 1900, Sir Charles Tupper moved the following resolution in this House :

> This House is of opinion that a system of mutual trade preference between Great Britain and Ireland and the colonies would greatly stimulate increased production in and commerce between these countries and would thus promote and maintain the unity of the empire ; and that no measure of preference which falls short of the complete realization of such a policy should be considered as final or satisfactory.

The government did not accept that resolution and it was defeated. In 1901 I moved the following resolution in this House :

> That in the opinion of this House the adoption of a policy of mutual trade preference within the empire would prove of great benefit to the mother country and to the colonies and would greatly promote the prosperity, unity and progress of the empire as a whole, and that the present time when the Commonwealth of Australia is laying the foundation of its fiscal system, is particularly opportune for taking prompt and energetic steps towards the furtherance of this object.
>
> This House is further of opinion that equivalent or adequate duties should be imposed by Canada upon the products and manufactures of countries not within the empire in all cases where such countries fail to admit Canadian products and manufactures upon fair terms and that the government should take for this purpose all such available measures as may be found necessary.

This resolution was not accepted by the government and was voted down. The main grounds which the government and their supporters took in voting down this resolution were twofold. In the first place, they put forward the absolute hopelessness of expecting the mother country to impose duties on foodstuffs. I will not weary the House by going over the debate and pointing out, in the language of almost every one of these hon. gentlemen, the argument which was based upon that supposed aspect of the question. But, I will quote from the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) who said in his speech in 1897 :

> All the advocates of preferential trade, at all events all who have taken an active part in that movement, have assumed that, as the first step, England must consent to put a duty on corn. We know that England does not view that project with favour. We know that no more unpopular project can be offered the English people than to ask them to put a duty on breadstuffs.

In 1900 the hon. gentleman, in an interview in Montreal, I think, said :

> There are three points which Sir Charles Tupper would like to make, but in not one of them is there any foundation for his efforts. He continues to talk about the Conservative party obtaining a tariff preference for Canadian products in England ; that is to say, that Great Britain would impose duties on foreign foodstuffs while admitting those of Canada free. This is an old cry with Sir Charles Tupper, but no one knows better than he does that it is arrant humbug.
>
> Everybody who has had a correct view of English public opinion has been and is still aware that such tariff legislation in Great Britain for the present or the early future is impossible.

Well, our position in regard to this matter was that the policy of Canada should be a policy of action and not a policy of inaction. We did not believe it as impossible as hon. gentlemen argued on the other side that Great Britain would be disposed to impose a tax upon foodstuffs and upon corn. At all events, we said, it is in the interests of Canada that efforts should be made for the purpose of inducing Great Britain to grant us a preference in her markets. It may be true, we said, that the project does not meet with favour in Great Britain at the present time, but what we read in the press of Great Britain, and of the utterances of statesmen in Great Britain at the present time leads us to suppose that a change in public sentiment in regard to that particular matter is rapidly coming about in the mother country. And it is the duty of this government, we said, having regard to that probable change, not to sit supinely in a state of inaction and say it is impossible, but to make some effort in the matter, because Canada will be none the worse off if you do make some effort and take some action, while on the other hand it may result in some very material advantage to this country.

Even more significant is the language which the right hon. leader of the government used in this House in the debate of 1901 in which debate he put forward the other argument which has been used against this proposition—the other argument which is that unless Canada is prepared not only to give up her policy of protection, but her customs tariff also, it is absolutely hopeless to suppose that you can ever obtain a preference of this kind or any system of mutual preferential trade within the empire. I was surprised on looking over the debate to find the extent to which the right hon. gentleman had gone in making an assertion of that character and I find that the position he took, as the leader of his party, supported by many statements of hon. gentlemen who followed him in that debate, was this. In the debate upon a resolution introduced by me in 1901, the right hon. gentleman used this language :

> Allusion has been made very often to my trip to England and to the position I took there. The position I took there was this : I acted like a reasonable man, I saw at once that it could not be possible, so great is the free trade sentiment in England, to have a mutuality of preference so long as we continue to levy customs duties upon English goods. But the moment we are ready—it may take a long time, but I hope some day it shall come—to discard our

tariff, the moment we come to the doctrine of free trade, then it is possible to have a commercial mutual preference based upon free trade in the empire.

The right hon. gentleman continues even more strongly. Referring to the Conservatives' quid pro quo argument, the premier said :

Such a policy would not be received in Great Britain, it is not to be taken seriously. It is not a thing to be discussed seriously. . . . . If we are at any time to obtain mutual preferential trade between Great Britain and Canada —and more than once I have stated that for my part, I think it would be a great advantage for Canada, but if we are to obtain it, upon what condition can we have it ?

I would like to call the attention of the House to what the right hon. gentleman stated to be the condition :

We can have it perhaps upon one condition, but we cannot discuss it unless we have that condition.

Mark you, we cannot discuss it even unless we have that condition.

We cannot even discuss it as long as we have a protective tariff or a customs tariff in Canada. That is the position which I have taken again and again.

That is the right hon. gentleman's language used only last year. He says that we are pointing in the direction of free trade. We have not absolutely got free trade but we are pointing in the direction of free trade. I believe that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Tarte) is pulling back in the traces upon that particular question, as hard as he can, but the right hon. gentleman who leads him tells us that we are pointing in the direction of free trade. We are not even in a position to discuss mutual preferential trade with the mother country unless we give up, not only our protective tariff, but even our customs tariff as well. The right hon. gentleman has told the right hon. Secretary of State for the Colonies that he wants to discuss the question of commercial relations within the empire. That is the only subject mentioned by the Secretary of State for the Colonies which he thinks it will be useful or profitable to discuss. What does he mean by commercial relations within the empire ? If he means anything surely he is alluding to a mutual preferential trade within the empire. If he was alluding to anything else, when he used the expression 'commercial relations within the empire' as a subject for discussion perhaps he will be good enough to tell us what it was, and until he does so I shall assume that he had reference to that subject. But, he has told us that we cannot even discuss it at the present time unless we are ready to give up, not only our protective tariff, but our customs tariff. These were not light words which the right hon. gentleman used in the debate last year. These were well-matured views. These words were considered, no doubt, and these are words that were reiterated over and over again in the speech—that unless we were prepared to give up, not only our protective tariff, but our customs tariff as well, we were not even in a position to discuss the question of mutual preferential trade within the empire. My right hon. friend will not discuss political relations; he says that except in a few minor points they are all right. He will not discuss the question of imperial defence, and he cannot discuss the question of commercial relations within the empire. It then follows, necessarily, that the right hon. gentleman must go there, sit in the conference and never open his mouth and it will not be necessary for him, in so far as any useful or practical result is concerned, to delay any holiday trip he may have in view after attending the Coronation ceremonies as he has precluded himself from saying anything useful upon this subject. After he had told the people of the mother country in 1897 that we did not want a preference, he sent his Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) over there during the past year to reiterate that statement and he did so. He has told the people of the mother country that he will not discuss the question of political relations, that he will not discuss the question of imperial defence and he told the people in a well considered speech last year that we were not in a position to discuss the question of mutual preferential trade at all unless we were prepared to give up not only the protective system in Canada, but our customs tariff as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the right hon. gentleman is going to the conference, and if he proposes to enter into any discussion upon the subjects which have been mentioned : we are entitled to know what the policy of the government is with regard to these different subjects. The right hon. gentleman's conduct did not commend itself to this side of the House at least, when he told the people of the mother country in 1897, that Canada did not want a preference. We are entitled to know what the attitude of the government is now, and we are entitled to know even what steps the government have taken with regard to mutual preferential trade within the empire during the past few months.

In the months of January and February ; nay, as far back as the months of November and December of last year, it was in the air, it was in the press, it was all over England and all over Canada, that duties were likely to be imposed on foodstuffs by the mother country. What steps have the government of Canada taken for the purpose of securing complete or partial exemption from these duties ? Have they lifted their finger for that purpose ? In view of the preference of 33⅓ per cent which we have given the mother country, have we made any presentation pointing out that my right hon. friend did not correctly inform the mother country in 1897, when he stated that

we want no preference. Have the Canadian government taken any steps to withdraw that declaration? Have they taken any steps to point out that Canada at the present time is very desirous that there should be an exemption of Canadian products from this tax, either in whole or in part. If the government of Canada have not done that, they have not done their duty. I have examined to some extent what has taken place in the English parliament, because it would seem to be hopeless to obtain information from this government on the subject; and I find that a member of the imperial parliament was informed by the government that a letter from Lord Strathcona had been received by the imperial government upon this subject. Well, a letter from Lord Strathcona is not exactly the way in which we would expect a communication of this kind to go to the imperial government. We would suppose that there would be a memorandum and a communication from the Governor General to the Colonial Secretary, and we would expect that a communication of that kind would within a reasonable delay, and particularly during the session of parliament, be laid upon the Table of this House. There can be no excuse whatever for the Canadian government taking no steps in this matter, because their attention was very often directed to it through the public press, and many commercial bodies passed resolutions on the subject asking the Canadian government to bring the matter to the attention of the British government. On the 21st of April last the right hon. gentleman stated that copies of these documents which had been forwarded to this government would be laid upon the Table of the House. Although a considerable delay has elapsed they have not yet been laid on the Table, but I happen to have a copy of one of them which I shall read. I suppose there must have been so many of these that the great volume of the correspondence between the Boards of Trade and the government has caused delay in the copying. However, the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto, on the 10th of February, 1902, passed a resolution which is in the following words:

THE BOARD OF TRADE OF THE CITY OF TORONTO.

Report of Committee 're duty on Wheat.'

To the President of the Board of Trade.

Your committee having fully considered the question referred to them, beg leave to report the following resolution for submission to a general meeting of the board:—

Whereas, according to the press despatches it is the intention at the present session of the imperial parliament to levy additional taxes in order to meet the heavy expenditure caused by the war in South Africa, and the large additions to the British navy, and amongst other products which may be taxed wheat has been especially mentioned.

In view of the position so strongly urged by this board for many years, for a preferential treatment of the different products of the empire exchanged therein, and Canada having granted a tariff preference on the products of Great Britain when imported into this country, one of the results being that Germany has discriminated in her tariff against us by imposing practically prohibitory duties on our cereals, thus closing a valuable market to our farmers;

Therefore, be it resolved, that in the opinion of this board, any tax placed by Great Britain upon products similar to those produced in this country should be so levied as to grant a preference to the products produced within the empire.

That if Great Britain should see her way clear to adopt such a policy, it would result in the knitting together still closer the various parts of the empire, and thus materially strenghen our position by diverting to the colonies a large portion of the emigration from the United Kingdom now going elsewhere, with the result that ere long the wheat and other food products required could be entirely supplied within the empire.

And that copies of this resolution be sent to the premier of Canada, and he be requested to cable the same to the Honorable Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary, Lord Curzon, Viceroy of India, and the premiers of Australia and New Zealand, and to forward them the full text of the resolution by mail.

Further, that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the different boards of trade and commercial bodies in Canada, and that they be requested to pass similar resolutions and forward them to the proper authorities.

(Sgd.) C. B. WATTS,
Chairman.

Toronto, February 10, 1902.

Adopted as the report of the board at a general meeting held on February 12th, 1902.

This was adopted at a general meeting of the Toronto Board of Trade on February 12, 1902, and as I am informed a copy was immediately sent thereafter to this government. Therefore this government had ample notice that these duties were likely to be imposed and had ample opportunity to take energetic and active steps in good time for the purpose of impressing on the British government the desirability that the products of Canada should be exempt in whole or in part from these duties imposed by the mother country.

Now, I did propose, Mr. Speaker, to move a resolution, setting out some of these facts which I have mentioned in a succinct form, as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply; but I do not wish to take any step which instead of being an assistance might rather be a detriment so far as any action by this government may be taken at the present time. Therefore, I prefer to say to the government and to the right hon. gentleman who leads the government: That on this side of the House we are prepared to support a resolution assuring our belief in the advantages of a system of mutual trade preference with the empire, and so far as we are concerned, to have that resolution passed in the House unanimously for the purpose of strengthening the hands of

the government at the approaching conference. I think that is a fairer way to deal with the question than to move an amendment setting out the various matters which I have dealt with in my speech to-night. I thought it well to review these matters as I have done, and I say that so far as assisting the government in its endeavour—if it proposes to make any endeavour to procure a preference for Canada in the markets of the mother country—we, on this side of the House, place the interest of the country, above the interests of the party if they ever differ, and we are prepared to acquiesce in a resolution of that kind and to assist the government in having it passed this House unanimously.

Now, Sir, I wish to say before sitting down that the country expects from the government some declaration as to the course which will be pursued by the Prime Minister and his colleagues at this conference. It is only fair to the House and to the country that some full and explicit statement should be made by the right hon. gentleman with regard to his course. I think we should know what policy he proposes as the policy of the government with regard to all the subjects which have been mentioned by the Secretary of State for the Colonies as proper subjects for discussion at this conference. We want to know whether the government, while retaining for Canada the full control of all her public moneys and her system of defence, is prepared to discuss with the imperial authorities a sysetem of imperial defence. We want to know whether the Prime Minister proposes, as he did in 1897, and as the Minister of Agriculture did in 1901, to tell the government and the people of the mother country that Canada desires no preference in the British markets. We want to know whether the government are yet fully seized of the fact that the British government have adopted a policy with regard to duties on breadstuffs which the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues have repeatedly declared during the past 5 or 6 years was absolutely impossible of adoption by the mother country in the near future. We want to know whether, having regard to that changed condition of affairs, the government are still impressed with the opinion expressed by the Prime Minister repeatedly in the debate of 1901, that Canada cannot obtain any preference in the British market nor any system of preferential trade with the mother country unless Canada is prepared to give up not only her protective tariff, but her customs tariff. Now, I submit, Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is not an unreasonable thing which we on this side of the House are asking the right hon. leader of the government on this occasion. We desire to be informed as to the course he proposes to take with regard to these great and important subjects; and I trust that the right hon. gentleman, before he sits down, will give us such clear and explicit information on that point, as will enable us to judge accurately, and if necessary to criticise the attitude which he proposes to take on behalf of this country at the conference to be held in June next.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Mr. Speaker, I might regret that my hon. friend has waited until we are in the dying hours of the session to bring to the attention of the House a question of such great importance, but for the fact that my hon. friend, in the long and evidently well-prepared speech which he has delivered, has brought nothing very new to our attention. He has covered ground with which we are already familiar; he has brought forth notions and arguments and facts which we have heard over and over again during the last 4 or 5 years. I may, perhaps, be permitted to compliment my hon. friend on the fact that he has evidently developed a good deal of capacity as a scrap-book man. I must admit that he has not reached the eminence of some of his predecessors in that line; but for a first effort he has not done badly. On the whole, however, I have no fault to find with the tone of the speech of my hon. friend. On the contrary, making allowance for the views he entertains, and for his natural desire to have a dig at the ribs of the government, I think that on the whole he has treated this subject in a very fair manner. I will endeavour to follow him in the same tone and spirit, and give him the information which he asks from me. My hon. friend bases his whole argument on the despatches which have been exchanged between the imperial government and the Canadian government upon the subject of the conference which is to sit next summer in London. Perhaps in order to make the matter still more clear than it may be in the memories of the members present, I may be pardoned if I recall the tenor of that correspondence. It will be sufficient for the time being to refer to the despatch of the 23rd of January last from Mr. Chamberlain to the Governor General, which was in the following terms :

> It is proposed by His Majesty's government to take advantage of the presence of the premiers at Coronation to discuss with them the questions of political relations between the mother country and the colonies, imperial defence, commercial relations of the empire and other matters of general interest.
>
> Should your ministers desire to submit definite proposal or resolutions on any of the above questions or should they wish to suggest any further subject for discussion, I should be glad to be informed of purport by cable in order that the other governments can be communicated with.
>
> With view to proposed conference, hope your premier will be able to remain for a short time.

To this about a week afterwards we sent the following answer :

> Referring to the several questions mentioned in your despatch of 23rd January, the only one

which in the opinion of my ministers, gives promise of useful discussion is that of the commercial relations between the various sections of the empire. The political relations now existing between the mother country and the great self-governing colonies, and particularly Canada, are regarded by my ministers as entirely satisfactory, with the exception of a few minor details, and they do not anticipate that in the varying conditions of the colonies, there can be any scheme of defence applicable to all.

In the opinion of my ministers, there is thus but a limited range of subjects upon which the contemplated conference can be productive of useful action. Nevertheless my ministers realize the desirability of taking advantage of every opportunity for the discussion by the public men of the mother country and the colonies, of questions of imperial interest, and Canada's representative will be prepared to give respectful consideration to any proposals that may be submitted by His Majesty's government or by the representatives of other colonies.

I may remark here that my hon. friend commented this evening, as he did once before, upon this answer of ours as being wanting in courtesy to the imperial authorities. Sir, I would like to know, and I pause here to ask the House, what is the word in this despatch which I have just read, which can be said to be in any way wanting in courtesy? What is the expression as to which exception can be taken, either by the mother country or by this parliament, which would go to show that we did not treat the imperial authorities with the consideration and respect to which they are entitled? Certainly there is nothing in the despatch which I have just read to which any such exception can be taken. If there is anything that is wanting in courtesy, in the opinion of my hon. friend, it is not to be found in the language of the despatch, but in its substance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My right hon. friend will pardon me. I do not remember using any such expression as that which he attributes to me.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am very glad that my hon. friend takes exception to my observation; but if I were permitted to refer to a past debate, I could quote expressions which have been used in this House and repeated over and over again by the press which supports the hon. gentleman, with reference to this despatch as wanting in courtesy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think my right hon. friend is referring to some observations made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean).

The PRIME MINISTER. It is sufficient, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend disclaims that intention, and I will not pursue that matter any further. I now come to the substance of the answer. My hon. friend says we ought to be prepared to discuss the subject of imperial defence. I think I am correctly stating the position he has taken this evening. I may observe to my hon. friend upon this subject that the conference will be composed of representatives of the imperial government and the self-governing colonies. It will include representatives from Canada, Australia, New Zeland, Newfoundland, Natal, and Cape Colony, and perhaps a few others. It will be open to all members of this conference to bring to its consideration any subject he may please. We all know that the First Minister of New Zealand, Mr. Seddon, proposes to bring to its attention the subject of imperial defence, and if we are to credit the newspaper reports which have appeared recently, the Premier of Australia, Mr. Barton, has rather taken the same course we have and deprecated the introduction of any such subject. At all events, we shall be there, at the invitation of the imperial government, to discuss all the subjects mentioned in the despatch I have read, and we propose to discuss them in the spirit of the reply we have given. That is to say, while we are prepared to discuss this question of imperial defence, neither my colleagues nor myself believe that any useful purpose can be served by such discussion. It is no use whatever, at this stage of the proceeding, on the floor of this Canadian parliament, to try to deceive ourselves as to what is intended by this subject of imperial defence. If it be intended simply to discuss what part Canada is prepared to take in her own defence, what share of the burden must fall upon us as being responsible for the safety of the land in which we were born and to which we owe our allegiance, in which all our hopes and affections are centered, certainly we are always prepared to discuss that subject. Nor do I believe that we need any prompting on that subject or that our attention should be specially called to it. Even this very session the government has given its pledge to the House that it is prepared to consider and to the fullest extent to carry out its duty on this score, and in that declaration the government received the support of both sides. But there is a school abroad, there is a school in England and in Canada, a school which is perhaps represented on the floor of this parliament, which wants to bring Canada into the vortex of militarism which is now the curse and the blight of Europe. I am not prepared to endorse any such policy. But the Canadian delegates will give a respectful hearing to all the propositions that may be made, and it is in this spirit I speak, and speak with candour. My hon. friend asked me to give expression to our intentions. Well, I can assure him that I intend to perform the duties which will devolve upon me when in England. I am speaking my full mind and have given my answer as to the position we hold on this question, an answer which I think should satisfy him. My hon. friend has not mentioned the political relations which we are invited to discuss in the des-

patch of Mr. Chamberlain, and since he has thought fit to leave that matter aside I shall follow his example.

But he has come to the commercial relations and prefaced his remarks on this subject by expressing the hope that we are all one in desiring a mutual preference between Canada and Great Britain. He expressed the hope that all parties were as one on that subject, but I must say that I am sufficiently incredulous to doubt my hon. friends sincerity. I have heard a good many expressions on this subject from my hon. friend and his friends behind him. I have heard them state more than once that they were in favour of a mutual preference, but notwithstanding all declarations I have heard on the subject from these gentlemen, notwithstanding the many eloquent speeches from the other side on this topic, I am yet in doubt whether or not it is the sincere wish of hon. gentlemen opposite to have a mutual preference. I will not go over the speeches they have made. I shall not follow my hon. friend in quoting from scrap books, but shall content myself with the single declaration just spoken by my hon. friend himself and to which he invited and received the full concurrence of his followers. I refer to the resolution, moved and voted on this session, and which reads in this way :

> This House, regarding the operation of the present tariff as unsatisfactory, is of opinion that this country requires a declared policy of such adequate protection to its labour, agricultural products and manufacturing industries, as will at all times insure the Canadian market for the Canadians.

Now, Sir, if the Canadian market is to be secured for Canadians, where is the preference to come for British goods? What place is to be left in the Canadian market for the British ? What is the preference these hon. gentlemen are going to give Great Britain if we are to have protection ? Protection against whom ? Against the United States ? Of course. Against Germany ? Of course. Against France ? As a matter of course. And against England ? As a matter of course also. If that is the policy of these hon. gentlemen, if they have nailed protection to the mast of the ship they intend to sail, if their policy is protection against the world, Canada for the Canadians, I want to know what is the preference we are to give British goods. My hon. friend told me a moment ago that he was ready to vote in favour of a resolution of which I shall speak in a few moments, and I want him to supplement his resolution by instructing me as to what goods of Canadian manufacture, our manufacturers are willing to sacrifice at the colonial conference next summer. I would ask him if, in his opinion, Canada should give a preference to British woollens. I see the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Brock) before me. He wants a preference given Great Britain, I know, but I would like to know if he is prepared to give the British manufacturer a preference on woollen goods.

Mr. BROCK. Yes, if we have a preference in return in the English market.

The PRIME MINISTER. I am glad to hear that my hon. friend from Toronto is prepared to sacrifice his woollens. I have heard him more than once complain that the preference we had given had killed the manufacture of woollens here.

Mr. BROCK. We get no preference in return.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friends opposite are in favour of a preference to Great Britain in words. Let us hope that they are in fact also.

Mr. BROCK. Hear, hear.

The PRIME MINISTER. More than once, on the floor of this House, reference has been made to a speech which I delivered in London in the campaign of 1896. My hon. friend referred to it this evening. It was referred to last year and the year before and the year previous. I have heard it again and again. But there is one thing which I said on that occasion to which I have not heard any reference up to this moment. I stated that if returned to power we would take steps to obtain a mutual preference in Great Britain. That is one thing which has never been quoted from that speech, and if somebody will send to the library for the report of that speech he will find that in it I referred to the speeches delivered in that campaign by Sir Charles Tupper, in which he declared that Great Britain was ready and willing to give us a preference. Sir Charles Tupper made that statement again and again in 1896. He made it, not by innuendo alone, but directly, that Great Britain, if approached by Canada, would be willing to give us a preference, provided Canada was prepared to do the same. The position I took was this, that if Great Britain is to give us a preference, the Conservative party is not the party to obtain it, but the Liberal party, because the Conservative party believes in protection.

That was the cardinal principle on which they appealed to the country. Whereas, our policy is a system of extended free trade. Therefore, we are in a better position to make concessions to Great Britain than the Conservative party are. But we found, as soon as we obtained power, that Sir Charles Tupper had been too sanguine, and that the British government were not prepared to depart from their fiscal system. Therefore, we had to take the position we did. As we could not obtain an imperial preference we thought we would give a preference ourselves. Why did we do that ? Because it was our best measure of tariff reform. And it has served its purpose well. It may not have accomplished all that we had

hoped; nevertheless the results are there and show for themselves, one of them being that our trade with Great Britain has almost doubled within five years.

Again this evening my hon. friend has attacked the British preference. But, while he has attacked it he has done what everybody on his side has done—while attacking this preference in words they have never dared to attack it in action. Not one of them has been able to screw his courage to the sticking-place. They have been willing to wound, but afraid to strike. If the preference has been what they represent it, if it has been so injurious to the country why, in the name of all that is courageous, have they not attacked it long ago? Why have they not attacked it this evening? When we adopted the preference to Great Britain, we achieved something. We forced the British government to denounce the German and Belgian treaties. My hon. friend has attacked us for the policy we have adopted on this point. But what is the result? I am almost ashamed to be obliged to refer to the fact again, it has been so often stated. But, as the attack has been made, I must recall attention to the fact that the Conservative party, again and again, pressed the government of Great Britain to denounce the treaties with Germany and Belgium. They failed, but we succeeded. And now they attack us because we succeeded. Sir, we could not remove the shackles that held us bound to Germany and Belgium unless these treaties were denounced. And, having gained the denunciation of these treaties, it will not do to attack us because we have brought about the existing state of affairs between Canada and Germany. We have moved in the matter. Our efforts may succeed or not. If they succeed, we shall be vindicated; if not we will have to say what position we shall take as to our relations with Germany.

Now, a word with regard to the different questions that have been put to me by my hon. friend as to our attitude at the coming conference. My hon. friend wants an explicit answer to these questions. He was a little jocose upon this point. He says: The Prime Minister is going to London, but he will have no reason to take part in this conference, as he will have nothing to say—he will not discuss imperial defence and he cannot discuss commercial relations. I do not think the hon. gentleman has read attentively and with his usual acumen the despatch that has come to us from Mr. Chamberlain. But, as it has escaped his attention let me read it to him:

> It is proposed by His Majesty's government to take advantage of the presence of the premiers at the Coronation to discuss with them the questions of political relations between the mother country and the colonies, imperial defence, commercial relations of the empire——

Now, what am I going to England for? I am going to England to discuss the commercial relations of the empire. I am going to England at the instance and invitation of the imperial government. The imperial government has something to propose to us, therefore, upon the subject of imperial relations. I cannot conceive that Mr. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, would invite the representatives of the colonies to come to England to discuss commercial relations unless the British government has something to propose on the subject of commercial relation. Has my hon. friend any other interpretation to put upon this invitation? Does my hon. friend believe, when the Colonial Secretary invites us to discuss commercial relations, that it is simply pro forma? Has not this invitation been given because something has taken place, or will take place which will make the discussion of commercial relations possible? My hon. friend is aware, as I am and as everybody is, that there has been a change in the economic conditions of Great Britain. What was not proposed in 1897 may possibly be proposed in 1902. In 1897 the fiscal policy which exists to-day did not exist. In 1897 there were no duties upon flour and wheat, but in 1902, there is a duty upon flour and wheat. Therefore, there is a new condition of things in England whose very existence makes possible in 1902 what was not possible in 1897. But my hon. friend says: What have you been doing all this time, have you been bestirring yourselves? What we have been doing is shown in this invitation. We have been preparing all this time in order to meet the Colonial Secretary and to meet our fellow subjects from other parts of the world to discuss the very commercial situation which is now possible through events which have recently taken place in England. We are in a position to make offers to the imperial government which we could not make in 1897. In 1897 we met to discuss certain things and we passed certain resolutions. I hope they have been productive of good. Certainly they have done no harm, and I am honest in believing that they have been productive of some good. In 1902, I go there prepared to listen to the propositions to be made to us upon colonial matters. The first step has been taken which makes it possible now to obtain a preference for the goods of Canada which could not be obtained in 1897. It is possible now that we may open a market. I said in 1897 that we would not disturb the economic conditions of England. We did not want to do anything which would make a violent change in Britain. We realized that the relations must be friendly between Britain and Canada, that it was important that the subject should be discussed free from the prejudices that exist in every country. We raise revenue by a customs tariff; in England, they raise a revenue under a free trade tariff. No man can go to England and achieve anything, if he thinks he will be able to force his views upon them. We

must find a common ground upon which both the people of Britain and the people of the colonies can stand, each side giving up some thing, and so bring Britain and the colonies to an agreement acceptable to all. My hon. friend says : What are you going to propose ? We will first listen to the propositions made to us by the British authorities. I assume, from the statements I have in hand that the government of Great Britain has propositions to make to the colonies, upon this matter of commercial relations; for, if not, it would be worse than folly to ask us to discuss the matter. After we have listened to the propositions made to us by the imperial government we can see whether we can accept them; and whether we can or can not accept them, we go there with the intention of trying, if possible, to secure preferential treatment for the goods of Canada in the British market. That is the object we have in view.

Now, Sir, my hon. friend told us a moment ago that he would be pleased if this House could pass a resolution unanimously. I am quite prepared to say that I should be glad to confer upon that subject with my hon. friend. Since he has offered me this olive branch I am ready to meet him and to discuss a resolution or a proposition which we can put into such a shape that it can be adopted unanimously. That is the only answer which at this moment I am ready to make to my hon. friend. He wanted to have a candid answer from me upon the question that he has put to me. I think I am able to say that I have answered his question candidly in every point ; I have answered candidly upon the military question, I have answered candidly upon the commercial question ; and if my hon. friend is disposed to continue to be conciliatory he will find that I should be only too glad to meet him half way in anything that he has to propose.

Mr. W. R. BROCK (Centre Toronto). The right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister, in commencing his reply, if it can be called a reply, to the address that was delivered by the leader of the opposition, stated that it was to be regretted that the leader of the opposition had left this very important question, probably the most important question that could come before this House or this country, to be discussed so near the end of the session. I think, Sir, it was a great reflection upon the Prime Minister himself that he should have left, not only this House, but this whole country in positive ignorance and darkness as to the position he was going to take when going to England to discuss this question. I can say that at the present time, not only the eyes of this House and of this country, but I think the eyes of the whole empire are upon the Canadian government, wondering what position they will take at this critical time. The fact that the Prime Minister and his government have neglected to indicate what position they are going to take is a reflection upon the political acumen which the Prime Minister prides himself upon. The national, the political and the business position of this country at the present time is an object lesson as well as an object to the whole civilized world. This parliament representing the Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a land that is now being pointed to all over the world as a good land and a desirable land to occupy, this parliament has been here for nearly three months and we still have no indication of a definite and well defined policy—for no government is worthy of the name that has not a policy and a well defined policy. This country wants to know, and the British Empire wants to know what that defined policy is. This House has listened as usual with delight to the eloquent words of the leader of the government, and I defy any hon. gentleman to stand up in his place and say what is the policy that the government intend to carry out when they go to England. The Prime Minister says they are going to listen to what is being said by others. I contend that this government, with a Prime Minister with a reputation such as our Prime Minister has got, should go there to do something more than listen, they should go there to lead. We are constantly told by the English parliament and statesmen that they look to us for guidance in matters of commerce.

But I think if we look into this matter we will find that some of the difficulties of the Prime Minister come from his own colleagues. They are hampered by the wild statements some of them made when they went before the people in 1896. The Prime Minister asks : If we protect Canada for Canadian goods, what have we to give to England ? I ask him to look across the border. The United States have protected up to the hilt everything they can manufacture in that country, and yet they are one of the largest importers of British goods on the face of the globe. They collect a very large amount of duty on British goods. Is this not an example for us ? Can we not protect our own industries and at the same time import an immense amount of English goods ? And we give English goods a preference over all the rest of the world. While we are importing at the present time German goods and paying full duty upon them, we are importing a much larger quantity of German goods surreptitiously into this country through England, through the supineness and weakness of the policy adopted when the Prime Minister was in England. After having secured the denunciation of the German and Belgium treaties, the Prime Minister asks what more can we do ? Germany and Belgium have placed us on the black list. Could we not have asked Great Britain to intercede for us, to avail herself of the great ability of her statesmen and

her great reputation, to ask Germany to recede from the position she has taken in consideration of Great Britain receiving German goods free ? I contend that when Lord Salisbury stated that he was doing this for the benefit of the empire he meant what he said. We know what the empire includes. Could he not, then, in the interest of the empire, have said to Germany, either give Canada the same duties you give the rest of the empire, or the empire will put a duty upon your goods coming into Great Britain. Are you aware, Mr. Speaker, what that would mean ?. It would mean that one-third of the whole business of the German empire would be cut off. London is one of the greatest distributors of German goods and continental goods on the face of the earth. The Germans have their samples there, they have their market there, it is their greatest market. German goods come into England and are sold in England, and in many cases are carried in British bottoms to foreign countries. Therefore, I contend that Lord Salisbury meant what he said, and we know a British statesman always means what he says. We have some doubt in our own country as to what our statesmen mean when they speak, but we have no doubt about the word of British statesmen. When Lord Salisbury said that he meant this for the benefit of the empire, it was for the benefit of the British empire, and not for the detriment of this particular part of it. Therefore I contend that the position taken by the Prime Minister in England was one of the most unfortunate things that ever happened to the empire. He says that we want no return, that we did this out of good feeling and good will. These are very good sentiments, they would be good sentiments if we were a wealthy country and were able to give something for nothing. But we are inviting British immigrants, and immigrants from all parts of the world, to come into Canada, and I contend that the present is the time above all others when this matter should be settled. I desire to endorse the statement of my leader that the Prime Minister will not be hampered from this side of the House if he goes with a business proposition to the old country and not a sentimental one.

When the Prime Minister goes to England he will go, I have not the slightest doubt, with the very best intention in his heart to do what is best for Canada. I am proud to say that of him as a Canadian statesman. But he will go to England hampered by divided opinions, prompted on one side by a free trade wing and on another side by a protection wing. Even in his own cabinet he finds a difficulty in getting unanimity of opinion ; therefore it does not lie in his mouth to throw any reflections on this side of the House.

We are a united party ; we are where we have stood for the last quarter of a century for the ascendancy of the British Empire, but Canada for the Canadians always. The Right Hon. Prime Minister cannot see where we can have Canada for the Canadians and go to England and ask for a preference in the English market. Is it not better for Great Britain to have a strong and vigorous dependency in Canada than to have a weakling ? Anything which Great Britain can do to increase the strength of her dependencies she will do as she has done in the past. We have been invited to go to England and to discuss questions for the improvement of the whole empire. We may not be able to agree, but I cannot see why that is any reason why the right hon. gentleman should not be willing to discuss any suggestions which may be made for the improvement of the defences of the empire. Is the defence of the empire of no consequence to Canada ? We have manfully undertaken to defend the empire in the past and we will do our best to defend the empire whenever we are called upon to do so. I know the difficulties which surround the right hon. gentleman. I know the great political strength he has in his own province of Quebec and I can see the difficulties arising day by day. We find now that one of the right hon. gentleman's strongest supporters during the last two or three elections, a gentleman with whom he has some difficulty at the present time, has acquired a newspaper. We find that Mr. Bourassa has acquired possession of a paper called, I think, the Pioneer. That is a menace to the right hon. gentleman because the right hon. gentleman wishes to get all the support he can from that hon. gentleman and from those people who endorse his opinions—I will not say disloyal opinions, but who support these opinions in the province of Quebec very strongly, so that the party that sits on the other side of the House must not and cannot despise this hon. gentleman. These opinions carry great weight in the province of Quebec, because they are in accord with the opinions, probably, not of the majority, but of a very respectable minority of the people in that province. These are the difficulties that the right hon. gentleman has and we sympathise with him under those circumstances. They are causing him great difficulty every day. As to discussing with Great Britain the political relations of the empire I do not think there is any difficulty about that. The right hon. gentleman can go to England and discuss these political relations, he can hold his own opinions, and we can trust him to hold his own opinions in an argument with very great ability. But, he seems to express some doubt and difficulty ; when he arrives there he may find that his opinions are not in accord with those of the representatives of the rest of the empire. Have we not found that out before ? When the right hon. gentleman meets the representatives of the other parts of the empire he should be very candid in expressing the opinion of this country

and the opinion of this country is decidedly in the direction of protection to our own industries. This is one thing upon which the country can stand as a unit and he can assert that fact with absolute confidence. We have had some remarkable conversions in this House. Coming from North Norfolk, we have an hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) who has warned the right hon. the Prime Minister that the opinions of the people of this country are not changing but rather that the politicians who advocated free trade are changing. We will have to change, the Prime Minister will have to change before we get from the empire that which we think is our due. Therefore, I would urge upon the right hon. gentleman before going to Great Britain upon this occasion to take counsel with the leader of the Opposition as he has asked him to do. I think it is necessary that he should do so and if he will be guided by this side of the House on this occasion it will cause him to be more successful than when visiting England last.

Mr. JOHN CHARLTON (North Norfolk). My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) who has just taken his seat speaks very truly when he says that the coming conference at London will be an event of very great importance indeed. I can sympathise with the regret which the hon. gentleman expressed that this important question has not been made the subject of discussion in this House at an earlier stage of the session for it certainly deserves an exhaustive discussion and I apprehend that the government will be pleased to hear a general expression of opinion from members of this House upon both sides of your Chair. The criticisms in regard to the conduct of the government and of the statements of the government in the despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies as regards the subject of imperial defence are criticisms that I cannot fully accord with. I believe that the interests of Canada should be a paramount consideration for every citizen of Canada, and I believe that Canada is guided by a spirit of loyalty, is prepared to do its duty by the mother country, has done it heretofore and will do it in the future, but I am not prepared to say, Sir, that bonds should be laid on the country, that enactment should be agreed to and that we should be subjected to hard and fast conditions as to the character of the support that we shall give to the mother country, as to the amount of our contribution, as to the number of men that we should furnish, but, I believe, on the contrary that all these matters should be left to the voluntary choice of the people of this Dominion. We have been developing as a country for 140 years and there has been during all that time a constant and regular tendency and progress towards self control. We had disturbances in 1837 which resulted in giving this country responsible government; we entered upon confederation in 1867 and we assumed and acquired a nationality then. We became the possessers of a national autonomy; we became the possessors of the blessing of self-government in 1867 and since then we have made great progress as a nationality. Our first step was to acquire Prince Edward Island. We then acquired the vast country known as Rupert's Land and then we acquired British Columbia. We have inaugurated a continental system and we inaugurated a national policy in 1878, a national policy which was continued, in point of fact, by the government that succeeded the party that enacted this policy, and in all these things we have been, to the best of our ability and according to the best light that we possessed, advancing the interests of our own native country. Our aid to England in South Africa was rendered voluntarily. Our action in that matter has been greatly to our own credit, it has brought Canada into prominence, it has taught the world that we are possessed of great resources, that we are possessed of gallant men, that we are an important factor in the affairs of the world and I hold that the state of things which now exists is preferable to any arrangement that can be made as the result of a discussion of imperial defence that leads up to the passage of an enactment that will bind Canada down to certain line of action. I believe that the result of such action would beget discontent in this country, and that it is in the interest of England and in the interest of Canada to leave this as it is now—a matter of pure choice and selection on the part of this Dominion as to the course we shall take in connection with imperial defence. If we were bound by enactment as to what we should do and what we should not do; what quota of troops we should furnish and what amount of money we should raise; Britain might engage in a war which would be of no interest to us. She might engage in a war that would not be of the remotest advantage to us, and under circumstances in which we might have a reluctance to act that might result in lamentable consequences because of our being forced to take part in a war of that kind. And, Sir, the only war; the only probable war in the future that will be of prime interest to Canada, will be a war with our great neighbour to the south of us. If such a calamity should ever befall this country, we will not be called upon to give grudgingly or sparingly of our resources, but we shall be obliged to put up the last man and the last dollar in a death struggle for our existence. Apart from such a calamity as this, I cannot imagine what belligerent attitude can arise involving England in difficulties with foreign countries that would be of particular consequence to us. Our participation in the South African war was not because we had interests at stake. Our commerce with that country was of the most insignificant character. It was

purely a matter of sentiment; purely a sacrifice made on our part, because we desired to maintain British prestige; because we desired to maintain British authority in that land; because we realized that it would be a disaster in which we would participate if England lost South Africa, and in losing South Africa, lost her high position among the nations. Other nations may attack Canada, but I apprehend that the great nation to the south of us would not permit an assault on this country that threatened to divert it from the British Crown, and force it under the dominion of any other power. I think we rest perfectly safe in that respect. I repeat that the only war that would seriously threaten our existence will be a war between Great Britain and the United States. It has been asserted that our contributions to the defence of the empire have been paltry. Why, we have made great contributions to the empire ! We have built a road across this continent that has almost doubled our national debt, and this road adds to the prestige and adds to the efficiency, and adds to the power of Great Britain. It is a military highway for the motherland between Europe and Asia. We have in various ways contributed our full quota to the establishment of British authority, to the increase of British power, to the building up of the empire. Canada has great internal problems before her ; problems that require money which would be diverted from its proper use if it were expended in furthering British interests in China or in the Eastern Archipelago or in some remote part of the earth where our own direct interest did not reach. We have our great North-west to look after, and into that country we are just about to receive a deluge of population—200,000 are going in this year; 300,000 perhaps next year, and population will flow into that country as a great human river. We lacked transportation facilities to get the crop out of that country last year, and there are yet 18,-000,000 bushels of grain left in it. What is to be done when the present population of the country is doubled, trebled, quadrupled ? Why, we have to put forth our utmost exertions to give to that country the bare means of getting its productions to market. In my opinion it would be good policy for this government to construct the trans-Canada road from Quebec to Fort Simpson, passing through the Peace river valley with branches running to the valley of the Saskatchewan and other portions of the North-west, for the purpose of affording that great country an outlet, also for the purpose of regulating the rates charged upon other roads. Works of this nature are those that imperiously demand the expenditure of our resources and our money. I repeat that the interests of this country—this half of the continent which is to grow into a great nation—the interests of this country do not demand that we should place ourselves in a position where we would be required to do more in the interest of the empire than our own judgment at the time dictated to us as proper. For that reason I approve of the policy that the Prime Minister has enunciated here with regard to this matter.

There is another consideration that is worthy of being taken into account. If we were to unite with Great Britain in a hard and fast arrangement by which we became a party to conditions as to the amount of money we should pay each year for Imperial defence, by which we should become parties to an arrangement that would dictate to us the number of men we should furnish each year for such purpose; we might be held by the nation to the south of us to have joined in a military national armament of European standing, and we would perhaps bring upon ourselves the interference of the United States.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Rot.

Mr. CHARLTON—It might be rot, but it would be rot backed up by 80,000,000 people with all their prejudices and antipathies and animosities, and it would be the kind of rot we do not want to call down on our heads. Although it might be a most unjust and unreasonable position for the United States to take, yet I can foresee that such a position might be taken, and I do not believe that under the circumstances it is worth while inviting the condition of things that would follow so far as that branch of the subject is concerned, we want to retain our autonomy. We want to retain our perfect self control. We want to give as we feel we should give and we will give as we ought to on every occasion. I do not believe we need anything more than the conditions as they exist to-day.

And now, Sir, with regard to the trade question. I declare myself to-night as I always have done, in favour of a preference for our natural products in the English market. I hope it will be obtained. I have said before, and I say to-night, that I do not believe that the preference that we gave to Great Britain of 33⅓ per cent was a judicious act, although it had the effect of reducing duties. It was a tariff reform in that sense and probably was adopted for that reason. Yet as a mere preference it was more than sentiment required. And when Great Britain imposed duties upon corn—a modified form of the corn laws— a few weeks ago, I looked for a preference to the extent of that duty in favour of Canada, which would have amounted to less than 5 per cent against the 33⅓ per cent we gave. We did not get it, and I do not believe that the idea of getting a preference in the British market rests upon a very good foundation—that is a substantial, tangible preference—and if we cannot get a preference of at least 10 per cent the preference would not be a tangible and desirable one. We could offer to give a preference of 33⅓ per

cent as we do now, for a 10 per cent preference. It would be a very good arrangement, but I doubt if we could ever get it.

I notice in the news of to-night the very significant fact that the riding of Bury in England, in which a by-election has just been held, and which gave a Conservative majority of 849 at the last general election, has returned a Liberal by 414, which is a reverse of 1,263 votes; and the issue in that election was the bread tax pure and simple. This election is an indication to my mind that it is not unlikely that upon this very policy which the present Imperial government have adopted, they will go down to defeat at the next general election. It is by no means certain that the policy adopted by the Conservative government indicates that we are to have a return of the corn laws in England, or that the policy of duties on natural products will be continued. I do not believe it will. I do not believe that we need build our hopes on a policy of that kind being accepted as a permanent one in England.

When we look at the trade returns of England, we cannot fail to be struck with the comparative insignificance of the trade of Canada as compared with the trade of the British possessions at large, and more especially as compared with the foreign trade of England. Last year England's total imports were $2,600,000,000. Of this amount $547,000,000 were from British possessions, $108,000,00 from the Dominion of Canada. The total percentage of imports from Canada was 4·2 per cent, the proportion of imports from Canada as compared with foreign imports was 5¼ per cent, and the total percentage of the imports from British possessions was 20 per cent, while the foreign imports were 80 per cent. Now, is England likely to adopt a course which will imperil that 80 per cent of her import trade for the purpose of fostering a trade which now amounts to only 4 per cent? I think it is very doubtful. And when we turn to England's exports, we find that the total amounted last year to $1,771,000,000. Of this amount $1,261,000,000 went to foreign countries, $510,000,000 to British possessions, $45,293,000 to the Dominion of Canada. These figures are taken from the British returns, the pound being converted into dollars by multiplying by five. The total exports from England to Canada amounted to 2½ per cent of the whole, and their proportion to the exports to foreign countries was 3½ per cent, while the proportion of the exports which England sent to foreign countries to the total amount of her exports was 71 per cent. Here is 71 per cent to foreign countries against 2½ per cent to Canada. These figures suggest to me that we are building upon a very narrow foundation indeed when we expect to induce the authorities in that country to adopt a policy which will imperil an import trade of 80 per cent and an export trade of 71 per cent of her total trade. I do not believe it will be done; and consequently I believe now—and I advanced the same view one year ago in a review of this question—that we are building our hopes in regard to preferential trade on a foundation which is narrow and insecure, and that these hopes will not be realized. That is my belief; but if they can be realized, I shall be very glad to see it done, and I agree with my hon. friend from Toronto that we can give England a preference without abandoning protection, or without abandoning a revenue tariff. We can give it by the adoption of a resolution which I had the honour of moving in this House on the 23rd of February, of this year—a resolution by which we would give to all countries that admitted Canadian natural products free of duty a preference of 40 per cent. We would put up our tariff so that with the preference of 40 per cent deducted from the nominal rates of the tariff, we would still have a decent degree of protection, and with the 40 per cent deducted we would still have a decent degree of protection, and with the 40 per cent added we would have a degree of protection that would be quite satisfactory as against any country which refused to admit our natural products free of duty.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that we are under any very great obligation to England. I would be glad to be informed of any privilege we have in the English market that is not enjoyed by Russia and the United States and Germany and every other country in the world. We go to that market on a common level of free trade with all nations. We enjoy exactly the same treatment as other countries enjoy, even in the matter of the importation of our cattle. We give to England to-day a preference of 33⅓ per cent, and when England puts on corn duties of 5 per cent, we do not get a cent of advantage. I think that when the premier goes to Great Britain, he will naturally take these things into consideration.

We had better deal with this matter as a business question and dismiss to a certain extent sentiment. While I agree fully with the premier on the question of defence, while I do not believe that we need put that matter on a different basis from what it stands on at present, while I believe that Canada will do its full duty to the empire without entering into stipulations as to what it shall or shall not do, I believe our trade relations with Great Britain can be improved. If we cannot secure preferential trade, we can adopt a policy which will give to the country that admits our natural products free of duty an advantage that is not enjoyed by those countries which do not admit our natural products free of duty. Whatever course events may take, we want to deal with this question in a candid, businesslike, careful manner. It is not necessary to attempt to make party capital out of this question. I fully agree with my hon. friend from Toronto in his expression of the belief that the premier will go to Eng-

land as a Canadian sincerely desirous of advancing Canadian interests, and that he will do that to the utmost of his ability; and while we may criticise and properly criticise perhaps in this House, the courses that have been taken and the results that may ensue from the deliberations yet to come, yet it will be regretted if we deal with this matter from the low standpoint of mere party politics. Let us wish the premier and his associates in their mission to England abundant success, firmness to stand by Canadian rights, ability to resist the blandishments that will surround them there, and hope that they will come back from their mission with results of great advantage to their country.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, I intend to make only a few remarks on the important question which is at present engaging the attention of the House. We received some time ago a communication from the Colonial Secretary asking us to send delegates to the Coronation to discuss certain questions. First of all he refers to the political relations between the empire and the colonies. That, I think, is the most important question likely to be discussed at that conference. Then next comes the defence of the empire. It is all very well for the right hon. gentleman to talk about what we would do in defence of this British colony, if called upon. It is all very well for him to declare that we will spend our last dollar and drop of blood defending Canada against any aggression. That is all talk. That is not intelligent fighting, as it is considered in the present day. We are part and parcel of the greatest empire on the face of the globe, and as a celebrated statesman said in England to Mr. Barton, who advocated the same views with regard to Australia, the other day as the right hon. gentleman holds with regard to Canada—who considered that the Australian fleet should be stationed in Australia and the defence of Australia be left entirely to Australian vessels and troops—why, was the reply, the defence or the retaining of Australia as part and portion of the British Empire might not be fought in Australian waters at all, but in the Mediterranean sea. Our defence of this colony, as part and portion of the British Empire to which we are so proud to belong, is not the defence we may make in Canada. The issue may be decided on the Atlantic or Pacific ocean. The nation which has the preponderance of fleet in both these oceans, may at any time, although this country should be overrun from one end to the other by hostile troops, make it a condition of settlement, when peace comes, that Canada shall remain a part and portion of the British Empire. On these two questions, the most important for us Anglo-Saxons who inhabit Canada, the right hon. gentleman has no definite policy. Why are we here in this portion of North America? Why did our forefathers who left the British Isles settle on this part of the continent? They might have gone to portions where there were better lands, easier cultivated, and a milder climate, but they chose to come to this portion of America, because it is under British laws and because they intended doing something for the betterance of the empire. And we, I believe, are actuated by the same sentiments and prepared to do what we can to build up still greater that empire which our forefathers made the mightiest on the face of the globe. The first object and hope of every British settler in the North American continent is that the defence of the empire shall be secured and that Canada shall remain a part and portion of that empire. Yet the right hon. gentleman tells us that our statesmen who go over to the Coronation, are not going in any way to discuss this question of Imperial defence, but that their discussion is to be restricted to the mere mercenary one of the commercial relations between this colony and the empire. Well, I maintain that the first question to be discussed at the colonial conference should be the political relations between the different colonies and the empire, and the second the question of Imperial defence. What policy has the right hon. gentleman or his colleagues in the cabinet on those questions? The right hon. gentleman tells us that the Imperial ministers, when they summoned the colonial premiers of this continent, must have formulated a policy of some kind or other. Why does he not get that policy from them? Surely he has a right to discuss it with his colleagues before going over and making any declaration on the other side. And as to the question of defence of the empire, and the different colonies, surely, as the right hon. gentleman has told us, there must be a policy formulated by the Imperial authorities, and the right hon. gentleman has the right to have that communicated to him now in order that he may discuss it with his colleagues before going across. He is equally entitled to have the Imperial views on the subject of our commercial relations. What is the policy of the government on all these matters? They have no policy at all. They are not going to discuss the political relations between the empire and the different colonies, and as regards the question of defence their position is this. They say: We will be bound by nothing, we will consider nothing, but we will spend our last dollar and our last drop of blood in the defence of Canada. That is not what we expected from the right hon. gentleman.

The hon. leader of the opposition and many of his supporters have taken the position that we should not be bound by any fixed hard-bound policy. In that I agree. We have a right to consider from time to time, as the necessity arises, what should be our future relations with the empire and the different

portions of the empire, and our contribution to the defence of the empire. We should not part in any particular with our autonomy, but that is entirely different from the position taken by the Prime Minister of not considering at all the subject of political relations or the subject of Imperial defence. Just look at the position in which the right hon. gentleman will be in when he goes over. The only thing we have got from him is this : That he will consider the question of a preferential arrangement of trade with the empire and the colonies. At the same time he qualifies that declaration. He asks : In what can we give a preference to Great Britain ? The hon. member for Toronto, he says, is opposed to our reducing the duty on woollen goods, and so on. That is mere childishness. There are thousands of articles in this country, which we do not produce or manufacture, and which it is not necessary we should manufacture, and on which we might give a preference to England over other countries. But the hon. Finance Minister, who introduced the resolution giving a preference to English goods and the right hon. gentleman who supported it, both declared that we do not want anything in return. Again and again they made that declaration. What position did we on this side take ? We said it was not to be expected that a poor colony like Canada, compared with the mother country, should give a preference without getting any return. No statesmen in England ask it. The people of Great Britain would never expect us to do anything of the kind. The position which my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) takes is a proper one. The empire will be proud to see Canada prosper in any manner which is best for the prosperity of the country. Canada prosperous will be of great assistance to the empire, and the people of the old country want to see us prosper in our own way. We would be of greater benefit to the empire if we were in a prosperous condition under protection than in the condition in which we would be if we had free trade, as advocated by the right hon. gentleman and his friends. Here is parliament in session; here is a free country governed by parliament ; here is the greatest opportunity ever given a colony for making an arrangement between the empire and the colonies, and what statement have we from the right hon. gentleman or his ministers, as to what they propose to do. Instead of taking parliament into their confidence, we have simply the bald statement that they will consider the question of preference when they go across. Well, the condition of affairs in 1902 is different from what it was in 1896. In 1896, when I was stumping the country, it was not considered possible that England would ever impose a duty on corn and grain. But every man who has studied political economy as it affects nations knows that whenever free trade has a detrimental effect upon a nation indulging in it, especially an intelligent country like Great Britain, that nation will be governed by interests and not by sentiments and will drop free trade and adopt protection. Whenever it is in the interest of the people of Great Britain to adopt a protective tariff, they will adopt it, as we did here when it became necessary. We, of necessity, must have a protective policy in this country. As the Conservative party have stated again and again, to leave us a purely agricultural country would leave us poor and contemptible in comparison with countries that are protected, including the country to the south of us. We must have diversity of occupations; we must have employment for all the people of the country; we must have the mechanics here as well as the farmers; and the only way to do that is by protecting our industries. Therefore, I say that the right hon. gentleman when he goes to England, must state to the Imperial authorities that we must have a tariff to protect our own industries. He must say also that we have a large commercial trade with the rest of the world. We will give a preference to Great Britain, but we ask a preference in return. The only possible way to build up the empire, the only possible way to improve the political relations between the empire and the different colonies, is to adopt a system of mutual defence and to establish different commercial relations between the colonies and the mother country from those which now exist.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (Hon. Sydney Fisher). I do not think I would have said anything with regard to this matter this evening had it not been that the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was good enough to quote my utterances in England on various occasions upon this question of the preference. I accept his quotations fully, and I accept the responsibility for my utterances. I did, on several occasions in England, declare that we in Canada gave them a preference in our markets without asking any preference in return. That was the policy laid down by this government in 1897, which has been maintained until this time. And I venture to think that what we did has borne good fruit, and that we have been justified in the action which we took. I say emphatically that, though we made no demand for a preference, we have actually had a preference in the English market for all our food products. I have been in England on two occasions since that time, and I have seen, over and over again, in shops and retail stores Canadian products marked as Canadian and the people appealed to by the dealers to buy these goods because they were Canadian. And they did that on the ground that Canada had given a preference to Great Britain in her markets and it was only fair that the people of Britain should give the first choice to Canadian goods.

Mr. BROCK. Oh, no.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brock) denies this. But I can assure him that I have seen it with my own eyes. And I had the assurance of those who had placed the notices in their shop windows that that was the reason for appealing to the people—that the people had a kindly feeling towards Canada because of the preference. But supposing that we had obtained that preference which hon. gentlemen opposite think we ought to have obtained—supposing that owing to the representations of the Canadian government and people, Great Britain had imposed a tax upon the food of her working people—is it conceivable that these working people would have been favourably disposed towards those who had been the means of imposing that tax upon them? Is it conceivable that the breadwinners in the cities of Great Britain would have been disposed to buy the articles sent to them by the people who were the cause of increasing the price of their loaf? I do not think it is conceivable. I believe that, on the contrary, the working people of the large industrial centres in England would have cursed the name of Canada, and would have tried their best to injure Canadian trade in Great Britain, instead of supporting and encouraging it. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) a few moments ago, referred to a supposed change of public opinion in England in favour of protection, and quoted the imposition of these taxes as evidence. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has given the first result of the imposition of bread taxes upon the English electors by showing that in the city of Bury, one of the very centres in which Canadian products are received with favour, the electors, who, a few years ago, elected a supporter of the present government by a large majority, had rejected another supporter of that government by an almost equally large majority; and the battle was entirely fought out on the question of bread taxes, and the change amongst the electors was entirely due to the adoption of that policy by the government. Now, that is an expression of the feeling that exists amongst those people. Had we in Canada been responsible for the imposition of that bread tax, we should have antagonized the great industrial class of the mother country. I venture to say that not only would that be a great detriment to the trade in our food products, but it would have been one of the greatest hindrances to that movement for Imperial unity, one of the first steps in which was the preference that we granted to Great Britain. Had we adopted that plan, and had we obtained that result—which I do not for a moment think we could have obtained as a matter of fact—we would have brought about this condition of affairs—that the breadwinners of England would have felt aggrieved against the colony and would have felt that the colonies had asked them to tax themselves for the benefit of colonial producers. Instead of having the people almost unanimously in favour of the colonies, we would have had them divided into two great camps, one opposed to everything colonial because of the sense of grievance against the colony, and the other the feeling that they were helped a little by the fact that the products of their farms had been increased in price by the imposition of these taxes. But to-day we are in an entirely different position. When we adopted the preference we reduced the taxes upon our own people. That is a point that hon. gentlemen opposite do not consider. It is not part of their policy to think of reducing the burden upon the taxpayer. All they want to do is to pile on taxes for the purpose of protection. When we gave the preference, we relieved our people of a burden. When we wish to secure a preference in Great Britain, we wish also to remove a part of the burden of taxation resting upon those people. The condition to-day is such that we can do that. My right hon. friend can go and ask for the remission by Great Britain, so far as the colonies are concerned of the tax on breadstuffs in part or altogether. When we do that—we shall have the sympathy of the breadwinners of the old land, and they will feel that the colonies are acting in their favour. We shall have the support of these people, instead of their direct antagonism. It seems to me, therefore, that we are in a much better position to-day than we should have been had we tried in 1897 to make a bargain and had succeeded. We can make a bargain to-day, but we could not make one then without injuring a portion of our fellow subjects in the old land. I do not wish Canada to occupy that position.

Now, Sir, I will say one word more in regard to the question in England. I am not going to say for one moment what should be the policy of Great Britain. That is for them to decide, just as it is for the people of Canada to decide our policy. It would be unfortunate if we were to be hampered in the exercise of our independent right in deciding upon our own policy, and I wish to give the same freedom to the people of the old land, to the people of Australia, and to the people of all the other colonies. But I do believe that we can do it off our own bat, if I may use the expression, in the interest of the rest of the empire, just as in 1897, we gave a preference to the people of Great Britain in our own markets without asking anything in return. Speaking for myself I venture to think that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach the other day when he introduced his corn duties, missed a great opportunity. If he had then, without any consultation with the colonies, given them immediately a preference in that imposi-

tion of the corn duties. I believe he would have done a great stroke of statesmanship in the interest of the empire, and in strengthening the bonds uniting the various portions of the empire. But if he did not desire to do that then, I believe he is still in a position to give a preference to colonial products which will help the situation, and do a great deal to strengthen the ties between the motherland and her colonies.

I want one thing to be noticed, that in all the discussions in the parliament of Great Britain, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach himself, Mr. Balfour, the leader of the House, and all the other speakers in support of the government, distinctly declared that this imposition of a bread tax, is in no sense a reversion to protection. So emphatically have they declared this that as a matter of fact in Great Britain to-day this tax is not looked upon as involving the issue between free trade and protection, although the Liberal party are rather disposed to bring it forward as a line of cleavage between the two parties on the issue of free trade and protection. But the accepted opinion in Great Britain is that this tax is not a protectionist tax but a revenue tax.

Mr. GOURLEY. Did you not say that the election in Bury was run entirely on the question of free trade ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I said it was run on the question of the corn tax. But it does not matter to my argument whether it is a question between free trade and protection, it would be a question of the antagonism of the people who suffer from the imposition of a bread duty if the colonies were the instrument of the imposition of that duty. It is not a question between free trade and protection, it is a question of whether the people who feel the incidence of the tax, think it has been brought about by the colonies or by the voluntary act of their own government. I do not wish them to think it was brought about by the colonies. I would be sorry to have them think that any preference had been given to Canada which would hurt the people of Great Britain to such an extent that they would feel aggrieved towards us. On the contrary, I wish, when any preference is given to Canada by Great Britain, that it shall come from the people of Great Britain just as freely as the preference which we gave to Great Britain, without any bargaining and without asking anything in return. That is the feeling I have always had in regard to this preference. I stated over and over again in Great Britain that Canada gave that preference freely without asking anything in return ; and I hope the time will come that Great Britain, now that she has put a food tax upon her people, will give a preference to the colonies and relieve her own people without imposing a duty upon them. I believe that such a preference would do more than any act looking towards military defence or affecting political relations, to strengthen the ties that bind the different parts of the empire together, and make the empire stronger to face the world when it becomes necessary for her to face the world.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) feels himself in an awkward situation in view of what England has done lately. He said : When he was over there we did not want any preference, that what we had done we had done freely, generously and liberally. He said also that although we had made no demands for a preference we have practically a preference in the markets of the mother country. He did not offer any proof of his statement, nor did he show that our preference to the mother country had resulted in any advantage to us in the English market over what we have in the market of the United States or of other countries. If he looks up the trade returns since this preference was given, he will find that the whole argument is against his contention, for they show that we have not benefited in any material respect on account of that preference. He says the working people of England would look with disfavour upon Canada if a tax was put upon their bread for the benefit of Canada. But it has been put on. If the hon. gentleman desires to get into the good graces of the working people of England the first thing he should do would be to try to relieve them of that tax by letting our wheat in free, by letting the grain of the colonies in free, and by that means supplying the nation with their breadstuffs. The colonies could readily supply all the breadstuffs of the English people in a short time. So if his argument is worth anything it can be turned against himself. The policy of the present government, he says, has not been to pile on the taxes. Who takes $10,000,000 of taxes more out of the people than their predecessors ? Is it not the present government ? Who raises a larger revenue if it is not the present government ? Who makes a larger expenditure if it is not the present government ? So I say that instead of not piling on more taxes the whole history of this administration is an argument to the contrary.

The hon. gentleman for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said that the result of an election in England adverse to the government was due to the bread tax imposed. He said that shows the sentiment of the British people. Then I say if he desires to have the sentiment of the British people in his favour let us tell the English labouring men that we desire to take off that bread tax and supply them with their bread free. That is one of the strongest arguments that could be addressed to the British people. The hon. member for North Norfolk goes on to say that we should not do this for fear of offend-

ing our friends to the south. I have heard that argument addressed to this House for 24 years in succession, and it seems to me the most humiliating, the most debasing argument that could ever be addressed to a free people. Are we not here an independent and integral part of the British Empire with rights of our own, with duties of our own to perform ? Have we not to look after the interest of our own people, and can we not do it without fear of offending any other nation in the world ? Why, we would be little better than slaves if we cringed before any other nation. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves as British freemen to say that because of the fear of offending the nation to the south of us we are afraid of doing what it is our duty to do as members of the Canadian parliament.

That hon. gentleman has always addressed that argument to the House and I think it is unworthy of him and unworthy of any British subject in the Dominion of Canada. Our great danger, he says, is a struggle that some day may come with our American friends to the south that may take every man and every dollar that we have and that then the result will be doubtful, and he gives that as his reason why we should not do anything along the line of Imperial defence or even consider Imperial defence with the mother country. He is afraid that we may offend our neighbours to the south of us. Would that not be the strongest reason that we should prefer to do our part in the defence of the British Empire so that neither the United States nor any other country in the world would dare attack us either on the high seas or on the lakes ? Should it be a matter of offence to the American people ? Even if it should be a matter of offence we should be unworthy of ourselves if we regarded it as a reason why we should not join with the mother country in considering the question of Imperial defence. The hon. gentleman says that we should not be bound by hard and fast rules in regard to national defence. My answer is that it is not necessary. The hon. gentleman went on to say that we have done a great deal for national defence. Why did we build the Canadian Pacific Railway that will be available for the transport of troops from the east to the west and from the west to the east, and for bringing the forces from one part of the empire to another ? Was it because of any hard and fast rules ? Not at all. I see no reason why we should be bound down by hard and fast rules, but we should work upon intelligent lines jointly with the mother country, and we should have an intelligent understanding as to what are the best lines to be adopted. We should not be bound down by hard and fast rules, but there is a strong reason why we should talk it over and come to an understanding as to what is best to be done on the part of the colonies and the mother country, so that we shall act upon intelligent lines and be able to benefit by the understanding arrived at in time of need. Then the right hon. the leader of the government says : Formulate a resolution for us and we will see whether we can accept it ; or in other words, make a policy for us, and if it is acceptable we will adopt it. The hon. gentlemen have been stealing our clothes too long and they are reform misfits up to the present. They want to do a little more of that same kind of thing. If we were to move a resolution he would call upon his supporters to vote it down, because it would be a motion of want of confidence. We have introduced this subject in the way in which it has been introduced so as to avoid that possibility and in order to secure the freest possible discussion ; yet, the right hon. gentleman says: Formulate a policy. We are asking the right hon. gentleman to say whether he is prepared to discuss commercial and political relations along the lines that we have indicated. It is for the purpose of enabling the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues to understand what the sentiments of this House are that we have made the proposition we have to-night and we have done it in such a way as not to embarrass him, but for the purpose of having the freest discussion so that he may understand that he carries with him the sentiments of the Canadian parliament. He does not require us to formulate a policy for him, because if these hon. gentlemen are not fit to formulate a policy for themselves they should not be there. The Canadian people should put others in their places who are able to formulate a policy that will be suited to Canadian needs and interests. The Prime Minister says that they are going over there and for what purpose ?—To listen. He reminds me very much of a bashful maiden who wants to be wooed but will not make any proposals. He is the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, one of the most important parts of the British empire. He goes to the conference and the representatives of the empire there say : Let us have a free conference to see what we had better do. He says : I am not going to take part in the discussion but I am going to listen. He is like a shy maiden sitting in the corner, waiting to be coaxed out and to be asked, will you do this or not. He says : We will listen and if they propose something that meets our views we will accept it and if they do not we will come home practically with our fingers in our mouths. That is the sum and substance of what he is going to say and do there. Yet, as the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says, here is a golden opportunity. Parliament is in session and he can get the views and the assistance of parliament to strengthen his hands in the negotiation, but he does not desire to have them. Now, we have not thought it necessary during this session to introduce a resolution. Why ? For the purpose of giving the right hon. gentleman an opportunity of asking parliament for its opinion in reference to these

questions. We expected that he would take advantage of the opportunity before parliament prorogued to ask an expression of opinion from the Canadian parliament as to what he should do at the conference, upon what grounds he should consider this question and as to what he should be free to propose to the British people. But, the right hon. gentleman does not want anything from England. If Great Britain proposes preferential trade, he says, we will be prepared to consider whether we shall accept it. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) says that it is not our place to ask it, but if Britain proposes it we will accept it. How under heaven is Great Britain likely to propose it if every member of the government who goes home tells the people there that we do not want it and that we do not look for it ? They say that such a policy is unsuitable for us and unsuitable for them and they say if England offers it we will consider it. Is England likely to offer it when the people there have been told that we do not want it ? Hon. gentlemen have already given England the strongest excuse for not proposing it. The right hon. gentleman says that what was not possible in 1897 may be possible now. But he has told them that we do not want it whether it is possible or not. Then the right hon. gentleman does not propose to discuss the question. He has told us that he is going over there to sit and listen and not to propose. Is England likely to propose what she has been told Canada does not want ? No, her statesmen are too astute and her diplomats know that a hint is as good as plain statement. Therefore the right hon. gentleman is not likely to get preferential trade. The free trade preferential tariff was a wonderful measure of tariff reform and it was based on the reform misfit principle. It does not fit Canada. It is of no use to Canada and of very little value to England, but it has done great harm to some of the most important industries in Canada. The right hon. gentleman says that we do not want to discuss the question of our political relations, and he tells us that they are all right. He says that we do not want to discuss the question of Imperial defence, that we do not want to touch that. As the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) stated the British Empire may be attacked in any part of her colonies and it is the decisive battle there fought that will tell whether Canada is to be free and whether it is still to be Canada. The battle which is then being fought will be the battle of Canada as well as Britain. Canada must be prepared to take her part in the conflict and to give her assistance in defence of the British empire no matter where the battle may be fought. But, why should we not confer with the British empire as to what may be done along intelligent lines so that each integral part of the empire can come to this conflict in support of the empire prepared to do its part in the defence of that empire ?

If the Prime Minister carries out his intention not to discuss Imperial defence I can tell him that there is not an Anglo-Saxon in the British Empire who will not declare that he has done less than his duty. If he will not discuss the defences of the empire with the representatives of the other colonies he is—I was going to say, unworthy of the name of British and unworthy the position he occupies as Prime Minister of the first colony in the empire. We have been told over and over again in this House that our political relations cannot remain in the future as they have been in the past. The right hon. gentleman has told us many a time that he can foresee the day coming when we will have reached that ripe age that we shall become a nation ourselves. That indicates that the right hon. gentleman believes that a change is going on in our political standing. The premier of the first British colony knowing that and telling the Canadian people that yet proclaims in the same breath that he will refuse to discuss our relationship with the empire with a view of continuing those ties which have bound us to the mother land in the past and strengthening them. But the right hon. gentleman says he will discuss our commercial relations. He will sit in the corner and he will say to the others : Make your proposals and I will consider them. He admits that we want to extend our trade and to open up new markets, but he says that he will have no proposals to make at the conference. He has not the genius of statesmanship to the extent of possessing enough initiative to enable him to make proposals as regards his own country to the representatives of the other colonies. He will not tell them what his own country requires, but he will take chances on their knowing better than he does the needs of Canada, and when they tell him what Canada wants he will consider whether he will accept it or not. Why, Mr. Speaker, a man who is so reticent and bashful that at such a conference he cannot tell what his country wants is not the right man to represent Canada on such a mission. Our representative should be as free to make proposals in the interest of his country as would be the premier of any other colony, or the representatives of Great Britain. If the right hon. gentleman fails to place the needs of this country before that important body he will do less than the Canadian people expect of him. He is going over there to represent the executive of this government, but he does not want to represent the parliament of his country. That is evident from the fact that the right hon. gentleman declines to ask the advice of the Canadian parliament. Far from asking for such advice he spurns it when tendered, and he refuses to be fortified by the strength which the Canadian parliament could lend to his efforts. Now is the time when he can obtain the opinion of parliament if he desires it. Parliament is ready to support him in

making demands which would be for the welfare of Canada and of the British Empire, but to-night he rejects the assistance of parliament. He goes to that conference silently to represent the executive, his whole action is very much like unto the deal which that executive made in connection with the Yukon railway, in which case they found out afterwards that they were not in harmony with the sentiment of the country, and perhaps not in harmony with themselves. He tells us that the country wants preferential trade to-day. He ought to know that for he has been told it in a thousand ways. The boards of trade, the municipal corporations, the commercial and agricultural interests of the country have pronounced to him in favour of preferential trade. He admits that the conditions have changed. Formerly he told us that he would not ask for preferential trade from Great Britain because England would not grant it as she would not abandon her free trade principles and tax her breadstuffs. But England has changed her policy, and now that there is an opportunity to get preferential trade the premier does not desire to ask for it. Well, the right hon. gentleman is practically going it blind. He is going to represent Canada at an important imperial conference and he is going without ascertaining the views of the Canadian people through their representatives in parliament. If parliament had not been in session for some months past I could perhaps understand the attitude of the right hon. gentleman, but the fact that he refuses to take the advantage of parliament which he can now readily obtain is absolutely inexplicable. He keeps the country and parliament in the dark and he apparently desires to be in the dark himself. He is treating Canada and the parliament of Canada with scant courtesy, he refrains from disclosing to parliament what he intends to do and in view of his entire conduct we are justified in bringing this matter to his attention. And if, when the right hon. gentleman returns home we find he has disregarded the advice tendered from this side of the House he cannot blame us if we call him severely to task for his sins of omission as well as his sins of commission in connection with this matter.

Hon. WM. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that it is not the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) who is going to represent the interests of Canada in England instead of the premier. If he would not by argument convince the Imperial government as to their duty, he might succeed better by scolding them, as he generally does in this House. I have not spoken much on this subject when it has been under discussion, and I do not intend to occupy much of the time of the House to-night. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to take great consolation from the idea that there is a disturbing element in the government. Well, I think we on this side of the House have the confidence of the government at least as much as hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have not heard a hint of anything but the greatest unanimity of sentiment among our friends in the government, and we at least have the happy assurance that there is unanimity on the part of their supporters to keep them in the position they at present occupy. Hon. gentlemen opposite appear to take great consolation from the position of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte). It appears that he made an after-dinner speech somewhere. Now, I do not know that any member of the government should be held responsible for an after-dinner speech. The only after-dinner speeches we hear of for which governments are to be held responsible are those made at the Lord Mayor's dinner in London at which the government announce their general policy and the relationship of the empire with other countries. But that was not the case with my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. When you think of the horrible pit and the miry clay out of which he escaped when he left the party on the other side of the House and came over to this side, it is almost a miracle that he is as pure as he is. If there is any element of protection in his policy, it is because he has not been perfectly emancipated from the ideas that were once promulgated on that side of the House. To my hon. friend I would say, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees; do not take any advice from that side of the House, and if you will be guided by the advice of your friends, the supporters of the government, you will occupy a sure position and the country will sustain the government of which you are one of the brilliant members.

A good deal has been said about the condition of England and the curse that free trade has been to England. I think it was my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. Gourley) who dwelt upon Cobden and Bright as being the curse of England. But if you look at the condition of England since she adopted free trade, you will find that no country in the world has acquired such greatness or so extended her trade as Great Britain did under her free trade policy. The moment the present government adopt a protective policy, it will be sure to go down. I believe that to-day, if a general election took place in Great Britain, the present government would be defeated because of the small measure of protection they have adopted on wheat and bread.

Mr. GERMAN. What about the election that took place yesterday ?

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) I am going to speak of that. I have in my

hand a paper which, referring to the cotton trade of Great Britain, says

> A recent issue of the 'Commercial Intelligencer' published statistics which show that Great Britain has more than double the number of cotton spindles in operation that the United States has, and that, apart from the latter country, Great Britain has more spindles than all the rest of the world put together.

Then it goes on to say that Great Britain has 45,500,000 spindles manufacturing cotton, while the United States, which produces the raw material, has only about 20,000,000. Here is the article of cotton, carried in British ships from Egypt and from the Southern States, manufactured in England and sent to all parts of the world to compete with the rest of the world; although cotton is a material England does not produce. No other country in the world could have succeeded in doing this, nor could England except under her free trade policy.

We have dwelt perhaps too much on what we have achieved in South Africa. I, for one, do not consider, and have not considered from the very outset, that Canada has done as much as we ought to have done in defence of the empire in South Africa. When you compare what Canada has done with what has been done by New Zealand and Australia, I hesitate to say that we have done our duty in that respect.

The PRIME MINISTER. The very same thing.

Hon. Mr. ROSS (Victoria, N.S.) We have not the number of men in South Africa today that those other colonies have; but there is one thing certain, that Great Britain need not be afraid, if assistance is wanted, but that Canada will be prepared to do her duty both on land and on sea. When sailors are wanted to supply the navy, we shall be prepared to give our fishermen of Nova Scotia, and they will not be a month on board the ships before they will be just as active as the men who were there before them.

The friends of the government will send to England the premier and the other members of the government with him to discuss the trade policy; and we have the utmost confidence that they will protect the interests of Canada as far as they can be protected; but I do not think that they will be in a position, even supported by the premiers of the Commonwealth of Australia and New Zealand, to dictate to the Imperial government what they shall do; and I have very serious doubts indeed that, with all the interests involved, you will find Great Britain agreeing to preferential trade in favour of the colonies as against the rest of the world. If they will, we will all rejoice. But I have great doubts that the empire will give a preference to Canadian products against the products of other countries. Every step this government takes should be a step, not towards protection, but towards reducing the duties lower and lower, and the lower you make the tariff the higher revenue you will get.

This question is being discussed in the Australian papers. Cable intelligence has been received in the 'Herald' of late to the effect that in Australia public attention is directed to the fact that Canada is desirous of bringing about closer trade relations with Australia. The Canadian government proposed meeting the representatives of Australia and New Zealand in London for the purpose of taking various intercolonial matters into consideration, and the premier of the Commonwealth recently cabled our Prime Minister his consent to that proposal. I have some hopes that perhaps an arrangement for preferential trade or free trade may be established by this means between Canada and the other colonies. That is a practical subject and one that may to some extent be accomplished; but I do not think that, with all the influence which the premiers of the different colonies will bring to bear on the government of England, they will succeed in convincing that government to give a preference in favour of the colonies against the rest of the world.

Hon. gentlemen opposite have been very free in giving advice to the government, but the government have been very cautious in accepting advice from their opponents. They would rather take advice from their friends. Well, their friends prefer that they should go home to London untrammelled by any advice, because we have full confidence in the Prime Minister and those associated with him. We believe that they will do everything possible in the interests of Canada, and prefer that they should go across untrammelled, and not limited even to the views that may be expressed by some of their own supporters, because we know that they will do everything possible in the interests of this Dominion. The eyes of the whole Dominion will be on them, and the whole Dominion is satisfied that they will do all that can reasonably be expected and all that any men in their position could do. Should they fail in any particular, it will not be because they have not advocated the interests of Canada to the most of their ability. I had taken quite a number of notes, but at this hour I shall not delay the House longer, and I shall conclude by repeating that the right hon. the First Minister and the other members of the government, if they should require any advice, should rather seek it from their friends than accept it from their opponents.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). The hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Ross) tells us that when the right hon. the First Minister and his colleagues go to Great Britain, the eyes of Canada will be upon them. In that opinion I quite agree. Not only will that be the case then, but the eyes of Canada are upon the government to-night, and have been since the beginning

of this session, and their ears have been open to ascertain whether the government were going to take the country into their confidence or not. This is a momentous time in the history of Canada. It is a momentous time in the history of the empire. Two terms are, to a great extent, concurrent and synomous, because the prosperity of Canada is inevitably wrapped up in the destiny of Britain. In these months that have gone by, I think I am right in saying that the people of Canada did expect, and had a right to expect, that at such a momentous time, when such great issues are involved, both to Canada and the empire, the government would have regarded it as their duty not to wait for the opposition, not to wait for anybody, but of their own initiative to bring before this House a resolution for discussion covering the various matters which must come up for discussion at the colonial conference to be held during the Coronation ceremonies in Britain I would rather be wrong than dilly dally and I want to lay down as my view, whether right or wrong, that it is of the essence of constitutional government that when a great question of this kind arises, the administration should take the representatives of the people into their confidence and discuss in parliament the questions that are to be submitted at that conference. Instead of that, the government, although invited from time to time—and I was one of those who suggested it to the government during this session—the government although frequently urged to lay some broad proposition before parliament for public discussion and ventilation, have seen fit to adopt the policy of silence. And I charge, on behalf of the people of Canada, that the government has been recreant to its duty with regard to this great question. We have to-night a discussion which transcends, I believe, in humiliating the administration before the people of Canada, even those discussions we have had previously in this session—and this session has not been unmarked by humiliating positions for the government of this country. What have we had ? I will refer to the statement made by the hon. leader of the government a little later on, but we have had a statement from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and if the fitness of the administration of the government of this country is to be measured by the utterances of that hon. minister upon this great occasion, I must say that the people of Canada will not form a very high estimate of our present administration. Why, a weak defence is worse than none. And if this was not a weak defence, if it was not pitiably destitute of argument, then I must be singularly unable to appreciate the statement of the hon. gentleman. But his remarks have gone into cold print and the country will be able to estimate them at what they are worth. The hon. gentleman asks would the English workingmen be favourably disposed to Canada, if Canada was the means of increasing the price of food in Great Britain. But these hon. gentlemen opposite were teaching us during eighteen years they were in opposition—true they have dropped it pretty well in the last four or five years since they have got into power—but during eighteen years previous they kept telling us that the consumer pays the duty. Well, what do we propose ? We propose that such a duty should be placed upon foreign goods by Great Britain as would exclude from the British market foreign products and allow Canadian products to enter free. What then will the British artisan and workman buy ? He will buy the produce of the Canadian farm, and he will buy it free of duty. So that it is most idle for the hon. gentleman to advance that argument, because the argument inevitably defeats itself.

But he says, as an argument to support, if he can, this frail and tottering edifice of a one-sided preference, that it was a step towards Imperial unity. Sir, words in favour of Imperial unity do not come very well from my hon. friend. What progress is the government making in the direction of Imperial unity when they send back that deputation which, prematurely and unwisely as I say, refuses to discuss the question of Imperial defence and the unity of the empire. In what regard will the hon. Minister of Agriculture tell us are they advancing Imperial unity when they utterly refuse to even consider the question of Imperial defence ? He also tells us—and it is a pity that these hon. gentlemen cannot have a little more consideration for our home affairs and not travel so far afield—that Sir Michael Hicks-Beach missed the chance of his life when he introduced the change in his tariff and did not declare (without being asked and without being solicited, of course) that he would take off entirely the duty from the produce of Canada. When such a statement is made, I would like to ask the right hon. premier and the members of the government if they were taken by surprise when that change was made in the British tariff ? Did not they know that that change was to be brought about ? Were they the only people in the whole civilized world who did not realize that that change was coming ? Why, I, as one of the youngest members of this House and the most modest, told them what was coming, told them that Great Britain would have to change its trade policy and that the stability of the British Empire depended upon the conbined policy of Great Britain and her colonies with regard to trade. In speaking thus, I was not speaking on my own authority, but on the authority of the greatest of British statesmen, Mr. Chamberlain, who said : If you ask me what will be the destiny of Great Britain for the future, I answer that it will depend on the attitude taken by the great colonies of Great Britain. When all the world knew that this change was to be brought about, I must assume that this government was not

altogether asleep and that they knew something about it. But, if they did know about it, what did they do before that policy was announced to secure a preference for Canada in Great Britain such as the Minister of Agriculture says Sir Michael Hicks-Beach should have inaugurated at that time? I say that a more completely condemnatory statement could not have been made by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite then was made by the premier's own lieutenant, the Minister of Agriculture. Except that it introduces something that I wish to lead up to, I need hardly trouble very much about the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He wanders from post to pillar, but he always comes back to his first love. He gave us a very nice review of many steps in the history of Canada. I do not think he went back quite to the visit of Columbus, but he did go over most of the important steps in the history of the country for the last fifty years. And it is significant that every one of these steps was a step marking the progress of the Conservative party.

Mr. SPROULE. And he opposed them.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, those steps were opposed by the hon. gentlemen who are now in and of the government. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) tells us—and it is a very nice moral sentiment—that the only great thing to consider is what is best in the interests of Canada, and that this should be our guiding star. That comes well indeed from the hon. member for North Norkolk, who, according to his own declaration in this House—and I am sorry he is not present—though he knew in 1876, 1877 and 1878 that the true policy for Canada was the protective policy advocated by Sir John Macdonald, yet, in company with the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) for eighteen years—aye, for twenty-five years and more—kept his mouth shut, so far as saying a word in favour of that policy. On the contrary, he went up and down the country denouncing the policy which he knew to be in the best interests of Canada. And yet he comes here to give us a moral lesson and tell us what to do in the best interests of the Dominion. Of course he is supported by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser) who speaks of him as the gentleman who is responsible for 'the sanctity of the Sabbath and the chastity of the home.' But I object to these hon. gentlemen giving us moral advice. I object at least, to taking it, until, as the hon. member for Victoria suggests, I find that their conduct is consistent with their utterances. Now, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) says that there will probably be many wars in which Canada will not be concerned. I do not join with him in that view. I contend that the position we must take in this colony is that whatever war affects Great Britain, must affect us. Our destiny is inseparably bound up with that of Great Britain and I thank God it is so; for that is where I want my destiny to be. We hear of 'Little Englanders.' Let us not have any narrow Canadians who think there can be prosperity for Canada when the prestige of Great Britain begins to decline. I believe that prestige never will decline, but that, with the unity of the empire, of which the Minister of Agriculture speaks so eloquently, Great Britain, with her colonies surrounding her, will go on and prosper, and, in years to come, will become greater and grander than she has ever been in the past.

Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk has given us advice. He says it is to be a go-as-you-please affair, that we are just to give what we like, and therefore Britain is not to count on anything. What would the hon. gentleman say if, in the case of Canada being attacked by the United States Britain were to say, Oh, you need not count on our defence, you need not be sure we will defend you with men or arms or ships. But what Britain says, and what Britain has verified, is this: In the remotest part of our dependencies, whenever a British subject is attacked, the whole strength of the British army will be put forth in his defence, in vindication of British justice and British rights. That is the position that we have to reciprocate. It is not a question of money alone, but it is a question of the enemies of Britain knowing that the whole empire is united as one man for the defence of every part of it.

Now, the member for North Norfolk says we may run up against the Munroe doctrine. Sir, I think it is unfortunate that matters of this kind should be aired in this way in the parliament of a British country. The hon. gentleman was discussing a proposal to formulate a scheme of universal defence of the empire, and he says if we do that we may run up against the Munroe doctrine. Now what position are we in? Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to understand the proposition. The premier and his colleagues are going to Britain where they want something in the nature of a contribution to a defence fund from every colony of the empire, some basis agreed upon by which each part of the empire will voluntarily contribute for the purpose of raising a defence fund available for the whole empire. It has nothing to do with the wars of Britain in Europe, but it is a proposition that each part of the whole shall contribute voluntarily to a fund for the defence of the empire. Yet when it is proposed to do this the hon.member for North Norfolk says we will run up against the Monroe doctrine. Has it come to this, that with all the strength of the empire, united as it would be if any part were attacked, we are to live in fear and trembling of the Monroe doctrine? In the first place, I have no faith in the hon. gentleman's argument; in the second place, I am not prepared to take

that cowardly attitude, even if I believed in the suggestion of the hon. gentleman.

Now I come to what is, after all, of more interest to the country, and that is the attitude taken by the hon. gentleman who leads this government. He began his speech with what I may call a left-handed compliment to the leader of the opposition. I think he was not as generous as he might have been, I think he was not as just as he might have been. I think it hardly did credit to the accustomed politeness of the leader of the government. Let me make a comparison. I may be a little partial, I may not be the best judge, but I have endeavoured to listen dispassionately to the arguments that have been advanced, and I would like to have some unprejudiced person who has listened to the magnificent argument—I would call it so if the hon. gentleman himself was not present—presented by the leader of the opposition, and contrast it with the speech of any member of the government, or any supporter of the government delivered to-night upon this question. I acknowledge that in some lines of eloquence I do not think I will be speaking disparagingly of our honoured leader if I say he does not hold a candle to the leader of the government. I am told, and I believe the story is true, that among the very numerous admirers of the leader of the government, a countryman of his own came here from a long distance down in the province of Quebec, to hear the hon. gentleman speak. After listening to him in rapt attention, he went out, and was asked what he thought of the Prime Minister, and he said : 'Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he speak long, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he speak well, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, he say nothing.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Hon. gentlemen may say oh just as much as they like, but we will have the judgment of the country upon this question.

Some hon. MEMBER. You had that before.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, but that is not the final judgment, as hon. gentlemen know. They pretend to be very happy for the present, and some hon. gentlemen who look very happy are not so. I see one hon. gentleman who is trying to smile, and his smile has just about as much relation to mirth as the grin of a jackass eating thistles. Now, I was going to say that when the leader of this government discussed this question to-night he failed to rise to its importance, and avoided it at almost every point. Although the little incident that I have related was perhaps somewhat exaggerated in expression, still we know that in the matter of talking without committing himself to anything definite, the hon. leader of the government transcendently surpasses anybody upon either side of the House. We are told by the leader of the government that the suggestion put forward by the leader of the opposition, although good in substance, comes too late, that we have waited too long. What has the government done in that regard ? Is it not their duty rather than the duty of the opposition to formulate a policy in this matter, to take the country into their confidence, and to ascertain the opinion of the country as a guide to the Prime Minister and his colleagues when they go to that conference ? They would then be in a far better position to make suggestions to the other gentlemen appearing at that conference than they will be under present circumstances.

Now, although the conduct of the government has been marked by conspicuous silence in regard to many great questions that have been suggested on this side of the House, although the government have adopted a hesitating, vacillating policy in many cases where it would have been well that they should have declared themselves, yet in this one point I charge that silence would have been golden and that it would have been more prudent, and statesmanlike, if the government were not able to agree in that measure of Imperial defence to have kept quiet, at all events, at that juncture upon this point. There was no necessity for making a declaration upon the matter one way or the other. It was at a time when the South African war was still raging and it was all important that in the eyes of the world Great Britain should be seen with her colonies rallied around her and that there should be no suggestion that they were faltering in their defence. Therefore, I charge that it was weak, unwise and unstatesmanlike on the part of the right hon. leader of the government and his cabinet to send that message to Great Britain at the time. It has had a bad effect in Australia. Mr. Chamberlain said that the Australian Commonwealth was following in the wake of Canada, that Canada had set the example and that as Canada was the stepping stone, the Commonwealth of Australia was in that way a stepping stone toward the greater unity of the British Empire. But we are setting a bad example this time. The example of the right hon. gentleman is an incentive to the premier of Australia and he has announced his antagonism to the scheme. What is the principle which he announces ? He announces that they will have an independent defence, that they will defend their own commonwealth. Does Canada want to take that attitude ? Canada cannot take that attitude and there is no destiny for Canada as a British colony except she accepts some reasonable scheme for the general defence of the empire.

The right hon. leader of the government, when in London, told the people of Great Britain that Canada gave this preference out of generosity and out of a sense of appreciation of the many obligations that Can-

ada was under to Great Britain. In Toronto, as has been pointed out, he takes a different position and it is bad enough when these two speeches conflict with each other. But the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is again an unwise friend in coming to the defence of the government, like the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher), because he brings confusion to the ranks. He contends that Canada owes nothing to Great Britain that with the consumption of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Canada wiped out every obligation that she owed to Great Britain for protection in the past. Which of these hon. gentlemen is right? But, the right hon. gentleman said in London that we wanted nothing and that he was ready to give this preference as a free gift. That is not the position that Mr. Chamberlain takes in regard to the same matter. Mr. Chamberlain, I think, hon. gentlemen opposite will admit, is a practical statesman, and in discussing this very matter of closer trade relations and closer relations generally between Great Britain and her colonies, and particularly Canada, he said:

> But my first point is that in the proposal and the suggestion which has hitherto been made there is no sufficient quid pro quo, the advantage offered is not enough to induce this country to take the certain loss and the possible risk which would be involved in revising altogether its present commercial policy.

In other words, Mr. Chamberlain takes the only statesmanlike attitude that can be taken when he says: When I represent my own goods I can be generous, but when I represent the people of Great Britain I can only be just. When I give anything I must have a quid pro quo. That is the position that the statesmen of Canada must take if they wish to meet the views of the people of Canada.

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

Dredging—Dredge vessels, repairs, Manitoba, $12,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many dredges have you in Manitoba now?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two. There is the old dredge at Winnipeg and the tug Sir Hector which are in need of repairs.

Mr. MONK. Where is this dredging going to be done?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The dredging that is going on now is at the mouth of the Red river, between the Red river and Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. MONK. Is there to be any dredging to be done this year at Sault Ste. Marie?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes. We have asked for tenders which we have received but I have not disposed of them as yet.

Mr. MONK. What amount will be spent in dredging there?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I cannot say, but there is a large amount of work to be done there.

Mr. MONK. I do not know if the minister is fully aware that there is a great need of dredging there. I have been there quite recently and I can testify to the fact that while we have on the Canadian side a canal in certain respects superior to the American canal there is a very serious defect in the approaches to the Canadian side. They have asked for dredging there frequently and although that dredging is extremely urgent it has not been attended to during the last three years. I may add that there are no docking facilities at Sault St. Marie. There is a government dock but the water is so low that large steamers cannot come up to it, and in fact the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers are obliged to resort to the American channel. Although Sault Ste. Marie is the twelfth port of entry in the Dominion, yet the custom house is kept in a leased building, and the post office is quite out of proportion to the importance of the place. When I say that 28,000,000 tons a year pass through the Sault canal; 20,000,000 tons more than through the Suez canal and that the facilities on the Canadian canal are inferior to those on the American canal, it will be recognized that is a humiliating condition of things which calls for immediate remedy. I would urge upon the Minister of Public Works to improve the approaches to the Canadian canal and also the docking facilities.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I concur in what the hon. gentleman has said. There is not enough water on the Canadian side and our ships are obliged to go on the other side. I was there a year ago and I know that. I appreciate it to such an extent that we have this year in the estimates a pretty large sum of money to go on with the work. As to the public buildings I may tell my hon. friend that we have also in the estimates a sum to provide for them and a site has been bought. We have therefore looked after the interest of that town, much more than the hon. gentleman would think.

Mr. MONK. What is the amount voted for dredging?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $25,000.

Mr. MONK. I do not pretend to be an expert, but from information I have gathered, I should think that $25,000 will scarcely do anything towards the improvements which I have mentioned. I under-

stand that the necessary dredging to prevent the humiliating spectacle of Canadian ships having to use the American canal would cost about $300,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am very glad that one of the leaders of the opposition has at last gone to Sault Ste. Marie. I may repeat here what I said elsewhere: Wait till next year, and when I ask for money then I will not be accused by the opposition of spending too much. I know I am not asking enough to carry on the whole work, but I believe I have asked enough to give a contract that will be completed in another year.

Mr. GERMAN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has just come from Sault Ste. Marie having been up there with the leader of the opposition in the province of Ontario, and I apprehend that he has learned considerable of the existing conditions. I quite agree with him that the government needs to expend a very considerable sum of money in deepening the channel to the Canadian lock, but I would like the hon. gentleman to understand that for many years that lock was existing as it is now under a Conservative government and they never even thought of appropriating any money to deepen the channel. You can search in vain through 'Hansard' for a suggestion from a Conservative member up to the present date, that money should be expended in deepening the Canadian channel. The Canadian lock was built under a Conservative government, and as any engineer will admit the channel was defective originally and is defective now. This government is spending money to deepen the channel so as to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway boats and all other boats to navigate through the Canadian channel. The Canadian Pacific Railway boats never have gone there, not because of there not being sufficient water but because of the fact that they get their supplies from the American side. There is water enough for them to go through the Canadian channel, but they go to the American lock because they get their supplies there, and if the hon. gentleman had not been quite so anxious to make a point in the interest of the Conservative party in the province he would have endeavoured to understand the exact situation. I know the situation and I know that there is water enough on the Canadian side for the large boats to navigate the Canadian lock.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. And to reach the wharfs.

Mr. GERMAN. There is really no use of their reaching the wharfs because there is nothing there at present for them. But the Canadian Sault is growing. We hear just to-day that Mr. Clergue is turning out steel rails and he is doing that by reason of the bonus granted and the vim that has been put into that country on account of the concessions granted by the Liberal government in the province of Ontario. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) wants to make any political capital out of the situation we are prepared to argue that point out with him. Perhaps this is not the place to do it, but whatever credit there is for giving a channel for safe navigation through the Canadian lock is due to the present Liberal government which is providing the money to do the work there. The Conservative government never did that when they were in power.

Mr. MONK. I am bound to say that I do not look upon this question as a question of politics, and I do not wish to make a point against this government or for the Conservative party. I consider that a man who has the honour of a seat in this House and who visits the country and finds things that he thinks might be improved upon, is bound to mention these things in the proper place. As to the information which my hon. friend has vouchsafed to me and the House to-night, I have been only two days in Sault Ste. Marie, and I am sure that his information is very defective. I would take, for instance, the point raised by my hon. friend that the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers do not come to the Canadian side because they get their supplies on the American side. That may be so; but it is absolutely contrary to the information given to me there by competent men, far more competent than my hon. friend, and knowing a great deal more than he does about the subject. As to the suggestion that they wished to make a point against this government, I can assure the hon. Minister of Public Works that such an idea did not enter their minds. As a matter of fact, the reason given by business men in the Sault why the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers got their supplies on the American side was that they could not come to the Canadian side. It is true, the lock there was built by the Conservative government, but it is in the right place. Nobody complains of the location of the lock, and in some respects it is far better than the American lock. It moves much more quickly, and is therefore sought by men who want to get their vessels through quickly; but I believe this government finished that lock.

Mr. GERMAN. No. The Conservative government gave Messrs. Ryan & Haney $90,000 to finish the lock before their time.

Mr. MONK. That may be. At any rate, it was finished about the time there was a change of government.

Mr. GERMAN. Before that.

Mr. MONK. However, what is retarding progress there is the need of dredging on a considerable scale. Competent men told me that it was a matter of some $400,000.

The figure surprised me, and probably the dredging could be done for a less sum; but there is no doubt that it will require a far greater amount than the amount mentioned by the minister, to place that port on a proper footing. On the American side they have all the conveniences and facilities that are required, and the vessels go there preferably to coming to our side. On our side there is a wharf, but the water near it is not deep enough for large vessels.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Two wharfs.

Mr. MONK. There is only one government wharf. The other wharf was built by private enterprise. I think it is right, irrespective of politics, for a man who knows these facts and has visited the place, to rise in his seat in this House and mention them without being criticised in the small picayune spirit the hon. gentleman has shown.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I cannot find anything in this item in regard to the Sault canal, and I must insist on the committee keeping to the item under discussion; otherwise we cannot make any progress. I understand from the Minister of Public Works that there are items in the supplementary estimates yet to come in reference to that very question, and that is the proper place to discuss it.

Mr. SPROULE. The question is a question of dredging, and I understand that there is dredging to be done at the Sault canal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I rule it out of order, and I hope the committee will support me. The item is dredge vessels repairs, Manitoba, $12,000.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. If the objection had been taken at the commencement of the discussion I think it would have been reasonable.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We have to stop at some place—carried.

Mr. SPROULE. Not carried by any means. I want you to understand, Mr. Chairman, that I am on my feet, and until I sit down it is not carried. I can talk on that question as well as on any other, and I am not going to be put down in that way. I understand that there are two dredges in Manitoba, but I am told that they are not very suitable for the dredging to be done. I understand that one is engaged at the St. Andrew's rapids. Is this merely for repairing the old dredge, or is the purpose to build another for the work there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The sum of money I am asking is to make repairs to the old dredge, which is doing fairly good work, but which needs to be put in better shape. The next item is to provide a new dredge. That will make three.

Dredging—Man., self-propelling snag boat, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the beginning of the new dredge ?—because $10,000 is a small amount to put on a dredge.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $10,000 is to build a snag boat, similar to what the Americans have on the Red river on their side. These snag boats are not expensive. I think with these three dredges we shall have all we require to do the work.

Mr. McCREARY. Before this item passes I wish to thank the hon. Minister of Public Works for the action he has taken this year in assisting the people who own boats on the Assiniboine and Red rivers. The dredge which was built in 1881 and is now to be repaired has been used to dredge out the mouth of the Red river where it empties into Lake Winnipeg. The dredge is entirely out of repair, and it was running last year at great loss. It is not being used in St. Andrew's rapids, but at the mouth of the river. The necessity of renewing the dredge has been brought before the minister for the last two or three years, and I beg to thank him for taking the matter up in a thoroughly businesslike manner. I said some time ago that I thought the word Manitoba was never mentioned in this House by the hon. Minister of Public Works —that he had apparently forgotten it. I wish to take back that statement. With regard to the snag boat, I may say that in the Red river, both above and below the St. Andrew's rapids there are many boulders and sunken logs, so that vessels cannot navigate the river. The steamer 'Gertie H.' went up the river, and has been nine days above the rapids, and cannot get back owing to the boulders and snags in the way. I was at a meeting last fall of the board of trade which is composed largely of friends of hon. gentlemen opposite—in fact almost entirely. A very large deputation came to that board, and the board very strongly recommended that a dredge be purchased to remove those boulders and other impediments in the river. I am sure that the board of trade, composed of gentlemen on both sides of politics, as well as the citizens of Winnipeg, generally, will thank the hon. Minister of Public Works for having put these sums in the estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this the full cost of the dredge ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. When will it be available for work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Next season.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are you building it ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Probably on Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you building it by contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I do not know yet. I will take the best means.

Bryon Island to Anticosti, cable, &c., connection, $25,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. minister explain this item of $25,000 ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My hon. friend perhaps will allow me to lay on the Table a map, which will make the whole thing clear to those who take an interest in the question. I want to connect Anticosti Island, which is connected with our north shore, with the Magdalen Islands, which are connected with Cape Breton. Then we will have a complete connection with the cable at Canso and Sydney and a complete Canadian telegraphic system on Canadian shore.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the object of the cable to Anticosti ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Anticosti Island is connected with the north shore by a cable telegraph system on the north shore. We have reached St. Paul's Bay, and my idea is that we should have a complete system of telegraphs on our own soil, and my ambition is to take that system of telegraphs to Montreal as soon as possible. To reach Quebec it would cost about $13,000 to $15,000 because we have already a telegraph system at Grosse Isle. I do not see why, now that we expect the Marconi system will work well, we should not have a telegraph system of our own instead of relying on New York for our commercial news. Montreal and Toronto should be made, and will be made, Canadian centres of distribution for all news, commercial and other. When I have completed those lines to Sydney and Canso our Canadian telegraph system will have communication with all the cables, American, English and French. We have only a very small sum to spend this year to have that complete telegraph system.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are these cables open to use by the public ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, it is a regular telegraph system.

For extension of the Magdalen Islands telegraph system to Bryon Island by means of submarine cable, $9,000.

Mr. MONK. What is the distance from Magdalen to Bryon Island ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. 14 knots. From Anticosti to the north shore, 104 knots.

Mr. MONK. Any tenders asked ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we have had a cable ship. We are asking quotations in Germany and England for cables and wires. We have cabled the best firms in England and Germany, and as we have a cable ship ready, we will do the work ourselves.

Mabou to Port Hawkesbury, $5,600.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any telegraph line between these points now ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, we are in the hands of the Anglo-American Company, which I want to get rid of.

St. Peter's to Louisbourg and Scatari Island—extension, Gabarus to North Sydney, $4,900.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose the same is true in this case—there is already a telegraph line there ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, there is none. We want to reach the lighthouse there, which is now isolated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely there is telegraphic communication between Louisbourg and St. Peter's ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I was speaking of Scatari Island, to which there is no communication. My deputy tells me there is a line of telegraph along the railway from St. Peter's to Louisbourg, but there is none on the coast.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But a person in St. Peter's can telegraph to another in Louisbourg ? The object of this vote must be to establish a system of government telegraphs throughout the country ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It is surely a beginning in that part of the country. But my main object is to have direct communication with the cables at Sydney and Canso, and then take the system up to the city of Montreal, and—well, further up if the country desires.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems to be a quiet way of undermining the Postmaster General.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, no, the Postmaster General is too strong for that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, perhaps not completely undermining him, but undermining him so far as this telegraph service is concerned. How many miles of this telegraph open for the use of the public service does the government now own outside of the Yukon ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Outside of the Yukon we have about 4,400 miles. With these extensions we shall have about 4,700 miles, and, in the Yukon 2,135 miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any substantial revenue from these lines ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, that will be found in my report. I may say, in passing, that the Yukon line is doing very well. The revenue for April was about $11,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). After deducting expenses, or gross ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Gross.

Mr. EARLE. Did the minister ascertain, according to the understanding of some days ago, what portion of the business on the Yukon line was government business ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. During March, the departmental telegrams amounted to about $1,100. I suppose it will run about $1,000 a month. If hon. gentlemen will refer to my report, page 11 of the telegraph report, they will see that the revenue last year outside of the Yukon was about $15,000, and the expenditure about $60,000. I may explain that when these lines are completed we hope to do better. And the House must not lose sight of the fact that these lines are built where private companies would not build them. Take, for instance, the North Shore line—there is no appreciable revenue from it, and no company would build a line there.

Mr. WILSON. Aside from the cost of building, it cost $60,000 to run these telegraphs, and the revenue was $15,000. That revenue included government business, I suppose ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but we do scarcely any business except on the Yukon line. But, as I say, all the lines have been built where private companies would not build them. The North Shore line, for instance, was built in the interest of navigation and trade.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the construction of lines between points already served by lines owned by private companies is concerned, it does not seem to me that it is justifiable unless the government is preparing to establish a system of government telegraphs throughout the country. I cannot see any other principle, upon which it can be justifiable. It must be very much more expensive to the country to construct a line for its own use than to pay for the amount of business usually done at the regular prices of the established lines. Perhaps I may be mistaken in my deductions, but that is what I would suppose. So I can only regard this as the initiation of a system of government telegraphs throughout the country. Is that the policy?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would not say more than I have already said. I have not been authorized by my colleagues to say more. My object in asking for this money is to connect our system with the different cables at Sydney and Canso. We have given $80,000 to the Marconi Company to establish a station in Cape Breton. If that system works well, we shall have a means of communicating with the other side of the ocean besides the cable. But we shall have also the cable to rely upon. Speaking for myself, I believe that the cable will be, for some time to come, the safest means of communicating. I hope that Mr. Marconi will be able more and more to improve his system. We have tested it, and are testing it every day between Belle Isle and the North Shore. There are two stations in charge of my department. When the atmosphere is dry and the conditions favourable, the system works well; but when the atmosphere is damp and high winds prevail, it does not work well. It is a very difficult thing to maintain regular communications between the two stations when the conditions are unfavourable. The distance between Belle Isle and the North Shore is twenty-two miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are not many of these points where the hon. gentleman now proposes to build cables, points well suited for working the Marconi system, assuming that system can be effectively worked, and if so, would it not be better to learn whether that system would be practicable before expending so large an amount of money in the construction of a cable ? For example, between Louisbourg and Scatari, if I remember the geographical conditions accurately, I would suppose that would be a proper place for the establishment of this system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, but it is so unsafe now I would not trust it for commercial purposes. It works when the weather is fine, and it does not work when the weather is damp. On different occasions last winter I asked news from our agents, and they answered that the instrument was sticking. I may say that we have not the best receivers, although they have been installed by Mr. Marconi's agents. Mr. Marconi told me these receivers were not the best. Since then we have put in new receivers, and I understand with better results. But I am quite sure the cables will be required for service for some time to come.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to know whether the minister has taken hold of this Marconi system merely as an experiment, or whether he found out before taking hold of it that it would be of some practical use. From his last remarks I would infer that he does not know whether this $80,000 is going to be of any substantial benefit to the Dominion. If stations are to be established

at Glace Bay for communication across the Atlantic, I cannot understand why we are establishing cable lines along very much shorter distances, from Anticosti to the Magdalen islands, and from Scatari to Louisbourg. I cannot understand how it is going to operate across the Atlantic when it will not operate between nearer points. I would like to know whether the government is going to establish an experimental station to aid people in scientific investigations, or is he going into this large expenditure to save money to the government on submarine cables ? If that is the case, I would suggest that a very suitable point for the development of the system for a short distance would be from Cape Tormentine to Cape Traverse, where people are suffering a gross injustice by reason of an ineffective service by submarine cable operated unjustly by a private company.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As the minister of telegraphs I arranged for the establishment of two Marconi systems last fall. I thought it was only fair to try it, as it did not cost much. We are paying a royalty of $500 a year for these two stations between the North Shore and Belle Isle. The station at Glace Bay is a government station. I am asking nothing for it in my estimates. It is a government question altogether, so much so that it is not placed in my estimates as Minister of Public Works and of Telegraphs. I am responsible for the establishment of that station, of course, but I did not make a bargain myself. I hope the Marconi system will be worked between ocean and ocean. But I say again that, after having read a good many things that have been written on the Marconi system and all the other wireless systems, I have come to the conclusion that it will take some years before these wireless systems can be worked safely for commercial purposes. Mr. Marconi and others are all the time improving their system, but I am afraid no country will rely on these wireless systems. I would rather rely for safe communication on cables that I know and have tested. Still, the Marconi, the Slaby and other systems are making great progress.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The curious feature of the situation seems to me that we are spending about $70,000 here in cables for short distances which certainly could be supplied by the Marconi system much more easily, if that system can be established across the Atlantic. The Marconi system has either arrived at a stage at which it is likely to be in some measure successful or it has not. Most people think it has, the government evidently thinks that it has, because they are voting $80,000 for the purpose of assisting that gentleman and his system. It certainly has been successful in England over much greater distances than those covered by some of these cables, if we are to believe all we read in the public press. It has been established over distances very much longer than between Louisbourg and Scatari.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. In all kinds of weather ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So I understood.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I say no, I am sure of that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then he should not have permitted this sum of $80,000 to be put in the estimates for the purpose of cabling across the Atlantic. He seems to want to relieve himself from the responsibility for that particular vote. If it can be used at all in all weathers and under all conditions for any distance, then it certainly can be used between Louisbourg and Scatterie. How far is it between these two points ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. About three or four miles.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). About 15 miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). From Louisbourg to Scatterie ?

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). From Louisbourg to Scatterie is about 15 miles.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is what I would have supposed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is by land, but the channel is not more than three or four miles across.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Not that much.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Surely, if this system can be used for a distance of that kind, would it not be the proper course to delay proceedings a little before spending a great deal of money on these cables ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The experience that I have had of the Marconi system between the North Shore and Belle Isle is such that I would not like to tell the commercial community that they could rely at all times on it. Last winter I asked for reports between the North Shore and Belle Isle, and I could not get them. This system works well in a dry temperature; that is our own experience. But Marconi and other scientists are working on the wireless system and improving it every day. There is no doubt that Marconi has been ahead of everybody else, but I would not take the responsibility of saying that the commercial community could rely upon the wireless system at all times and that is the reason why we have these cables.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You want to double-track the system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no doubt as to the usefulness of the Marconi system, because improvements will be made in the future. To-day they are communicating at very long distances, but, I am sure, that at the present time it cannot replace the cable.

Mr. MONK. Is there an officer in the department who is specially charged with reporting upon the system ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Who is the expert ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Mr. Keeley, our superintendent general, who is a very capable man.

Mr. MONK. Has he recommended this additional laying of cable between the Magdalen Islands and Anticosti ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, this has his full approval.

Mr. WILSON. I think it would be well perhaps if the hon. minister would make some explanation as to how far he has gone with the bargain with Marconi under which the government pay $80,000, or whether this is only the start and whether we are going to spend larger sums of money on that system ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We have an item, No. 92——

Mr. WILSON. That has been discussed by every hon. member of the committee who has spoken, and I want a little information with respect to this particular item.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. We have an item, No. 92, which deals with this question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the discussion is perfectly regular. We are considering whether or not we will spend money on cables. It is a perfectly proper thing to consider this matter and to point out that this expenditure may be unnecessary because you can have communication by means of the Marconi system. I do not think the discussion has gone beyond the range of what is proper on this item.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This $80,000 will be all.

Mr. WILSON. How many instruments have you ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As to that I do not know.

Mr. WILSON. If it is regular, I might as well find out whether you expect to use this system to communicate with the other side of the Atlantic.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The instruments which the hon. Minister of Public Works holds have no relation to the Marconi contract. These were obtained before we made the Marconi contract. The contract simply is that we shall expend $80,000 to aid Mr. Marconi in putting up a station in the hope that it will be a success. If it is a failure we have speculated in science and have not got much for our money, but if it is a success we gain by the fact that the Atlantic rates are to be decreased.

Mr. WILSON. And you have the instruments besides, which you have bought ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. These instruments bought by the Public Works Department are outside the contract. The contract also provides that for our own purposes we shall be able to get the instruments at cost price free from royalty, but the hon. Minister of Public Works had purchased these instruments before Mr. Marconi came here.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The instruments that are under my care cost $2,000.

Mr. WILSON. You do not know how many you have ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have two stations under my care.

Mr. WILSON. Did they cost $2,000 apiece ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, $2,000 for the two stations. We have one at Belle Isle and one on the north shore. This summer we will give them a fair trial and I think they will work well.

Mr. WILSON. It does seem a pity that before laying this cable you had not made a fair trial with this system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My own personal conviction is, that, useful as the wireless system may be, cables will always be necessary.

Mr. SPROULE. If cables will always be necessary, would it not be the part of wisdom to allow Mr. Marconi to go on with his experimenting and risk the cables until such time as he has perfected the system ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Governor in Council has decided otherwise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works dissenting.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if the arrangement made with Mr. Marconi includes any improvements made in the future on the system ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. As far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, I am perfectly free to make any other arrangement with any other company. I have only instruments for two sta-

tions. If they work well I will be very thankful indeed. If they do not I will change them. I have not paid much for them. As to the hon. gentleman's question, the government have made their experiment and, as the hon. Minister of Finance says, if it works well we will have the benefit, and if it does not, we will lose.

Mr. LEFURGEY. That is not the question I wished to ask at all. I wished to know if any future improvements on the Marconi system were included in the present arrangement ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We pay $80,000 towards the construction of these stations, which will be completed I expect within a few weeks or a few months. Beyond that the Marconi Company stipulate that they will give us the instruments for the purposes of our lighthouse service and for the purposes of navigation, &c., but not for commercial purposes, and that will naturally include improvements at fair prices and without royalties. Anything of that kind which we require they must supply at a fair price without regard to royalty.

Mr. WILSON. I thought you said we got it for nothing.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It means that we get them at manufacturer's prices without any cost for royalty. They must not charge us for royalty which is the chief cost in those things.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Have you purchased the future improvements that might be made in the Marconi system ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would not say that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the minister tell us the position exactly that we are in ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Our main contract had relation to the creation of this station, and the other part was rather incidental to the arrangement and no great importance was attached to it. It provides whatever instruments we need for our lighthouses and for the safety of life and property, but not for general commercial purposes, we are entitled to get at a fair price without having to pay a royalty.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Then we are absolutely in the hands of the Marconi Company as regards any improvements they may make upon their system, and after this expenditure of $80,000 we will still have to pay the piper for any improvements they may make.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Justice has sent for the contract and it will speak for itself. We are paying the $80,000 mainly for the station, and Marconi will be interested in making his system as perfect as possible. We are getting the benefit in the shape of reduced rates which is the only way we get our compensation. The Minister of Justice thinks the word 'improvement' is mentioned in the contract.

Mr. LEFURGEY. It appears that we are in a rather precarious position in regard to this matter. We have the Minister of Public Works saying that he has no faith in the system.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not say that.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Well, he says that he has no absolute faith in the system. We are spending therefore $80,000 merely on an experiment, and I do not think we are justified in paying $80,000 out of the public funds to assist an experiment on behalf of any person. The minister himself says that he is not sure that it can be used over a space of ten miles. If we are not entitled to the improvements which may be made in the Marconi system, our money is absolutely wasted and we are simply putting ourselves in the hands of any speculator that may come along.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I differ from my hon. friend as to the experiment, because I believe that whether it succeeds or fails it was a good thing for us to take hold of Marconi and give him a helping hand in a matter which was attracting world wide interest. Whether it succeeds or fails there is no question but that the public opinion of Canada has fully justified the government in taking the step it did. If it succeeds we will get our compensation in the shape of a ten cent rate instead of a twenty-five cent rate, and that is worth risking something for. Like Mark Twain's uncle who took the pork contract, we will be serving our country and making a nice thing out of it.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister a written report about those cables from Mr. Keeley ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have estimates.

Mr. MONK. Prepared by Mr. Keeley ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Certainly.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I differ from the Minter of Finance, for I do not believe that the government of Canada should set itself up as an experimental station of any sort. Scientific investigations have gone on in this world for a great many years and I do not know of any government having assisted mere experiments. There are experiments on flying machines and other things, and the first thing we know the Minister of Finance and his colleagues will be making experiments in this line. We can very well allow such experiments to be carried on by the parties interested, and when completed we can reap the advantage of them. I notice that the government has not yet taken up the experiment of the fast line of steamers across

the Atlantic, which is a very desirable experiment for the government to make in the interest of the country, and on which $80,000 could be much more wisely spent than on this wireless telegraphy which the minister himself does not know will be a success.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia—Branch from Port Simpson-Hazelton main line to Aberdeen, $1,500.

Mr. EARLE. Is this under contract ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Not yet, but it will be carried on immediately. There is a large cannery there.

Mr. EARLE. I was going to ask if it would be completed in time to be of use this season ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes; instructions will be given immediately.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia—150 Mile House to Quesnel Forks and Horse Fly, $7,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Might I ask what brand of cigars they will use in the construction of this line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope they will not use any cigars.

Mr. EARLE. Is this to be constructed by the same party who constructed the Dawson line ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, we are going to carry out this work by contract.

Establishment of timber creosoting plant to treat timber required for general repairs to wharfs and breakwaters, $40,000.

Mr. MONK. Where is that ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have not yet made up my mind as to the best location. It will be necessary to be in the maritime provinces, where that kind of timber is more required. I have really no place in my mind at present.

Mr. WILSON. How does the minister know how much to ask ?

Mr. MONK. I strongly advise the minister to hesitate before he enters upon this work, because the sum mentioned for the establishing of a creosoting plant is quite insufficient.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is quite sufficient.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister any estimate or report from experts showing that with this sum he can establish a creosote plant ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes.

Mr. MONK. Where is that report ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not expect me to carry to the House all the reports which I have in the department. When I say I have reports, it does not always mean that I have written reports. In this case, my late chief engineer, Mr. Coste, investigated that matter for years, and Mr. Lafleur, my present chief engineer, shares the views of his late chief. We purchase every year about $40,000 of timber which we have to get creosoted in the States, because we have no establishment here. My officers have investigated the cost of these plants on the spot, and they tell me that a plant will not cost more than $40,000. It is not a very expensive plant; it is a question of large tubes.

Mr. MONK. I am only putting the minister on his guard. I am surprised to hear that he has been getting his wood creosoted in the States, when we have a considerable establishment in this country. There is one in my own county.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. For long pieces of timber ?

Mr. MONK. Both long and short. My hon. friend knows the establishment—that of Mr. St. George.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. That is not creosoted timber at all. It is not the same thing. The worms would eat it as quick as a flash.

Mr. MONK. They do both. I can tell the hon. minister, from what I have heard of the cost of that plant, that he will not get the establishment for $40,000. It seems to me that when he asks the House to grant the government $40,000 to start a new business of that kind, we ought to have something in writing before us showing plainly what the establishment will cost, and where it will be placed.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have here a list of the articles necessary for the establishment, and they make up the amount of $40,000. This is the estimate of my officers, and I cannot give more than that.

Surveys and inspections, $25,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is that a usual vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No, it is an additional vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you want an additional vote ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Because I have a great many more surveys than I ever had before, and, moreover, it has become necessary to make a complete survey of the St. Clair river and the St. Mary's river. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Clarke) called my attention to the fact that our American friends had been dredging in our waters, and I want to make a complete survey of these upper rivers, so as to know how the matter stands.

Mr. MONK. I do not think the hon. minister will readily ask the committee to vote a sum of $40,000 on that kind of an estimate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The hon. member is very difficult to please. I have discussed the matter with my most competent officers, and what more can I do ?

Mr. LENNOX. At this point I think there ought to be an understanding. We are asked from time to time to vote large sums of money for matters which members of parliament necessarily know very little about. The hon. minister does not profess to thoroughly understand this matter himself. I think that before we are asked to vote this money, we should have the best information on the subject that it is possible to obtain. That information should be laid before the House in writing, and without something of the kind it is unfair to ask the representatives of the people to vote the money. I am not speaking of this item in particular but of the system, and I certainly think that in the case of any considerable item, a definite statement of the estimated total expenditure involved should be submitted to the House. It is not a question of $40,000 alone, but the larger question of our spending large sums of money without really knowing what the expenditure is for. When we vote this $40,000, we have no proper means of knowing whether that is anything like the ultimate amount we will be asked to vote.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I have no objection to give all the information I have at hand. I fully recognize the right of hon. members to ask for every possible information, and I have never refused to give them any information I have. My hon. friend would like to have a written report on every item. Really I would not like to undertake to do that. I believe that when a minister of the Crown says he has a report from his officers, his word should be taken. I do not profess to be an expert on every item. I am not a builder or an architect or an engineer, and must necessarily rely on the competent heads of the different branches of the Department of Public Works. I inform myself the best I can, and more than that I cannot be expected to do.

Mr. EARLE. Will that complete the work ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. My officers inform me that it will.

Yukon system of telegraph lines comprising the Ashcroft-Dawson line and branches—working expenses, additional amount, $33,500.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have in the estimates $80,000 for the working of our Yukon line and we are asking this addition. I am going to reduce the rates very soon.

Mr. EARLE. I hope that will be done at an early date.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To-morrow morning the rates will be reduced $3 instead of $4.50.

Mr. EARLE. How will be the rates from the Skeena river to the coast ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Our present rate is 50 cents per 100 miles. I do not know how many miles it is to the coast, but I will make a deduction all through. I will try it for a month or two. The reduction will be specially between Dawson and Ashcroft.

Slides and booms, Gatineau river—compensation to Messrs. Gilmour & Hughson for use of their retaining booms at the Cascades, $3,600.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Instead of building booms ourselves, we have used those of Messrs. Gilmour & Hughson and of course we have to pay for them.

St. Maurice district—working expenses, additional amount, $20,000.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This year there will be four million logs to pass through our booms, we expect, and we anticipate a good incoming revenue.

Civil government—Department of Railways and Canals—To provide for the promotion of F. A. Dixon to the rank of chief clerk, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,800.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is no difference in this gentleman's salary. The salary is voted in the main estimates, but on the basis of his being a first-class clerk. He is now made a chief clerk, his salary as chief clerk being the same as the highest salary attained by a first-class clerk.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But you have the money voted already, and this should be struck out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But the other amount cannot be paid to him, as it was voted to him as first-class clerk, and the object is to promote him to the rank of chief clerk.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But you should not have the amount voted twice.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When we come to the item in concurrence, if the House thinks it desirable, it can be struck out; but, as I say, the salary previously voted to him could not be paid to him in any case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know, but I cannot see any sense in, or justification for, this way of doing it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The salary will only be paid once.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The salary we are now voting is the same exactly as the sum already voted, but it is to be voted for a first-class clerk instead of a chief clerkship. There will be no objection to striking the item out on concurrence, but we cannot deal with it here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we were giving Mr. Dixon a larger salary it would be necessary only to vote the difference. But where the salary is the same and only the rank is different it must be voted as it is here.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the money is voted twice, the first time for a first-class clerk. That means that the minister has a first-class clerkship to dispose of.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But I understand the Minister of Railways and Canals to say that he does not intend to pay two salaries.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We can strike it out on concurrence.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I am not sure we have not passed the item in concurrence. If we have, we can strike it out.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to capital—Railways—Intercolonial Railway—Rolling stock (revote, $303,000), $345,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. By adding up all these votes on capital account, hon. members will see that about $800,000 of it is made up of revotes. In this item all but about $42,000 is a revote. This is to pay a balance of $6,750 on locomotives that were not sufficiently estimated for and for two shunting engines estimated at $35,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended on rolling stock last year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had a vote for rolling stock of $2,000,000. At the end of the current year we will have expended that amount less about $200,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I do not quite understand this item. If I remember rightly there is an estimate in the next year of $500,000. Then, in the supplementary estimates for the current year there is $70,000 to cover an expenditure which the minister seems to have made in excess of his estimates. What, then, is the revote for?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We got an appropriation of $2,000,000 for the current year, and we got a supplementary vote of $70,000 for this year. This makes a total of $2,070,000. We will have expended, at the end of the present fiscal year, say $1,800,000 in round figures. We have contracts pending which wil not be executed in time for the rolling stock to be received and paid for during the current year, to the amount of $30,000 in round figures, and we are providing for a couple of shunting engines, as I have said.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But the hon. gentleman asked for a supplementary vote for the year ending 30th of June, 1902, of $70,000. That must have been for a deficiency in the vote of that year. But he has not explained why he wants this $70,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. At the time the supplementary votes for the current year were made up we had reason to believe that this rolling stock would be delivered before the current year, and, in order to cover that we required $70,000, and we put it in the supplementary item. Now, we find from the latest reports that the stock will not be delivered to the extent of about $300,000 in round figures, and, in order to pay for that, we have to get a supplementary revote for the year to come.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister had a vote of $2,000,000. And about a week ago he brought down a supplementary estimate for 1902, amounting to $70,000. Now, he finds he has made a mistake to the extent of $303,000. There must be most extraordinary book-keeping in his department.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. minister ask for this $70,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. minister has not spent it, and virtually he is asking for $373,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We got $2,070,000. If the contracts we have given were filled we would require that sum. But there will be about $300,000 which we cannot pay this year, and that we will have to pay next year.

Mr. BARKER. As I understand the hon. gentleman, he has only paid about $1,700,000. He has paid less than his estimate by over $300,000. That means that he pays up to the 30th of June $1,700,000. He has taken $2,070,000 to pay $1,700,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I put it very clear as a revote, there can be nothing more explicit.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman propose to cancel that $70,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I do not.

Mr. BARKER. Well, it is a fictitious item, there is no such item.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is an item passed.

Mr. BARKER. I know it is in the estimates, but there is no such item in the hon.

gentleman's books. He has not spent his $2,000,000 by $300,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Well, that is a fact.

Mr. BARKER. It is a fictitious fact.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, it is an actual fact.

Mr. BARKER. But there is no such thing as that $70,000 when he explains the matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, there is a vote for $70,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount have you expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We consider now that we will require by the end of the year—we have not expended it all yet—$1,767,000 to pay for rolling stock which we shall receive.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That would leave $363,000 for a revote. He has $2,070,000 voted already and he expects to spend by the end of the year $1,767,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will leave $303,000, and that amount I am asking to be revoted.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does not the minister see that he should have a better system of book keeping ? He came down here ten days ago asking for a supplementary vote of $70,000 to his $2,000,000, then he comes here a few days after with another supplementary estimate and asks us for $303,000 of that as a revote for next year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot see any question of book keeping in it all. The estimates are presented to the officers of our department, and I say to them : What amounts will be required for the supplementary estimates for the current year ? They, with the knowledge which they possess, say they will require $70,000 for rolling stock to cover contracts we have already made. They find out after we have received that and after the estimate has been brought down that they are not going to be able to secure the completion of the contract by the first day of July to the extent of the whole amount which they have contracted for, and they fall short by $300,000 ; and in order that we may possess the means to pay the articles when we receive them next year, we ask a revote for $300,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Ten days ago the department virtually tells the House that they want, for the purpose of balancing their accounts last year, $2,070,000. Now, they find out they were mistaken by $303,000 which the hon. gentleman asks to be revoted for next year.

Engine house, &c., at Chaudière Junction, $63,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is an enormous sum for an engine house.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The new round house, which will contain eighteen stalls, will cost $37,350. Then there are machine shops, a boiler building, building for repairing stores, turntable, foundation for stationary boiler plant, water service and heating the different buildings. All this will be done by contract that can be so done. You cannot put down a turntable by contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will that build the whole ? Was there any vote in the main estimates for that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is the total amount required for Chaudière Junction ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is what is estimated will finish it.

Mr. BARKER. You buy your turntable from a bridge builder ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but we put it down by our own people. We allow $4,000 for a turntable and foundation.

Increased accommodation at St. John, $90,500.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is to provide for tools, machinery and car shop, $7,000 ; electric lighting, $5,500 ; apparatus for providing and storing compressed air, $1,000 ; stationary engine and boilers, $5,600 ; building for stores and offices, $5,500, making $25,500. We then complete a new engine house, a new turntable and a new machine shop for $35,000 ; to complete the filling of the new yard, laying tracks and furnishing water supply, $30,000, which makes in all $90,500.

Mr. BARKER. Does that include the new sidings at St. John ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND Yes, that is included. The whole item for filling the new yard, bridging the creek, laying these tracks and furnishing the water supply, is $30,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why does the hon. gentleman ask for that vote when I understood in the Public Accounts Committee that he was charging the greater part of that as an expenditure ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did not charge any portion of it. All that was charged was the rails. We have the rails ready to lay down.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount now expended at St. John for terminal facilities with this vote ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That will include the amount that was paid for the land which the hon. gentleman had a hand in, all the Harris property which the hon. gentleman may have heard of.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I mean the whole of the terminal facilities at St. John. The minister must have it under his eye.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I did not know I had it here, but I have found it. The total amount expended and estimated to be expended is $2,500,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. For one yard ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman does not mean to say he is making a correct statement when he says it is for one yard ?

Mr. BARKER. One station yard at St. John.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is at St. John, but it is not one station yard. This is the amount which has been expended from the beginning.

Mr. BARKER. Yes, but it was on one station yard.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, but it includes the whole thing from beginning to end.

Mr. GERMAN. How much did the Harris property cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Over $200,000, and if the other property had cost as much as the Harris property it would have been over the $10,000,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does that item include the land bought from the Gilberts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many acres were bought at that time ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Thirty-seven.

Mr. WILSON. How much has been expended during the last five years at St. John ? The hon. minister must have particulars. We heard him speak about the Harris property that was purchased during the time of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Haggart), and if he could give us the particulars of this purchase we should know something of what he has done since he took office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is some excuse for knowing about the Harris property, because we have heard a good deal about it. It struck everybody as a somewhat paralyzing purchase.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When we purchased the Harris property we were accused of having more property than was necessary at St. John for terminal facilities, but it seems we have not enough by 37 acres.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman bought a little bit of land alongside the station which very possibly will be three-quarters of an acre or an acre in extent. With that quantity of land we could not make very much of a railway yard.

Increased accommodation at Stellarton, $17,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the work you have done at Stellarton ? There is another vote already I think of $15,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is necessary for the purpose of completing the works there. Stellarton being a divisional point has to be equipped as a divisional point. It is a divisional point between Truro and Mulgrave, and we require that all engines shall take water, besides which considerable yards are required to accommodate the cars which go to the mines, and so on. We have to handle a good deal of coal traffic at that point. We intend to put up a two-story building for the accommodation of the engine men, register rooms and foremen's office, master mechanic's office, train engineers' lunch room and oil room, which will cost $6,500; heating offices and building, $1,000; new electric lighting plant, $2,000; office furniture, $1,000; building for storing wrecking car, $1,500; tracks and laying tracks, $5,000,- which makes a total of $17,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended at Stellarton ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $116,000.

Mr. BARKER. I do not understand why it is that these estimates are brought forward in this way. The hon. gentleman prepares his estimates for the year, and no doubt his officers know what will be required at a particular station. In his original estimates he wanted $15,000 for improvement at Stellarton. How does it come that these extra works are now to be undertaken which were overlooked a few months ago ? Did the hon. gentleman's officers overlook these things or does somebody else suggest that they would like to have these works carried out ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They are not overlooked and nobody suggests them to the officers. There are a great many things that the officers think are necessary and they send forward their recommendation that they should be done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We are talking about the estimates for 1903, and this is for the same year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am talking of the estimates of 1903. We do not, as a matter of preference, always insert in our main estimates every dollar of any one expenditure that may be made.

Mr. BARKER. I think that if the hon. minister's engineer would do that with an ordinary railway company he would be allowed to retire from the service. The engineer is supposed to make up his estimate of what is required on the line. He comes to his chief and says that a number of improvements are wanted at a particular station during the year. If he were to come back in six weeks and say that he wanted double the amount that he had originally asked for he would not remain in the service.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We do not want to be too harsh.

Mr. WILSON. I think it is because there will be a thin House, and everybody will be anxious to get away, that they keep these estimates from us until this late period of the session. I remember that when hon. gentlemen opposite occupied seats on this side of the House they took this objection very strongly. I do not see any reason why these amounts do not come down in the original estimates. I think this is done for a purpose that it is hard to defend.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman would not defend anything he could help.

Mr. WILSON. I think the hon. minister ought to have some reason better than the one he has given to justify acts of this kind. His party took strong grounds when they were sitting on this side of the House on this question, but he, fortunately or unfortunately for himself, has spent most of his public life in office and as a matter of course he has not had to do much in criticising, and in the province that he came from, I understand, that he did about as he liked.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I was always very careful to do what I thought the country would like.

To increase accommodation at Sydney (revote), $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Some information is required here.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is a revote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You have $70,000 odd in the main estimates, and how is it that when you were preparing your main estimates you overlooked the fact that you would have a revote of $50,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. When the estimates came up our officers did not anticipate but that they would be able to complete the work. They are satisfied now that they will not be able to do it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended at Sydney ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total estimated cost of Sydney works will be about $390,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this going to finish it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Increased accommodation at Halifax (revote $90,000), $143,000.

Mr. BOYD. The committee should rise now. We have been here since 11 o'clock this morning and it is not fair to go on voting large sums of money in this way.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have made no progress.

Mr. BOYD. But we have been doing public business. I appeal to the Minister of Finance.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. If we had been doing any business I would not object.

Mr. EARLE. We have been here day in and day out from 11 o'clock in the morning for more than a week past, and you should not ask us to stay up after two o'clock. We have been criticising the estimates very moderately, and I think we should adjourn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not one whit worse on us than it is on the hon. gentleman.

Mr. EARLE. Oh, yes it is. You can go away when you get through your estimates but the few of us here have to remain to do the business.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the minister doing with this $143,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We had a vote last year of $146,000 and in that was an item of $120,000 under the heading of increased accommodation at Halifax; dredging and blasting work at Halifax, $26,000. Out of the $120,000 we only expect to spend $45,000 up to the end of the current fiscal year which would leave $75,000 out of the $120,000 for which provision has to be made. I explained that this $75,000 was made up as follows :

New works and improvements at North street station $30,000——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Give the expenditure and the estimated amount so that we will get it in 'Hansard.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am reading the items showing the amount that was not expended and there cannot have been any expenditure. The $75,000 that remained unexpended out of the $120,000 consist of new works and improvements at North street station, $30,000; guard retaining wall, Richmond, $20,000; grading behind guards, $2,000; alterations to buildings, $15,000; making the $75,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How do you get the rest of the $90,000?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have to add to that, dredging and blasting of rock at Halifax which was in last year's estimates.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Under what heading?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Under the heading of increased accommodation at Halifax and dredging, $142,000. For dredging and blasting there will only be expended up to the end of this year $11,000, which will leave the $15,000. That makes the $90,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I mentioned that there was an engine-house at Richmond, which amounts to $53,000, and if to that you add the $90,000 revote, you will have $143,000 for the current vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell us what is the total amount, including this, expended for terminal facilities at Halifax?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. $2,000,000.

Mr. WILSON. Could the hon. minister tell us how much of that has been expended within the last five years?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot tell that off-hand.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. minister give us that, with the expenditure at St. John, to-morrow?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will with pleasure

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any scheme for taking the land between Lockman street and Water street south of the present station?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have to confess to my hon. friend that we have not taken that subject up yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I brought it to the hon. gentleman's attention last year.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman did, and if these other matters had not been very pressing, we would have turned our attention to that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I suggested to the hon. minister last year was that if that were done, a great deal of the rock blasting and other work might be dispensed with. It is highly probable that the land will have to be taken some time, and it might be better to take it now than at some future date. However, I trust that the hon. gentleman will take that into consideration.

To strengthen bridges (revote), $50,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will this finish the work? If not, what is the total amount which it is expected will be required to finish it?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have no data here, but I stated the other day that the estimate which was given at the time we started on this work was that it would probably cost in the neighbourhood of $600,000 or $700,000 altogether. Perhaps that would be a fair estimate yet, although I have not had any recent estimate on the subject.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. minister tell us how many bridges there are?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There are a great many. I had the data here when we were going through the main estimates, and I think I furnished the House with it; but I have not got these particulars here now.

Mr. WILSON. The hon. minister might bring that to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That makes $225,000 which the hon. minister is taking for strengthening the bridges this year.

To provide additional siding room and increase accommodation and facilities along the line (revote), $135,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Can you explain how it is you ask this? Did you expect to spend that much up to the 1st of July this year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We did certainly expect that when we took the estimate last year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But this year?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have received no information which would lead me to any different conclusion. We found as the season was advancing that it would be impossible for us to carry on the work to the extent originally contemplated.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If I understand rightly, there was $150,000 odd voted for increased accommodation for the third year, and you have not expended that by $135,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was $300,000 odd.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am afraid that if it takes all night we must ask the minister at what places he intends to expend that money all along the line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the hon. gentleman will look it up, he will find that when that item of $330,000 was obtained last year, I made a statement of how and where we proposed to spend that money.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. If the hon. minister has not the information with reference to this item, I will ask him to put in a written statement to-morrow of how he intends to expend this money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not sufficient for my hon. friend to be told that once or apparently even twice. I told him when the item in the main estimates was going through for the next year, and I told him when the item for $330,000 was passed last year. I did not come provided with a duplicate statement of the same thing to repeat it to-night. I did not anticipate that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister has not told us where he is going to spend the $50,000 he has in the main estimates. Will he tell us now ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot undertake to furnish information on the estimates that we disposed of some weeks ago, as to which I had the explanations, and if they were asked they will be found in 'Hansard.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It is absolutely necessary that we should know where this large expenditure is to be made, and the expenditure on every part of the work. There are only a few items ; the hon. minister can easily get the information from his department; and we want it on 'Hansard'—where he spent the money last year, and where the amount that remains unexpended is to be expended. The hon. minister says that of the $330,000 he voted last year he expended all but this $135,000. The House would like to know where he expended the vote of last year and where he intends to spend this re-vote.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have not got the statement before me, but I will bring all these statements if the hon. gentleman would give me delay.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is only reasonable that they should be furnished. The hon. minister cannot expect to get through his estimates by referring us to last year's 'Hansard.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We want an explanation of where this balance of $135,000 is to be expended. If the hon. gentleman has not got it at hand, let him give it to us before the next item passes. While on these items, let me ask him has he the information I asked for with reference to a number of votes ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have that information.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This item may be adopted on the understanding that the hon. minister will furnish the information required.

To change car couplers on passenger cars (re-vote), $8,000.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. minister took a vote last year of $20,000. How is it there were only $12,000 of that spent ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The quantity of repairs required is very considerable and the car shops are very limited in their capacity and found it impossible to get through the work.

Mr. BARKER. Is it not rather because the hon. gentleman bought new cars, instead of repairing the old ones ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not at all.

Mr. BARKER. It seems extraordinary that he estimated last year expending five times the amount he really did.

To provide new superstructure for six spans of Miramichi bridge (revote), $60,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How is it this is not expended ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The bridge companies could not get the steel and were not able to build the bridges, and will not be able before the 30th June.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Who has the contract ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have contracts with all the bridge companies.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did you call for tenders ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be required to complete ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We will require $50,000 to complete.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will that $50,000 with this re-vote complete them ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, I think so.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What will be the total amount of the whole at Miramichi ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One hundred and thirty-three

thousand dollars is the total amount, less the value of the old span, $60,000, making $70,000.

To raise Sydney and Louisbourg bridge over Intercolonial Railway at Sydney (revote, $3,300), $4,300.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why should we have to do this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have not headway enough.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is it your bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a bridge of the Sydney and Louisbourg Railway Company. We have been trying to come to some arrangement with the company, but have not yet been able, and we have to provide for this expenditure in the next year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How much was expended last year ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nothing at all.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On what principle do you do this for the railway company ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The railway was built first and the Intercolonial Railway afterwards, and the land of the company had to be expropriated for the purpose.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes, we could not compel them to rebuild the bridge for our purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This railway was built under the Sydney and Louisbourg Railway, and it ran along a trestle.

Increaed accommodation at Pictou (revote, $15,000), $70,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The appropriation for 1901-02 was $45,000. We expect to be able to expend by the end of the year $30,000. This leaves $15,000 for the re-vote. The reason for the delay was that the creosote ties were not delivered us in time to allow the contractor to complete his contract. The railway tracks on the wharf cost $3,000. A special gangway for steamers, $500. Approach, $3,250. Engineers' inspection, $2,000. Another item, $800, making $8,550. We require additional amount for land for station yard, a new station building and covered platform, and an addition to the baggage room. We have to make an approach to the station, we have to double the track on part of the approach to the station and the town, and that will make up the additional $46,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Why did not the minister bring down this $55,000 in the main estimates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am quite sure it is no fault of the engineer that it did not come down.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount expended on terminal facilities at Pictou ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One hundred and five thousand dollars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Including the $70,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Station at Nicolet (revote), $2,500.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What amount have you expended there ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We have made no expenditure yet. This item is expected to cover the whole cost.

Station and freight house at Eel river (revote), $3,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This will cover the cost.

Improvements at North Sydney, $40,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for the extension of the Intercolonial wharf 200 feet and to put up sheds, &c.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is the connection with Newfoundland.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A pretty ample amount for a wharf.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is a large pier. The extension will cost $17,000; then you have dredging to do of about the same amount and freight sheds and tracks $6,000. There is a good deal of business developing there.

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). This is not half enough.

Building a spur line of railway from Intercolonial Railway station at Rivière Ouelle to the wharf on the St. Lawrence, $43,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is this ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is for a spur line we are running down from the River Ouelle six or seven miles to secure a share of the traffic on the north side of the St. Lawrence. This is opposite places that are becoming great summer resorts. Murray Bay and adjacent places. We think it would be of material advantage to our business to have a spur line to that point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What will be the cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is expected to be covered by this vote.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Where do the passengers come from to these places ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. From every part of Canada, and from every part of the United States.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Murray Bay, Ste. Irénée, Baie St. Paul—these have become summer resorts which are largely frequented.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is this spur opposite Murray Bay ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, there will be a ferry there. I suppose that in the summer months Murray Bay has a population of four or five thousand people. Americans are swarming in there, invading the province of Quebec—and spending their money freely.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. In this $43,000 is included the cost of the right of way, which we do not think will be very large.

To increase accommodation at Moncton (re-vote, $32,000), $156,700.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We would like to know about this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are extending the machine shop to meet the very imperative demand made upon us by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) which will cost $11,000, in addition to the amount we estimated last year. We intend to build a store house and this is for the store department and the mechanical department, and we propose to equip this with electric light and steam heating. For this building we estimated $50,000. We put in steam boilers, foundation under the building with power, heating and lighting, $30,000. Steam engine, electric generators and compressed air apparatus are estimated at $28,000. Then, hot air, hoisting apparatus and other items, $7,000. These improvements are all designed for the purpose of enabling us to build, repair and handle the large locomotives.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When did the hon. gentleman get the estimate for this work ? I think there is only $15,000 and $25,000 in the main estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will give the hon. gentleman a statement on that point. The estimates for these items were received from our officers before the opening of parliament. In point of fact they were received before I became ill and unable to attend to the department. The estimates went in but, in my absence, many of the items were coolly cut out. I was not there to stand by them, so they did not stay in. It was not the fault of the engineers in any way.

Mr. WILSON. Will the hon. minister bring down what has been spent at Moncton for the last five years ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Improvements at Rockingham, $4,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This is for addition to the stations and enlargement of the freight shed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Now, I think we can quit. There is another item for the Prince Edward Island Railway, but we want to discuss the contract on the Prince Edward Island line.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This item for the Prince Edward Island Railway is $30,000 to build a new station at Charlottetown, and we are proposing to use the old one for freight and storage purposes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But I want this item to stand so as to afford an opportunity to discuss the Murray Bay extension and the Prince Edward Island road. It will take some time to do it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Item 28 is a canal item.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You are not going on with any more ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There is an hon. gentleman who has been waiting all night for this canal item, as he wishes to make a few statesmanlike observations with regard to it, I think we might take that up.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to capital—canals—Welland canal—

To deepen portions of long level between Port Colborne and Thorold...	$50,000 00
To remove obstructions in the canal from Port Colborne down to Welland....	95,000 00
	$145,000 00

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I asked the minister the other day if he was lowering the mitre sill of the lock at the entrance to Port Colborne. I thought there was a necessity for deepening the whole reach, but the minister said there was no necessity for it. I did not know how he would utilize the canal without deepening it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am surprised to hear my hon. friend make this statement, when I said distinctly that we were dredging and deepening all along. There were places where the canal had silted in, and where the water was shallow.

To remove obstructions in the canal from Port Colborne down to Welland, $95,000.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a mistake in the wording, that should be 'towards Thorold' instead of Welland. I will state what the obstructions are. A good many of these bridges across the canal are turned upon a a pier which is in the centre of the canal.

To put the Welland in proper shape for navigation all these obstructions require to be removed. We intend to appropriate a portion of this amount for the purpose of removing these obstructions and erecting new bridges. We propose that the swing bridge piers shall be on the side, the same as in all new canals.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount required for bridging from Port Colborne down to Welland, and for changing the piers ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The chief engineer tells me it will cost in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We want to know the particulars of the two branches of work, what each will cost.

Mr. GERMAN. The one difficulty in the Welland canal for a full sized canal boat drawing 14 feet of water, 265 feet long, carrying 75,000 or 80,000 bushels of grain, is that when the boat comes to a bridge pier, the pier being built in the centre of the canal, it forms an obstruction to the passage of a full sized canal boat. As the hon. gentleman well knows, every pivot pier is in the centre of the canal. There is 45 feet of navigation on each side of the pier. The locks are, it is true, only 45 feet in width, but here is the difficulty. When these large boats come to a bridge the current, which is of considerable rapidity in the canal now by reason of all the water powers that are taken from the canal, is split at the bridge pier. One of these boats has only about 10 to 12 inches of water under her keel, and it is somewhat difficult to manage. Money is being voted now to deepen that level to some extent, making it a clean 16 feet. That is what they need to have, that is what the Welland aqueduct has, that was built under the administration of the hon. member for Lanark. When these big boats come to the centre piers the current is split, and they have to turn out of their natural course, and may either go into the bank or strike a pier. That does not often happen, but it does sometimes, and the danger of its happening drives vessels away from the Welland canal. If it happens once to a boat it destroys that boat as a money-making commodity. They have to send off for tugs to straighten them around, and they will probably break a portion of the pier. It destroys the earning value of that cargo, and perhaps of every cargo that it will take through the canal that season. Moreover it causes delay, and the charge of navigation by reason of that is so great that these boats will not pass through the canal when the pier is in the centre. The Hamilton and North-western Navigation Company bought two boats from Glasgow, the 'Strathcona' and the 'Donacona,' full canal size, which navigated the canal last summer. They had to take the boats off the canal and they absolutely refused to put them on again as long as these centre piers existed. Mr. Wolvin, an American from Duluth, one of the biggest ship owners and biggest shipping men in the United States, is desirous of establishing a line of ships to run from Buffalo to Montreal or Quebec. His chief captain, Mr. Norcross, who comes from our section, captain of one of his biggest boats, was down here interviewing the government to get them to remove the centre piers. They appreciate the danger and Mr. Wolvin is willing to put on a line of ships if the government will take out the centre piers. The superintending engineer two years ago, I think it was, recommended to the department, if I am rightly advised, to put a sum in the estimates to remove the centre piers. The government did not see fit to do so then, but they have now come to the conclusion that it is the proper thing to do. I think the estimate of half a million is very much more than it will ever cost.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. How many bridges are there from Port Colborne to Welland ?

Mr. GERMAN. One of them is on the lock. There is one question that has arisen as to whether or not the government or the railway companies are responsible for rebuilding the railway bridges. For instance, there is the Air Line bridge and there is the Michigan Central bridge. There are three highway bridges between Port Colborne and Welland costing $20,000 apiece

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. One will cost $30,000.

Mr. GERMAN. Well, one, say $30,000. Below Welland there is one, exactly at the town of Welland there is one and then there are four or five between that and the locks. When you come to the locks it will not be necessary to remove the bridges, because they all swing on the locks themselves. One might ask : Why is it necessary to have the channel where the bridge is any wider than the channel where the lock is ? When you come to the lock you have the current going into the lock and a boat, with the speed slowed down, will float right into it straight so that there is no splitting of the current, and the difficulty so far as the other bridges are concerned is that the piers stand in the centre of the canal and the split current is liable to turn the nose of the boat against the shore or against the pier. That is one reason why we have not more boats running through the canal at the present time. Navigators do not want to take small boats through and they will not go through with full sized boats so long as these centre piers are there. I think this is a wise expenditure.

Welland canal—To build a concrete centre pier and steel swing span for Montrose bridge over Chippewa river, $9,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the reason for building that bridge ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The present bridge requires to be rebuilt and a swing bridge is necessary.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of the Minister of Finance, House adjourned at 2.55 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 13, 1902.

The Speaker took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 112) to amend the Immigration Act.—The Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton) moved :

That the said amendments be agreed to, except the amendment whereby the words 'or for any other cause whatsoever' are inserted in the eleventh line thereof, and, as to said last mentioned amendment, the same be disagreed to because such amendment confers upon the Governor in Council power to forbid the landing of any person whatever in Canada in the discretion of the Governor in Council which is an altogether excessive and improper power to rest in the executive authority.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where are the Senate amendments to be found ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I presume they are in the original Bill. I will read them so that they can be followed. The Bill was pretty fully discussed in the House, and I need not go over what was said in connection with the general subject. But in the Senate some amendments have been made. The second section has been amended by adding after the word 'necessary' the words :—

And every owner or master of a vessel who violates the provisions of this Act ; or who aids or abets an immigrant or passenger in acting in contravention of such order or proclamation ; or who refuses or neglects to take back on board the vessel any such immigrant or passenger, shall incur a penalty not exceeding ten hundred dollars and not less than one hundred dollars in the case of each and every immigrant or passenger.

I have no objection to that amendment. It seems to me, perhaps, effective in amplifying the original intention of the Bill. Then, the first section, which enacts a section to follow section 24 of the Act, has been amended by inserting after the word 'any' in the tenth line, the word 'loathsome.' This would make it read :—

The Governor General may, by a proclamation or order, whichever he considers most expedient and whenever he deems it necessary prohibit the landing in Canada of any immigrant or any other passenger who is suffering from any loathsome, dangerous or infectious disease or malady——

—And so on. I see no particular objection to that amendment. but there has been inserted after the word 'malady,' the words 'or for any other cause whatsoever.' Now, that would make the section read in this way.

The Governor General may, by proclamation or order, whichever he considers most expedient, and whenever he deems it necessary, prohibit the landing in Canada of any immigrant or other passenger who is suffering from any dangerous or infectious disease or malady, or for any other cause whatsoever.

So that, as the Act is amended by the Senate, the Governor in Council may, in the arbitrary exercise of his discretion, prevent any passenger for any cause from coming into Canada. I need only point out that if my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), should go across to see the Coronation and the government, not desiring his presence here next session thought it desirable to prevent his landing, under this Act they could legally prevent him from coming into the country again. The persons we may stop, are not classified or restricted in any way. I do not know whether the attention of the Senate was called to the extremely remarkable powers which they desire to confer upon the government, but, certainly, the government does not consider that the executive authority should have such unlimited powers for the exclusion of people coming into Canada. No such principle has been adopted by parliament before, and we think that parliament would like at least to have a full discussion of the matter before adopting such a principle. I agree with the other amendments, but I think this one had better go back.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it would be better not to include these words. They seem to confer very wide power which is hardly necessary at the present time. As to the object of it, possibly some members of the government who are to remain here during the Coronation would like to keep out of the country some of those who are going. However, I would not like to see an unfair advantage taken of any of them in this way and I agree with my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior in this motion.

Mr. SPROULE. While this amendment seems to go too far, I think there should be a wider range of specified ailments and conditions that would be legal ground for excluding a party, so that those who are undesirable immigrants for other causes than such as are here given might be prevented from landing in the country. Notwithstanding this Act, people who are mentally

unsound and physically unfit may come in if they are not the victims of some loathsome, dangerous or infectious disease.

Motion agreed to.

MEDICAL COUNCIL OF CANADA.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). With the consent of my hon. friends on the other side, I will call item 39 of the Public Bills and Orders, consideration of amendments made by the Senate to the Bill of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Roddick), for the establishment of a medical council in Canada.

Mr. RODDICK. I move that the amendments be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we ought to know what these amendments are.

The PRIME MINISTER. If they satisfy my hon. friend from Montreal they satisfy me.

Mr. RODDICK. I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. SPROULE. I object to that, because, though it may be satisfactory to one or two gentlemen, it may not be satisfactory to the House in general. We have a right to know what the amendments are, because they might be objectionable to some, though not to others.

Mr. RODDICK. I may say that the amendments are practically only an addition to the amendment which was passed in this House some days ago, that is to say, that all the provinces shall consent before this Act can come into operation. There are a few changes in the wording, and an addition of one or two words, which are evidently unnecessary. I went over them very carefully with friends in the Senate yesterday, and I think there is no serious change in the Bill beyond what I mention. The changes are found on page 520 of the Votes and Proceedings.

INCORPORATION OF JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Bill (No. 161) respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by Letters Patent (The Prime Minister) read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). This is a new Bill to simplify the granting of letters patent. There are some new clauses.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This seems to be a pretty serious kind of Bill to put through at this stage of the session. I did not suppose, on account of the delay in bringing it before the House, that there was any intention on the part of the government to pass it this session.

The PRIME MINISTER. This Bill has been carefully gone into in the Senate. The object is merely to simplify the method whereby letters patent are now granted. They are now granted by Governor in Council, and there is a good deal of red tape in the procedure. The gist of the Bill is in the first clause. I do not think my hon. friend will find it very formidable. Letters patent are to be issued by the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it were merely a Bill regulating the issue of letters patent, that would be comparatively simple. It is desirable that the formation of companies should be free as much as possible from any red tape. But this is a great deal more than that, because it deals with the constitution of these companies, with their powers, the liabilities of the directors, the shareholders ; in fact, it is a Joint Stock Companies Act to all intents and purposes—a very important Bill indeed.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE (Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick). It is practically a re-enactment of a great number of statutes, respecting the several questions the hon. gentleman has just referred to. There are very few new clauses, and these have special reference to the preliminary stages. In other respects my hon. friend will find it practically the old Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course this is quite in order if we are content to accept the statement of the right hon. gentleman and of the Minister of Justice, and to abdicate all responsibility in the matter.

The MINISTER OF JUSTICE. I did not mean that at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know my hon. friend did not, but that is what it means, for at this stage how can we give any intelligent consideration to this Bill, and take upon ourselves the duty of suggesting amendments where we think they should be made. That is what we should do, in view of the existing law, at an appropriate time. But of course we cannot do that at this stage of the session, and if we are not to do that, what are we to do ? We are to sit here and listen to the clauses being read, and accept the assurances of the right hon. gentleman and of the Minister of Justice, that all these clauses are perfectly right—they are the existing clauses, and there is no use of any further amendment. Well, I do not regard that as a desirable way of dealing with legislation of this kind. I certainly did not expect this legislation would be pressed.

The PRIME MINISTER. In view of the very reasonable protest entered by my hon. friend, I will not press the Bill. I move that

the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE CHARLES A. BULL PRODUCE COMPANY.

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

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House and of the government to a grievance which has arisen among the produce merchants of Montreal, and which probably exists throughout the Dominion. I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture last night, whose department that matter particularly concerns. He was here this morning, and I suppose I may state the facts. In the early part of the spring the Canadian commission merchants and those employed by them who had business in England, when calling upon their clients there, were surprised to find that in many instances they had been forestalled by the visit of a gentleman named Bull. Mr. Bull had presented himself——

Mr. MACLEAN. Is his name John ?

Mr. MONK. It is not John Bull but Charles Bull. He presented the card which I hold in my hand and by which card he purported to represent 'The Chas. A. Bull, Produce Company, cable address, 'Chasab,' $50,000 subscribed capital,' and gave his address as Montreal, Canada. In presenting himself to the people in the commission business and those interested in the importation of produce from Canada he had a letter which, according to the testimony of one commission merchant of the city of Montreal, who was in England at that time —I speak of February, March and the early part of April—from the Secretary of the High Commissioner in England. Fifteen of these letters had been distributed among the commission merchants there and these letters, of which I have one here, were letters introducing Mr. Bull, written by Mr. Colmer, Secretary to the High Commissioner in England and written upon paper of the High Commissioner's office. I shall read this letter, which was addressed to the merchants and produce importers with whom Mr. Bull desired to establish business relations :

Dear Sir,—I am desired by the High Commissioner to give to the bearer, Mr. Charles A. Bull, this note of introduction to you, in the hope that you will be able to spare a few minutes conversation with him on a matter in which he is interested.

Mr. Bull, who is engaged in the export trade in Canadian produce, brought a letter of introduction to Lord Strathcona from Mr. Fisher, Dominion Minister of Agriculture, with whom he is acquainted.

The High Commissioner will be obliged if you will grant Mr. Bull an interview, and has much pleasure in commending him to your consideration.

I am, dear sir,
Yours faithfully,
J. G. COLMER,
Secretary.

The Canadian merchants having dealings with English merchants, as a rule, found themselves in some embarrassment, being confronted by this letter in most of the places where they went to. One of them took one of these letters and brought it to this country together with the card issued by Mr. Bull. It was represented to these gentlemen that Mr. Bull, although soliciting business for this new company and although having a letter from the High Commissioner's office upon the recommendation of the Dominion Minister of Agriculture, had very little experience in that line of business, and probably on this account the commission merchants lost less than they would have otherwise, because hon. members of this House know very well to what extent a gentleman going from Canada and holding a letter of recommendation in his hand from the High Commissioner, issued at the special request of the Minister of Agriculture—might be placed in a position of advantage. Those who are acquainted with the customs of the trade in England will easily imagine what amount of influence such a document would have given Mr. Bull. At that time Mr. Bull had no legally incorporated company, but there was a project on foot in this country for the formation of a company in which company I find that the brother of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and I think, one of the employees of the Department of Agriculture were the principal promoters. I wrote the hon. Minister of Agriculture last night before I left the House a letter addressed to his department in which I told him I would bring this matter up. I do not know whether or not he received the letter.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I did not receive the letter.

Mr. MONK. Well, I wrote it. I can briefly state to the hon. minister the facts which I desire to call to his attention.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am quite ready to listen to the hon. gentleman, but I did not receive the letter.

Mr. MONK. I was stating that the complaint is one made by the produce merchants of the city of Montreal, and I have no doubt that the same complaint is made by some produce merchants outside of the city of Montreal. They complain that they were forestalled in the canvass for business in England during the early part of last spring by Mr. Bull who had a letter

of introduction which I have read to the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. During the early part of last spring ?

Mr. MONK. During the early part of this last spring. Mr. Bull went among their clients in England armed with a letter issued by the Secretary of the High Commissioner. These letters were left together with a card of the Bull Produce Company at different places of business in England where these Montreal merchants were in the habit of doing business :

Dear Sir,—I am desired by the High Commissioner to give to the bearer, Mr. Charles A Bull, this note of introduction to you in the hope that you will be able to spare a few minutes conversation with him on a matter in which he is interested.

Mr. Bull, who is engaged in the export trade in Canadian produce, brought a letter of introduction to Lord Strathcona from Mr. Fisher, Dominion Minister of Agriculture, with whom he is acquainted.

The High Commissioner will be obliged if you will grant Mr. Bull an interview, and has much pleasure in commending him to your consideration.

I am, dear sir,
Yours faithfully,
J. G. COLMER,
Secretary.

At that time it is claimed that Mr. Bull represented, not a company, because there was no company then formed, but some parties interested in the export trade of Canadian produce, and that principal among these parties were the brother of the hon. Minister of Agriculture and an employee in the Department of Agriculture. I will quote to the House from the Quebec Official 'Gazette,' of the 10th of May, the present month, a notice to the parties seeking incorporation. At page 1,014 there is a notice of an application of some parties for incorporation under the name of the Charles A. Bull Produce Company, and in the sixth paragraph are given the names of the promoters of this produce company applying for incorporation.

Sixth. The names in full and the address and callings of the applicants are as follows :

Charles Irving Knight, of East Hatley, province of Quebec, general merchant ; Aaron Bull, of East Farnham, in the province of Quebec, gentleman ; Charles Albert Bull, of the city of Montreal, produce merchant ; Miss Annie Allison Horrigan, of the city of Portland, England, spinster ; Roswell Corse Fisher, of the city of Montreal, gentleman ; Horace H. Bailey, of the City of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario, clerk ; of which the first three are to be the first directors of the said company. All the said directors reside in Canada, and are subjects of His Majesty.

Now, it is claimed that of all these parties whose names I have given and who were on the 10th of May applying for incorporation, but who had not then obtained incorporation, the only responsible parties are Mr. Aaron Bull, who, I understand, is one of the chief supporters of my hon. friend in his constituency, Mr. Roswell Corse Fisher of Montreal, a brother of the hon. gentleman, and Mr. Horace Bailey, who, I am informed, is an employee in the Department of Agriculture. What the merchants of Montreal complain of is that the hon. Minister of Agriculture should have given this letter of introduction to Mr. Bull which enabled him to obtain from the High Commissioner in England a letter of introduction to each one of the importers, and which consequently placed the exporters of Montreal, who have been engaged in business for a long time and who have built up their business, in a handicapped position in regard to the promotion of their interests in England. It is claimed that in so acting the Minister of Agriculture went beyond the duties of his office ; that if he issued a letter in that way in favour of any one engaged in that line of business—which is a difficult business to build up and in which business some people have been engaged for many years—he should have given that letter, having an official character, to each one of those gentlemen or not given it to any one of them. One of these gentleman found letters of this kind in England in fifteen places where he was in the habit of doing business. They found that in the face of this letter of an official character coming from the High Commissioner upon the recommendation of the Minister of Agriculture, they were handicapped in obtaining orders. That is the complaint which they have made to me. It seems to me that it is a complaint well founded, and in pursuance of their desire I thought it my duty to bring it to the notice of the House.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. (Hon. Sydney Fisher.) I regret that I did not receive the letter of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) beforehand, so that I could have had with me a copy of the letter of introduction to the High Commissioner which I gave to Mr. Bull. I may say that it is quite a frequent occurrence that all persons engaged in Canadian business who are going to England ask for letters of introduction to the High Commissioner. Mr. Charles A. Bull asked me through a letter which I will show to the hon. gentleman for a letter of introduction to the High Commissioner. Having known Mr. Bull for a long time personally, although not connected with him in any business way, I gave him that letter of introduction. Mr. Bull appears to have presented the letter to the High Commissioner's office and to have received a letter from Mr. Colmer, secretary to the High Commissioner, introducing him to certain people with whom he wished to open business relations. Personally, I have always understood that it was one of the functions of our High Commissioner's office in London, to enable Canadians going to the old country to be introduced, when

they were known, or when they had proper references, to people in England for business purposes. I have myself on frequent occasions given letters of introduction to the High Commissioner to people from different parts of Canada with whom I was personally acquainted, and I know that others who are acquainted with the High Commissioner have done the same thing. As far as the company which Mr. Bull represents is concerned, what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) has just read to the House is the first which I have ever heard of it. I do not know that Mr. Bull is forming such a company ; I did not know that my brother, Mr. Roswell C. Fisher, was concerned with it, nor do I know who else was concerned.

Mr. MONK. Might I ask if it is true that Mr. Horace Bailey is employed in the department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There is a Mr. Bailey who is one of the patent examiners in my department, appointed many years ago by the Tories, but I do not know if he is the same.

Mr. MONK. Horace H. Bailey.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. His name is H. Bailey, but I cannot say whether it is Horace or not. I now nothing more about that than I do about the incorporation of that company of which I have never heard in my life until the hon. gentleman read the notice of incorporation. Mr. Charles A. Bull is a young man who came from my own county a good many years ago and entered business in Montreal. He has been a produce dealer there, and has done a good deal of buying and selling of butter and cheese in Montreal. He informed me that he wished to open direct communication with the old country and it was for that purpose that he asked from me a letter of introduction to the High Commissioner, so that when he went to England he might have somebody to whom to refer. Mr. Aaron Bull, whose name is mentioned there, is one of the most respectable and substantial farmers of my county, a gentleman whom I could trust and rely on in every shape and way ; an old Quaker, if I may use the term, whose name is noted for integrity and substantial standing in the community in which he lives. Mr. Charles A. Bull is his son, and he is a young man who, as I say, went to Montreal some years ago to enter business, and who, as far as I know, has conducted himself in a proper and trustworthy way. He has been concerned in a business which has not met with the approval of all the produce dealers in Montreal, because he has been a rival of theirs, and has been working up a trade on somewhat different lines from the established lines of the butter and cheese associations of the city of Montretal. In that way he has incurred, if not the enmity, at all events the dislike, of those who have been long established in the trade. I do not know, however, that there is anything in his methods which are objectionable or to which exception can be taken. If there is I know not of it. I do not know, that because his business happens not to have been on the lines of the established houses there, that therefore it is necessarily bad or improper in any way. Not having received notice of this matter being brought up, I have not got with me a copy of the letter which I gave to Mr. Bull, nor a copy of his letter to me asking for that introduction. I believe that the letter which I gave him will not show in any way any improper relations between him and me, or any relations except those of courtesy to one whom I knew and who asked for a letter of introduction in going to England, which I was quite willing to give him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Or to anybody else.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Or to anybody else as my hon. friend says, and as I have given to many other people. I knew I could depend on him, and I considered myself justified and in fact bound to give him a letter of introduction to the High Commissioner. I do not know that I can say any more in regard to this matter and so far as my own family relations are concerned, I apparently gave that letter to Mr. Bull before he tried to form the company of which I now hear for the first time that my brother is one of the incorporators.

REVIEW OF THE FINANCIAL SITUATION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the House very briefly, some facts in connection with the expenditure of this country during the present fiscal year, and also with regard to the proposed expenditure for the fiscal year which will end on the 30th of June, 1903. We have been accustomed during the past four or five years to a somewhat different nomenclature with regard to expenditure in this country, from that which prevailed during the years when the gentlemen on the treasury benches were in opposition. In those days, notably the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright), the present Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Mulock), the premier himself—and the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), was not far behind then—they preached throughout this country to the people of Canada that there was a reckless and extravagant expenditure on the part of the Conservative administration; an expenditure which it was said at that time reached the sum of about $36,000,000 a year on consolidated account.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Thirty-eight million dollars.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Trade and Commerce corrects me. He is more familiar with these figures than perhaps I am. Thirty-eight millions! I wonder if he has impressed upon him to the same extent the amount to which that figure has swelled at the present day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He remembers that it was $38,000,000 in these days because he preached it throughout this country; because he told the people of Canada so often that it was extravagant and scandalous. I wonder if the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has fully grasped the fact that during the present fiscal year the expenditure amounts to $51,000,000, and to this sum is to be added $14,250,000 on capital account, making a grand total of $65,250,000. Why, in days gone by the hon. gentleman would have shuddered at such an expenditure as he shuddered at the nepotism of days gone by. But these things do not shock him now at all. I remember when he said that a Conservative minister who happened to have some relative in the department was as fortunate as a bashaw with seven—no, three tails. Well, I do not really know with how many tails the hon. gentleman himself is now connected. I lost the count some time ago; but perhaps the hon. gentleman has that circumstance impressed on his mind as much as he has the fact that $38,000,000 was the highest expenditure during the time of the Conservative regime. In those days this was reckless and extravagant expenditure. Mr. Speaker, you know what it is now: it is merely generous appropriation. You have noticed that from listening to the debates in this House and from noticing the comments of the Liberal press in the country. Another curious circumstance has taken place. Formerly this money, which was wastefully and extravagantly expended, belonged to the people of this country. It consisted of taxes wrung from the people by an odious and scandalous system of taxation. But now, Sir, that has all ceased. These moneys now belong to this government, who in the goodness of their hearts are pleased to appropriate a portion towards the public services; and when the moneys in their possession are not sufficient for the purpose they are good enough to pledge the future of the country by borrowing large sums of money and adding to the public debt. And how delightful it is to know that the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) grows more and more philosophical as the years roll by. In days gone by this condition of things would have stirred his blood; but now, Mr. Speaker, as you have observed during the past four or five years, he sits in his seat and views this wreck and ruin, as it would have been termed in days gone by, with the most charming philosophy and equanimity that has ever been exhibited by any public man in this country. How delightful it is that this change, this philosophic change, occurs in one as the years roll on, and how pleasing it is to be able to view an increase of taxation in the spirit which the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has been able to apply to what has taken place during the past four or five years. I am glad I am able to amuse that hon. gentleman at the present time—that the mere thought of the pleasant change that has come over the spirit of his dream affords him amusement, and that this extraordinary expenditure, instead of producing the result in my hon. friend which it would have produced fifteen years ago, is capable of giving him not simply the cheerfulness, but the merriment which we see him exhibit on all occasions in this House when this subject is referred to. It inspires us with delightful confidence in the sincerity of our public men in this country, particularly those now sitting on the government benches. We cannot help feeling inspired as to the future of this country when we know that public men can retain in this marked manner the opinions and sentiments of days gone by, and also view, as the hon. gentleman does, the increase of expenditure in the philosophic spirit which he has exhibited on all occasions in this House since his party came into power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned to you, an expenditure of $36,000,000 or $38,000,000 was three or four millions too much, according to the statements of not one merely, but three or four of these gentlemen when going through the country. But now an expenditure of $51,000,000 is quite within bounds. My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, unless paired, will stand up in a few minutes and vote against the motion which I purpose to offer this House, and he will do it with that cheerful smile and that remarkable equanimity which he has exhibited to us on all occasions when this subject has been mentioned.

The net debt of this country was a subject that used to agitate my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock) in days gone by. Well, we have had in Canada during the past four or five years a time of the most abundant prosperity. The revenues of the country have swelled to an enormous amount—to a figure undreamed of in days gone by. That prosperity has been shared in by this country with all the rest of the world, and notwithstanding the fact that we have had these abundant revenues, there has been no decrease of the public debt; but on the contrary, we have seen that debt increasing from year to year, and during the present year we have had the announcement of the hon. Minister of Finance that it will be increased by no less than $6,000,000. And our

hon. friends opposite, particularly the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, regard that circumstance with a smiling cheerfulness which their utterances of former days would have in no wise led us to expect.

These hon. gentlemen were not satisfied with going up and down the country preaching this doctrine individually. They held a convention in 1893 and announced it as one of the planks of their platform. This plank has been referred to so often that I almost hesitate to mention it again. I am bound to say that it ought to be in a good state of preservation, because it has not been trodden on by hon. gentlemen opposite during the last four or five years, and I presume that it is a plank that is capable of sustaining these gentlemen once more when they get into opposition. They do not use it at all when in power, and therefore it will be in a very excellent state of preservation when they come again to use it, as I hope they will very soon, in opposition. The plank was this :

> We cannot but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt and of the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878, and we demand the strictest economy in the administration of the government of the country.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce could not but view with alarm the large increase of the public debt from 1878 to 1893, and his alarm was more than shared by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and by other prominent Liberal leaders, some of whom have departed from the political stage, and to whom I will not more particularly refer. Does my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce view with alarm the large increase of the public debt to-day ? Does my hon. friend the Minister of Customs view it with alarm ? Does my hon. friend the Postmaster General ? If so, Mr. Speaker, you will have observed, no doubt, that they have a remarkable faculty of concealing the alarm. They sit in their seats while these sums are being voted without any change of countenance, and without giving any outward and visible sign of that alarm and trepidation which no doubt they must feel in their hearts. They also viewed with alarm the 'large increase' in 'the controllable annual expenditure of the Dominion and the consequent undue taxation of the people under the governments that have been continuously in power since 1878.' Hon. gentlemen opposite lay a great deal of stress on the rate of taxation; but every one knows that a great many more millions are taken out of the people of this country every year than were ever taken by the Conservative administration. Do they view that fact with alarm ? No, they stand up in this House and justify it, because forsooth they say that the rate has been reduced a little. Let us look at just two or three incidents which attracted so much interest on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by. The net debt of this country in 1896, when these hon. gentlemen came into power, was $258,427,431. In 1892, it was $241,131,431, or an increase of a little over $17,000,000. These gentlemen came into power in 1896, and in the fiscal year 1901 it had increased to $268,480,000. And the hon. Minister of Finance estimates that there will be a further increase of $6,000,000 in the present year—a very remarkable increase in the public debt considering the abundant and unexpected revenue which this country has enjoyed during the past six years.

Look at the taxes which are being taken out of the people at present as compared with former years. The receipts from taxes in each year of the last ten years have been as follows :

Total Receipts—From Taxes.

1892	$28,446,157
1893	29,321,367
1894	27,579,203
1895	25,446,199
1896	27,759,285
1897	28,648,626
1898	29,576,456
1899	34,958,069
1900	38,242,223
1901	38,743,550

I shall not go over all the items of the total revenue, but will merely give the amounts of the first and last of these ten years. In 1892 the total revenue was $36,921,871, and in 1901 it was $52,516,332. And my hon. friend the Finance Minister estimates that the revenue for the current year of 1902 will be no less than $56,800,000. Yet notwithstanding that fact, $6,000,000 will be added to the public debt.

Yet these figures, which would have aroused the attention of my hon. friends on the other side in days gone by, are regarded by them as matters of mere routine, as matters of course, under the present regime, and as matters which entitle this government to the gratitude of the country.

Look at the total expenditures during the past ten years :

1892	$42,272,136
1893	40,853,728
1894	43,008,234
1895	42,872,338
1896	41,702,383
1897	42,572,756
1898	45,334,281
1899	51,542,635
1900	52,717,467
1901	57,982,866

And according to the estimate of the hon. Minister of Finance, the expenditures during 1902 will reach no less a sum than $65,-

250,000, or an increase of nearly $8,000,000 over the expenditure during the past year.

If we look at the expenditure on consolidated revenue account alone, the record is almost as bad:

1892....	$36,765,894
1893....	36,814,053
1894....	37,585,025
1895....	38,132,005
1896....	36,949,142
1897, the first year of this economical government.	38,349,760
1898..	38,832,526
1899....	41,903,500
1900....	42,975,280
1901....	46,886,368

Or an increase of nearly $4,000,000 in one year. And for 1902 the Minister of Finance estimates $51,000,000, or an increase of more than $4,000,000 in one single bound. From 1900 to 1902 the increase in the expenditure of this country, chargeable to consolidated fund, is between $8,000,000 and $9,000,000. Yet my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce does not whisper above his breath on this subject.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He has nothing to say now about the farmers being bled white.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am reminded of a favourite expression used by these hon. gentlemen in days gone by. The farmers, they were wont to say were being bled white. Of what colour would my hon. friend regard the farmers at present?

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. They never were as prosperous in their lives as during the last four years.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Owing no doubt to this extra expenditure of from $8,000,000 to $9,000,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Very largely.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I presume then that as we cannot have too much of a good thing we will have another increase in expenditure of $8,000,000 next year.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We expect to see it before we go out of office.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). By a judicious application of that principle the farmers of this country will eventually reach the highest stage of prosperity.

I would like to refer for a moment to some items which we are passing from year to year and to the manner in which the public money is being expended. Take, for example, the construction of the telegraph lines in the Yukon, under the administration of the hon. Minister of Public Works. Look at the expenditure on cigars and various drinkables which were necessary for the due and proper construction and maintenance of that line, and observe the efforts which the watch dog of the treasury, the Minister of Finance, made to prevent any unnecessary inquiry into these expenditures. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance is supposed to be the watch dog of the treasury. He reminds me very much of a watch dog spoken of by an American humorist. The burglars seemed frequent in the neighbourhood of this gentleman, and he procured a dog for the purpose of preventing any undue abstraction of his goods and chattels. A burglar did arrive while the watch dog was there. The faithful and intelligent animal fraternized with the burglar and immediately seized by the throat a policeman who arrived shortly afterwards to arrest the burglar. The attitude of the Minister of Finance, when we were pursuing our inquiries in the Public Accounts Committee into the expenditure, seemed to me very much like that of this watch dog. He fraternized with the gentlemen who were making raids on the treasury benches, but was hot and eager to seize by the throat any gentleman who was prepared to make any criticism or inquiry.

Look at the moneys which were voted by this parliament for public buildings in the Yukon and at the mode in which some of those moneys was expended. Officials were provided in that country, not only with a salary but a very ample living allowance as well, in some cases ranging to $3,000, and possibly more, and we found, when we went into the public accounts, that money voted for public buildings in the Yukon had been applied in paying the living expenses of these gentlemen in addition to the salary and living allowance voted them by parliament. When we inquired into this extraordinary condition, the hon. Minister of Public Works simply shrugged his shoulders and washed his hands of the whole business. He said that he was ordered to pay the money by the Minister of Justice, and when we inquired about it from the Minister of Justice that hon. gentleman also disclaimed responsibility by saying that at the time he was not in office. There was not one member of the administration who could give us the slightest information or justification for this expenditure of public money.

Look at the expenditure on the Gallops Rapids. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has an item of $50,000 in his estimates for expenditure on these rapids. Consider the position of affairs there. We are told that the Auditor General, or some official of this government who had a due regard for the public service, gave notice to certain contractors that the vote had lapsed on the 30th June last. Notwithstanding that, we have the Minister of Railways and Canals admitting, as he was forced to admit by cross-examination by hon. members on this side, that the work has been going on there to the extent of a great many thousands of dollars during the past year. We were not able to ascertain by whose direction or to what extent that work had gone on. The only information we were able

to get from the Minister of Railways and Canals was that he and his department knew nothing about it, but that the contractors came down here during the present year and presented their bill for a good many thousands of dollars, which they desired this government to pay. It was said that if the government had not ordered this work it would not be paid for. But it transpired a little later on that officers of the government had been in charge of the work, and yet we could not fasten responsibility for the expenditure of this money upon any member of the government. That is the information we have up to the present time. Perhaps we shall have further information before the prorogation of this House. And not only that, but we were assured by an hon. gentleman on this side who professed to know whereof he spoke that the work was not only useless but detrimental because it impeded the course of steamships up and down that canal. Then look at the Intercolonial Railway—contracts let without tender to the extent of twenty or thirty miles of road on the ground that ten miles of the same line had been let at the same figure after public call for tender. Look at the expenditure of public money in the county of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance—and I am not referring to this specially because it is in his own county, but as an illustration of the methods of hon. gentlemen opposite. Consider the matter that I brought to the attention of the House this year, where a canal was cut from the sea to a lake, for the ostensible purpose of creating a harbour for fishermen. But when the canal was cut, it was found that the bottom of the lake was higher than the sea-level, and the only result of the work was that the lake was drained into the sea.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The only way in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has brought this to the notice of the House is by quoting an anonymous letter. But has never ventured, either before the Public Accounts Committee or in any other way, to enter upon an investigation of any of the cases he referred to. In fact, he has shown by his own action that he has not the slightest faith in the statements that have been made to him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the hon. Minister of Finance deny that what I have stated is correct ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not know. And that is just the difference between the hon. gentleman and me. I do not know and I acknowledge that I do not know ; he does not know, but he does not acknowledge it. But, when he brought the matter up in the House he would not give the name of his informant. If the hon. gentleman had investigated, the engineers would have been present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). 'If the hon. gentleman had investigated !' Here is the watchdog of the treasury, and when I challenge him to deny the truth of the representations made to me not by one or two but by half a dozen responsible men, the only answer he is able to make, this watchdog of the treasury, is that he does not know.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I say that this is an engineering matter. The engineers know the facts, but they have been carefully not brought before the committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. minister does not know. And yet these engineers are officers of his government, and he could easily have informed himself upon the subject. And I know the hon. gentleman well enough to understand that if the facts had been otherwise than as I have stated them, public inquiry would have been made and the facts would have been heralded abroad.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend permit me to interrupt him ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Certainly.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I can state on the authority of the Minister of Public Works, whose engineers has made inquiries, that the statements were unfounded in nine points out the ten in relation to the works he referred to in Shelburne county.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am talking of one particular work, and the hon. gentleman will not get out of it by trying to distract attention to works in other parts of the county.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. What work is it ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The lake to which I have referred.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have made the statement on the authority of the engineer. I do not separate one from the other of the statements——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot even tell the hon. gentleman at this particular moment where the lake is to which he referred. But I state that if he desires an investigation even now, we will take that investigation. Let the engineers be summoned and it will be shown that the hon. gentleman is entirely misinformed. And, let the House bear in mind that he has never to this moment given the name of his informant.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is somewhat annoyed about this——

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Oh, no, I am not.

Mr. SPROULE. He may well be.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). Anonymous letters hurt nobody.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman being annoyed. And his friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) is coming to his assistance by talking about anonymous letters. Why, there ought to be a motion to strike out the hon. gentleman's salary because of the scandalous attack that he made upon census enumerators without giving them the slightest opportunity to make any explanation or to say a word in their own defence. Yet this is the gentleman who talks about anonymous letters. I think that if any member of the government is to come to the assistance of the Minister of Finance with regard to a matter of this kind, it had better be some one else than the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Now, Sir, I have made this statement about the lake, and have made it, as I say, on the authority of information furnished me not by one or two, but by half a dozen responsible men.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Give us the names.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And I have brought the matter to the attention of the Minister of Finance and to the attention of the Minister of Public Works. If the statements made to me are not correct some authoritative denial should have been made with regard to them long before this.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We have never had any charge ; no names have been given.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman is always very anxious for names and for obvious purposes.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Yes, for obvious purposes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The point in all this, however, is not who gave me the information ; the real point in the interest of this country is whether the information given to me is correct or incorrect.

Further than that, I point out that the expenditure of public money, in many respects, does not proceed upon systematic lines or upon any principle whatever. We have brought down to us in the closing days of this session supplementary estimates of large volume. At two or three in the morning, with twenty or twenty-five men in this House, with three cabinet ministers, two of them asleep and the other putting through his estimates, we have been voting here hundreds and thousands, and hundreds of thousands—aye, even millions of dollars for expenditures as to which we could not pretend at this stage of the session without undue waste of time to get any information from the government. We have no less than 258 items in the supplementary estimates relating to rivers and harbours alone, items covering thousands of miles of this country, items concerning which it is utterly impossible for us at this time to gain accurate and necessary information. We have been obliged to allow these items to go through without the information which we should have. And we throw upon this government, as we have a right to do, the responsibility for the expenditure of this money without giving any further information here than that which is afforded.

Criticism has been offered as to the duty of the opposition with regard to items of this kind. It has been said by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and also by the press which supports them, that the opposition, if they object to this enormous expenditure should move to strike out items that they do not approve of.

Well, the record of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to that indicates that in making this assertion they are departing as far from the principles which they professed in the past as they have in a great many other respects. In 1879, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce proposed to make a reduction of $70,000 in the expenditure for civil government. In 1881, they moved no resolution against the expenditure. In 1882 they moved for a reduction of $8,000; in 1883, no resolution was moved; in 1884, no resolution; in 1885, no resolution; in 1886, no resolution; in 1887, no resolution; in 1888, no resolution. The House will bear in mind that during all these years my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was going through this country clamouring against what he called the extravagant expenditure of the Conservative administration of that time. In 1889 the present Minister of Trade and Commerce moved that the vote for Manitoba penitentiaries be reduced by $10,526. In the same year Mr. McMullen, the present Senator McMullen, moved that the vote for East Pictou river improvements be reduced by $500. In the same year Sir Louis Davies, a late member of this government, moved that the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway be reduced by $200,000, and gave as his reason the fact that coal was being carried from Springhill mine at less than cost. In the same year the present Minister of Trade and Commerce moved that a vote for the Department of the Interior be reduced by $95,748. In the same year—this was a very active year with regard to motions for reduction of expenditure—Mr. Somerville moved that a vote of $195,135 be reduced by $50,000, because Mr. Henry Smith, who was formerly a member of the House, and Mr. W. A. Webster, who was immigration agent, had not furnished correct dates for their services. In the same year Mr. McMullen moved that the salary of C. C. Chipman be reduced by $2,300, or left out. In 1890 no resolution was moved,

nor was any moved in 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 and 1896. During every one of these years the cry went up from hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly from the hon. gentlemen to whom I have previously referred, that the expenditure of this country was scandalous and extravagant.

Now, where an opposition are not able to get, within a reasonable time, and without unduly protracting the session, information which would enable them to discriminate between hundreds of items brought down to this House, when they are unable to get information which would put them in the same position for forming an opinion that the government are in, the proper duty for an opposition is to protest against excessive expenditure, to throw upon the government the responsibility of making it, knowing as they do that the government have within their power the means of reducing that expenditure by eliminating from it items which are less worthy of public appropriation than those which are necessary to be made. That is the view which has been put forward in the English House of Commons as a sound principle, that an opposition in protesting, as we have protested, against undue expenditure, have discharged their duty without dealing in detail with the particular items of the expenditure brought down by the government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to go over these facts in greater detail, as they have been discussed, not only in the country but in this House for a long time. I say we must bear in mind in this country that we are passing through an era of great prosperity, which the Minister of Finance himself has, on more than one occasion, admitted cannot be expected to last indefinitely. I say that in that period of prosperity we are setting a measure of expenditure which we will find it hard to reduce when the lean years come in the future. I say that in doing that we are not acting wisely. To expend every dollar of the public revenue during the abundant years, to go into debt in the extravagant manner in which this government has proceeded to lay burdens upon the country, is not a wise or judicious course. We should look to the future, we should measure our expenditure by the fact that the abundant revenues we now possess cannot always be expected to continue. In view of the facts and figures which I have brought to the attention of the House, I move in amendment to this motion, that you do not now leave the Chair, but that all the words after the word 'that' in the motion be left out, and the following be substituted therefore :

The total expenditure during each fiscal year from 1892 to 1901, both inclusive, was as follows :

1892	$42,272,136
1893	40,853,728
1894	43,008,834
1895	42,872,338
1896	41,702,383
1897	42,972,756
1898	45,334,281
1899	51,542,635
1900	52,717,467
1901	57,982,866

That the Finance Minister estimates that the total expenditure for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1902, will be $65,250,000.

That the annual expenditure on both consolidated revenue and capital account has increased between 1897 and 1901 by no less a sum than $15,010,110.

That during the period above mentioned the revenues of the country have been unusually large and the government claim a total net surplus of $19,743,527.69 but no portion thereof has been applied in reduction of the public debt which with the addition estimated by the Finance Minister for the ensuing fiscal year will have increased from $258,497,432.77, in 1896 to $274,480,000, in 1902, an increase of more than sixteen millions of dollars.

That the Minister of Finance estimates that the total revenue for the year ending 30th June, 1902, will be $56,800,000.

That notwithstanding this very large revenue the Minister of Finance estimates that the public debt will be increased during the year about $6,000,000.

That this House desires to place on record the opinion that the expenditure for the year ending June 30th, 1902, and the proposed expenditure for the year ending June 30th, 1903, are excessive and extravagant and regrets that the government with the exceptionally large revenues at its command has not only failed to reduce but has largely increased the public debt and has incurred capital expenditure for which the country does not receive and cannot expect any adequate return.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). Mr. Speaker, before offering the few observations which I think may be called for upon the general question of the expenditure of the country, permit me to say a word or two regarding what I cannot help characterizing as a most extraordinary action of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) in reference to certain public works in my own constituency. If I refer to them particularly it is because he has referred to them particularly, and there is the further reason that the manner in which he has treated these expenditures made by the government may be taken, I suppose, as a good indication of the degree of fairness and of consideration which he applies to public questions of that character. At a comparatively early stage of the session my hon. friend read a list of a number of works in the counties of Shelburne and Queen's which I have the honour to represent and he charged in general, vague and indefinite terms, but still charged very emphatically, that there had been wrong-doing in some way. It was charged that the works were badly constructed, that they were extravagantly constructed or corruptly managed. The precise meaning of what the hon. gentleman wished to convey was not easy to determine, but that he did desire to convey the impression that there had been corrup-

tion, mismanagement and extravagance in connection with these different public works is beyond all question. What are the circumstances under which the hon. gentleman brought these matters to the attention of the House ? He began by saying, and that was to his credit, that he knew nothing about them. If the hon. gentleman had stopped at that, and, knowing nothing about them, had said nothing about them, he would have pursued a course far more creditable to himself and far more in keeping with the good order of our discussions in this House. I grant that an hon. gentleman at times may be obliged to refer to some things of which he knows nothing himself, but if he knows nothing himself he is obliged in all fairness to give the authority of the man who says he does know ; but here the hon. gentleman, on the strength of an anonymous letter, undertakes at the end of the session to make statements that are as slanderous as they possibly can be about these works, without the shadow of an attempt to prove the statements he has made. It was the hon. gentleman's duty, if he believed the statements which he made on the strength of an anonymous letter, to go before the Public Accounts Committee, to call the officials concerned, to bring up the public accounts, to call the Auditor General, to call the engineer who had to do with these things, and to have an intelligent and fair investigation into this matter. Not one of these things has the hon. gentleman done, but he hopes some one may believe, precisely what it is difficult to determine, but at all events that there is some wrong in connection with these works. The hon. gentleman will see that he has pursued a course that is in the highest degree discreditable to himself and unfair to every man connected with these works. It is unfair in a sense to myself, but that is a small part of the matter, because the hon. gentleman does not imagine, I suppose, that I actually did the work down there ; but it is unfair to the people connected with the work, it is unfair to the engineers, it is unfair to the faithful servants of the government for an hon. gentleman, and especially for one occupying the high position of this hon. gentleman as leader of a party, to stand up, and, on the faith of an anonymous letter, make these statements, as he has made them, and then leave the matter there and fail to pursue any inquiry before the Public Accounts Committee or some other tribunal. I say that he is chargeable from his own point of view and that his party has a right to charge him with a great wrong in this matter. If he had information that there was wrong-doing then, it was his duty to probe the matter to the bottom. I will give the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) the credit of saying that in several matters in regard to which they have wished more information, and in which they have thought there was some wrong-doing, they went to the Public Accounts Committee, they called up the Auditor General, they brought the public accounts, they summoned witnesses, they made some attempt to get information upon the point, and the men who were accused had a chance of appearing before the Public Accounts Committee. But, the hon. gentleman has not pursued that course. He has made these statements on the strength of an anonymous letter, he has not gone before the Public Accounts Committee, he has not asked for the Auditor General, he has not asked for a copy of the accounts, he has not summoned a witness, he has been content to make these statements, unjust, ungenerous, untrue ; I characterize them as such. He has been content to repeat these statements, admitting that he knows nothing himself and shrinking from giving us the name of any man who will verify these statements, and now, having been content to make these statements, he is about to go away and leave the matter in that condition. I think I have a right to complain and I do. The House has a right to complain, the public have a right to complain, because, if the hon. gentleman knew that there was wrong-doing, or believed that there was wrong-doing, it was his duty to probe the matter and in failing to do that, he has failed to discharge one of his duties as leader of the opposition.

As to the general question, my hon. friend will probably admit that he has not added very much which is new to the subject in the debate to-day. He has travelled over the same ground that he travelled a year ago, over the same ground that his predecessor travelled for several years, and over precisely the same ground that the former Minister of Finance on the eve of the last general elections travelled. He has made a number of general charges of extravagance and I am inclined to think that the country will take about as much stock in the hon. gentleman's assertions in that line as the country has taken on previous occasions, of which the constitution and membership of the House are the best evidence. But the hon. gentleman, if we were to take his criticisms as being serious, would have us understand that the conditions of Canada are the same to-day as the conditions were in 1896. He would have us understand that it is a fair thing to make comparisons between the expenditure of that day and the expenditure of this day, utterly ignoring the fact that a great change has come over the condition of the country. To use a common phrase it has been a growing time. It is not only a growing time in the affairs of the government but it is a growing time in the affairs of every great enterprise in Canada as well. Every railway, every great corporation, nay, every business

firm in Canada which is carrying on more business is spending more money than in 1896, and according to my hon. friend's logic, because it is spending more money than in 1896 it is therefore on the verge of financial ruin. In government affairs and in individual affairs as well a large expenditure may not be an indication of extravagance, it may be an indication of wise administration, it may be an indication of far seeing ability, it may be an indication of the ability of the merchant, or the ability of the government. By providing for a larger expenditure it may be that you are providing means whereby the individual or the government will be more prosperous than they were with a lower expenditure. The conditions of Canada have changed. The hon. gentleman takes our aggregate expenditure and he makes no explanation as to what that expenditure represents. Take for instance the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway. We have spent a great deal of money on the operation of the railway—I will leave out of consideration for a moment the capital account. We have spent a great deal more on the operation of the Intercolonial Railway than our predecessors spent. Therefore, the hon. gentleman says that we are extravagant. But on the other hand the Intercolonial Railway receipts are much larger than they were. Before we took office they were $3,000,000 and to-day the Intercolonial Railway receipts are $5,500,000. Yet, the hon. gentleman would have us understand that the increasing expenditure is an evidence of extravagance. Take if you will the Post Office Department. We are spending a great deal more money on the postal service of the country than we spent before, but what do the returns show ? In 1896 the net revenue of the Post Office Department was $3,200,000, and the revenue for the current year is estimated at $3,800,000. In both these cases the increased expenditure does not represent an increase of one cent on the burdens of the country, but it does represent greater facilities for carrying on the business of the country. The increased expenditure in the Railway Department and in the Post Office Department is something which the government need not be ashamed of, because it marks the growth of the progress and business of the country and the increased facilities which are provided for the people. Take the Yukon. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) gives us the total expenditure of the year, and he compares with the expenditures of 1896, but he forgot to tell us that there was practically no Yukon in 1896. We know that one or two officers of the government had gone in there in the earlier years, but up to the time that this government came into power the Yukon was practically an undiscovered country. It was only under the administration of the present government that the great development of that territory took place. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us of the total expenditure but they fail to tell that for every dollar that has been spent in the Yukon we have got a dollar back, and more. Therefore, the increased expenditure in that direction is not an indication of extravagance, but it is one of the indications of the development of the country which has come to this Dominion during the past few years.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the increased expenditure in the Yukon since 1896 ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. There was practically no expenditure in the Yukon in 1896.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the expenditure now ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have not the figures at hand, but it is only in the year 1897 that the great discoveries were made in the Yukon, and that the Yukon began to be known. It is only since this present government came into power that there was a rush of people from all parts of the world into that country, and that this government had to assume the administration of the Yukon. We had to administer that country far away from railways and telegraph lines, and in the face of all that has been said, I say that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has reason to be proud of the splendid development of that country under his administration. So far as the working expenses on the Intercolonial Railway are concerned, that road is at least in a better position to-day than it was before. It is less of a burden to the country—if it is a burden at all—than it was before. Its receipts are increasing so rapidly that it will practically pay for itself. I will refer to the capital expenditure later. Then the Post Office Department; that is not only not a greater burden, but it is a greater blessing to the people of Canada than it was ever before. Under a lower rate of postage we are getting a larger revenue, and for a less rate of taxation the people of Canada are getting greater accommodation than ever in the history of Canada. If you deduct from the total expenditures, the expenditure on the Post Office, on the Intercolonial Railway, on the Yukon ; these three revenue producing departments, you will find that in all that remains the increase in the expenditure of the country has been very moderate indeed, and that there is nothing like the increase that the hon. gentleman ((Mr. Borden, Halifax) represents. He can only make out his case by adding the increase on the Yukon and the increase on the Intercolonial Railway, which perhaps during the current year will pay its own way and even though

there was a loss last year it was in a better position than in the time of the Conservative government. However, if you take out these items of expenditure, as I say, the aggregate increase remaining will be found to be a very moderate amount indeed. I have already said that it has been a growing time; a time of great progress and advance in Canada. Let us take a rough indication to prove that. I repeat what I said on a former ocacsion, that if one wants a rough illustration of the progress of the country it would be a fair thing to compare the expenditures with the total trade of the country. Roughly, the total trade of the country is a measure of the development of the country, and if you take for a rough calculation your expenditure in comparison with the total trade you get some reasonable measure—I do not claim that it is exact—but you get some fair proportion; certainly a much fairer statement of the accounts than was presented by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax). Now, what do I find ? I find that in 1895 the consolidated fund expenditure of Canada—leaving out the capital—represented within a fraction of 17 per cent of the value of our total trade; while last year the consolidated fund expenditure of Canada represented only 12 per cent of the total trade of the country. Now, let us add both capital and income together, and take the total disbursements of Canada. In the year 1895 the total disbursements of Canada of all kinds—capital, revenue, &c.—represented 19½ per cent of the total trade of the country, while last year it represented 14·9 per cent, or a fraction under 15 per cent as compared with 19½ per cent in 1895. I do not present these figures as giving any exact measurement of the expenditure of the country, but roughly stated the total trade of the country is a fair indication of the general development of the business of the country, and when we show that the increased expenditure has only kept pace, or less than kept pace, with the development of the trade in the country, then I think we have a very fair and very satisfactory answer to make to the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bordon, Halifax).

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) talks of the public debt. He says we have increased the debt. Again, I say that we must have regard to the increasing population, and to the increasing business of the country, and taking these into account we need not fear a comparison on this question of the debt. I have on another occasion given a statement showing the increase of the net debt from the year 1896 to the year 1901. That statement is contained in the budget speech, page 1341 of 'Hansard,' and it may be useful to quote it again :

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Net debt 30th June, 1901	$268,480,003 69
" " 1900	265,493,806 89
Increase in debt in 1900-1	2,986,196 80

	Net Debt.	Increase in Debt.	Decrease in Debt.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts
1896	258,497,432 77	5,422,505 68	
1897	261,538,596 46	3,041,163 69	
1898	263,956,398 91	2,417,802 45	
1899	266,273,446 60	2,317,047 69	
1900	265,493,806 89		779,639 71
1901	268,480,003 69	2,986,196 80	
Total for five years		10,762,210 63	779,639 71
		779,639 71	
Net increase 5 years		9,982,570 92	
Average increase 5 years		1,996,514 18	
Average of 18 years from 1878 to 1896		6,563,075 00	

The total increase in the net debt of Canada in our five years of administration was $10,762,210.63, less one year of decrease, $779,639.71, showing that the increase in the public debt under the administration of this government was $9,982,570.92, or an average of $1,996,514 per annum, as against an average for the whole eighteen years of the Conservative government of $6,563,075 per annum. Does my hon. friend imagine that in the face of a statement like that he is going to satisfy this country that in the matter of the public debt the government of the day need fear comparison with their predecessors ?

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. gentleman think that it is a fair comparison to take the increase of the public debt during the eighteen years of the Conservative administration ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Why not? Most certainly it is fair. I cannot understand what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) means when he asks if it is fair. It is the statement in the public accounts. They are exactly the same figures that hon. gentlemen opposite take when making a comparison, but the difference is, that I present the figures fairly, and my hon. friends opposite do not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That includes the assumption of the debts of the different provinces, does it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It includes the statements as shown in the public accounts. If you assume a debt of a province, and have to pay interest on it, your expenditure is increased by so much; and what difference does it make ? I am not going into a discussion of what this increase of debt was for. A great deal of it was for the graving docks of Quebec. A considerable portion of it was for that interesting bridge at Montreal. A great deal of it was for purposes which, if I desired to investigate them to-day, might make a

very interesting chapter in the history of our predecessors. But I am not dealing with that phase of the question at all. There are the figures; I need not discuss the purposes of the expenditures, whether they were good or bad. It is the increase of the debt we are discussing, and the public accounts show that during the 18 years of hon. gentlemen opposite they increased the net debt of this country to the extent of $6,500,000 per annum, while during the 5 years of our administration, up to the 30th of June last, our increase of the debt was $1,900,000 per annum.

Let us view the matter in another way. My hon. friends like to make calculations per head in some cases, but you will observe that they have not done so in this case. We find that our increase of the debt has not exceeded the rate of increase in the population of the country. This is a fair mode of comparison. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs alluded to it some time ago, and I am only repeating his argument. In 1896, the last year of the late government, the net debt of the country was equal to $50.96 per head of the population, whereas the net debt last year, the debt which the hon. gentleman grieves about as so alarming to the country, which he holds up as such a bugaboo, was equal to $49.18 per head. In this we have but another evidence that, just as the expenditure of the country is only keeping pace with the reasonable growth and development of the country, so the moderate increase of the debt which we are showing is only keeping pace with the increased development and the increasing obligations and burdens which we have to undertake.

So we might go on through all the statements of the hon. gentleman and show that he is comparing conditions of former days with utterly unlike conditions which exist to-day. Will you tell me that the conditions in 1896, when our predecessors had a revenue on the Intercolonial Railway of $3,000,000, are the same as the conditions of to-day, when we have a revenue of $5,500,000 ?

Mr. BROCK. And spend it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend from Centre Toronto is very much worried over the expenditure; but I have never heard that when there were deficits on the Intercolonial Railway in the days of the hon. gentleman's friends, he stood up in Toronto and condemned them. My hon. friend was perfectly satisfied to have a deficit of three quarters of a million dollars under the Conservative administration, and to go and vote the old ticket, and say that the Conservative party was a party of economy; but when he finds us giving a better railway service, one of which the country may be proud, and he discovers that in one year there is a deficit in the operating of the road, the hon. gentleman suddenly discovers that the whole thing is wrong. My hon. friend is a most amiable and respected citizen of Toronto, but in the matter of politics he is about the blindest man in the House.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if perchance we admit for the sake of argument that this is an extravagant government, and that the country needs a government of economy, where are we going to find one ? From hon. gentlemen opposite ? What is the evidence of their economy ? What evidence have they given of it in past years ? Where is the evidence of it to-day ? Why, Sir, again and again we have been asked in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite to do what ? To spend less money ? No, to spend more money. Last year, when my hon. friend moved a resolution similar to this one, I was able to point across the House to an hon. gentleman who complained that we did not double track the Intercolonial Railway for a long distance. I could point to another hon. gentleman who complained that we did not go into larger expenditures in the North-west. I could point to another hon. gentleman, no less than the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), who but a few days before had led a deputation to the government to demand that we should spend millions more on the improvement of the St. Lawrence. So I could go along the whole line and show that hon. gentlemen opposite, who talk about economy and who are going to vote for this resolution, have been urging on the government a more lavish expenditure. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier not only wanted greater expenditure on these things, but he complained because we had not appropriated a large sum to send a man to search for the North Pole. I will say in fairness to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that he has been away lately in Ontario busily engaged in making speeches, not of the same kind that he made in the province of Quebec, and he perhaps did not know all that was going on in the House in his absence; and last night, the first time he got a chance, he demanded—what ? Economy ? No; but he called on the Minister of Public Works to spend more liberally on the approaches to the canal at Sault Ste. Marie.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. $400,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And my hon. friend the Minister of Railways reminds me that on a previous occasion the hon. gentleman reproached him because he had not spent a large amount of money in establishing locomotive works at Moncton. My hon. friend from North Perth (Mr. MacLaren) is now in his seat, and I am glad to be able to remind him, as he is going to vote for this amendment, that only three days ago, in a very able address, to which all listened with great pleasure as coming from a gentleman familiar with our commercial

affairs, he pointed to the fact that the United States government were spending hundreds of millions for the improvement of their waterways, and he declared that it was time that we set to work and did likewise.

I think I have said enough to show that if perchance this is an extravagant government, which I am not disposed to admit, then heaven help the country if it has to look to hon. gentlemen opposite for economy, when not one of them throughout this session has ever offered a proposal for economy unless the saving of a cent a gallon on a few gallons of oil. I venture to say that these things are understood in the country. The people understand that the conditions of Canada are not the same to-day as they were in 1896. The world has moved since then. Canada, as an hon. gentleman once said, before 1896, was living in a back street, and doing business in a back street; but in 1896, she moved up to the front, and since then she has been doing better business, she has plate glass windows, she has her sign up, and under the administration of this government the name of Canada is becoming known and honoured throughout the world. The country generally recognizes this fact. From east to west the story is told of how Canada has prospered under this administration. Go down to the sea, and you will find a great industrial development in the island of Cape Breton. But, say these gentlemen, it is our policy did that. No, Sir, it is not. They fiddled and faddled with their iron and steel bounties for ten years but never succeeded in building an industry which attracted much notice. It was only when this government took up the matter that the great development down there began, and that the great development in the steel industry began in Sault Ste. Marie. It was when we took steps to give a contract to that factory at Sault Ste. Marie to encourage them in turning out steel rails, that the towering buildings went up, and then these hon. gentlemen opposite quarreled with us because we gave that help. It was only under this government that the locomotive works at Kingston were restored to their old energy and activity. That was due to the aid given by this government, and hon. gentlemen opposite found fault with us for having given that aid. Go to the great west and what do you find? These gentlemen, who pride themselves so much on what they did for the North-west, managed to produce a condition of affairs there which culminated at one period in a great rebellion and which, in 1896, produced a high class stagnation. What has happened since? Under the administration of this government, which has not been disposed to shrink from expenditure when such expenditure was needed, every great industry in Canada has been spurred into activity, and out in the far west, instead of finding people hopeless and despondent, we find that not only are the people who were there before prosperous, contented and happy, but thousands are coming from all parts of the world, even from that favoured land to the south, and now we have a stream of immigration into that country such as has not been known for many years. East and west north and south, we see the indications that under the hand of this government, aye, the extravagant hand if you choose to call it so—but it is not extravagant because wise expenditure is the truest economy—east and west north and south you will find that, under the hand of this government, all the industries of Canada have been spurred into activity, Canada has prospered, and is filled to-day with the hope and belief that we have many years of prosperity still before us.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). I have listened with much interest to the statements of my hon. friend and leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and the answer of the Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding). The hon. Minister of Finance commenced with a very fierce personal attack upon the leader of the opposition, an attack which was quite undeserved. The leader of the opposition spoke of certain works carried on in Nova Scotia, notably in Shelburne county. One of these works, he said, had been washed away, another was of no public utility, while another, designed to afford a harbour of refuge for fishing boats involved such bad engineering that the canal dug from the sea into a lake only served to drain the lake, as the bottom of it was higher than the sea level. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) did not make these statements upon his own authority, but upon the authority of reports in the neighbourhood and of what the hon. Minister of Finance is pleased to call anonymous letters. These statements were made in Committee of Supply, and the hon. member for Halifax had the right to give any authority he pleased and, the right, if he pleased, to withhold the names of his correspondents. Are the facts true? That is what the country is interested in knowing. The facts are known to the Department of the Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Finance had only to ask the engineer to learn the truth or falsity of the statements made by the hon. leader of the opposition. But, the hon. Minister of Finance does not even take the trouble to deny these statements. Does he dare to say that the facts with regard to this ditch are not as given by the hon. leader of the opposition? He was challenged on this subject a couple of months ago; why, then, does not he produce the evidence? If the facts which are in possession of the department were made known to this House, and if they proved that the statements made were incorrect, no hon. gentleman would be more

ready to acknowledge his mistake and make the amende honorable both to the House and to the Finance Minister than the leader of the opposition.

The Finance Minister gives a glowing account of the prosperity of this country, due, as he would have us infer, to the statesmanship of hon. gentlemen who are now in power. Can these hon. gentlemen point to one thing they have done, to one Act which they have put upon the statute-book that has contributed to the advancement or development of the country? That development is due to the legislation of the predecessors of these hon. gentlemen, to the national policy, to the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to the building of the canals, to the bonusing of steel and iron works, and other Conservative measures. The hon. Minister of Finance takes credit for the opening of the locomotive works at Kingston and also for the development at Sault Ste. Marie. Why, I had an idea that I was the person who gave the first contract to Mr. Clergue at Sault Ste. Marie; that it was I who leased to him the water power when I was Minister of Railways and Canals; that I was the means of having that gentleman build up his enterprises there after he had been induced by the national policy to come to this country. I had some idea that if there was development in iron and steel works in the Dominion, it was due to the policy which was adopted by the Conservative government and was over and over again condemned by hon. gentlemen opposite. And what has become of the promises of these hon. gentlemen to establish a rule of economy? The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) has been taunted with having accused the Conservative government of extravagance and of over burdening the people with taxation and increasing enormously the public debt. Oh, but these are different times, these are the growing times; and that is the one poor justification that these hon. gentlemen can offer for increasing the total expenditure of the country—the capital expenditure on current revenue combined—from $42,000,000, as it was in the last year of our term of office, to $65,000,000 which the Minister of Finance proposes for next year. The hon. Minister of Finance makes a comparison to show that the amount of increase is not so very large after all. He asks us to deduct from the $65,000,000 of expenditure, the difference between the $3,500,000 which we estimated for the working of the Intercolonial Railway and the $5,000,000, which it costs now. That is perfectly right. That amount should be deducted—$1,500,000. And I will admit also that we should deduct the difference between the amount of revenue which we received from the post office in 1896, and the amount which they receive at the present day—$500,000. And I will admit further that the expenditure on the Yukon would also be deducted from this account. But make all these deductions, and you find that next year's expenditure will be nearly $20,000,000 greater than the expenditure during the last year of our term of office. What are we to think of public men, of statesmen, seeking the suffrages of the people with the promises of reduction in expenditure and in taxes, and, when they attain power falsifying every pledge they made, out-heroding Herod in their extravagance and corruption—even taking their own description of what used to exist—and also adopting the policy of their predecessors on every great public question? The hon. Minister of Finance makes a comparison between the debt of the country now and as it was when the Conservative government went out of power. The public debt has increased $10,000,000 since in 1896, and the Minister of Finance says he will have to increase it by $6,000,000 next year. This makes a total of $16,000,000 of increase. To make a comparison of the results of our policy and theirs in respect to public debt, the hon. minister takes the increase of indebtedness during the last eighteen years of Conservative administration. Does he think that is fair? He tells us he takes these figures from the public accounts. Yes; but would he charge to the Conservative government the $77,000,000 of provincial debts which were assumed by the Dominion at confederation? If not, then, why should he hold the Conservative government responsible for the $20,000,000 of provincial debts taken over by the Dominion under the Conservatives? Does not he know also that in his calculation he took in $10,000,000 expended for the purchase from the Canadian Pacific Railway of lands which had been given to them in consideration of their constructing the road, and that these lands were a quid pro quo for that increase of indebtedness? And does not he know that $62,000,000 of that debt represented an entirely abnormal expenditure, that upon the great work of the Canadian Pacific Railway? Leave out these three items of assumed provincial debt, expenditure in the repurchase of Canadian Pacific Railway lands, and expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway itself and the comparison will be favourable to us. He says that he took the accounts as he found them in the public accounts. Does he take the accounts as he found them in 1897 when he came into power, when, for the purpose of making a comparison between his administration and that of the Conservative government for two or three years previously, he falsified the accounts, shall I say? Not, perhaps, falsified them, but altered them to suit his purpose. The accounts are not the same as the hon. gentleman found them when he came into power. We took over the North Shore Railway from the Quebec government, and we were to give them an increased subsidy of so much a year, which was charged each year to the capital expenditure for the Dominion, but he capitalizes it and charges

it in a lump sum against his predecessors for the purpose of justifying an expenditure for the several years, and making a comparison between his government and the Conservative government, on capital account, to the disadvantage of the latter.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend is wrong. He capitalized it and forgot to put it in the accounts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We did not capitalize it, and it did not appear in the accounts in any sense.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It was capitalized by an Act of the Conservative government, and declared to be capital due to the province of Quebec.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Oh yes, declared to be capital due to the province of Quebec. It may be so, but all that we required to do was to increase the subsidy and pay the interest to the province of Quebec.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, I deny it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. And for the same reason, why does he not capitalize the amount of $140,000 which was given to the Grand Trunk Railway to secure an entrance for the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Montreal ? He could do it on the same grounds, because it is an annual amount.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend capitalized it. He was not content to let it stand as a subsidy, but by special Act he capitalized it and declared it was money due to the province of Quebec, which they are free to draw whenever they want to.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes, free to draw, and they drew interest on it and it was so charged in the public accounts when we went out of power. And when the hon. gentleman came into power he changed the form of it in the accounts for no other purpose than to make an unfair comparison against the Conservative government. These are the facts of the case. The Conservative government can point with pride to the administration of their affairs for 18 years before the hon. gentlemen came to power. What public work of any utility have they started ? Have they done anything in reference to the great question of transportation in this country ? No, their revenues have been frittered away in lighthouses, in little wharfs around the coasts of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, 15 or 16 of them situated in the county of Shelbourne, as I understand. I may be wrong, but if I remember correctly it is 16.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The whole of them together did not cost as much as the Tay canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Tay canal was commenced and finished before the hon. gentleman was born, and the hon. gentleman does not know it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have been there myself. I am one of the few people who even went near it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He has seen it, then, since it was finished ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes ; in 1832 the canal was commenced, and it was finished in 1834. It was built by Act of parliament of Canada. Under that Act the government had power to take it over from the corporation that built it. They took it from the corporation that built it and expended money to finish it. There is the same justification for the expenditure on the Tay canal that I have heard the hon. gentleman give himself. I remember well the support that he got from Mr. Somerville, the member for Brant. The justification was this : Large sums of money are being expended in different parts of the country, and it is hard that a section of country which does not benefit by these public works and yet contributes towards them, should not receive a quid pro quo. I well remember the arguments used in support of the minister who introduced the first item for the purpose of building the Tay canal, and I was gratified to hear the Minister of Finance, speaking in justification of that expenditure in the county of Shelburne using almost the same words. We agree upon that subject, that there should be a quid pro quo in some way or another in regard to expenditures.

But the hon. gentleman surely must be satisfied with the expenditure that is going on now in the maritime provinces. It is about enough to eat up the whole of his surplus since he got into power, $21,900,000—if you capitalize the amount that he has given to the Grand Trunk Railway at $4,660,000—has been expended in betterments on capital on the Intercolonial Railway. He has expended the whole surplus earnings of the Dominion in these prosperous times, not on his little wharfs, or lighthouses, or improvements in the different parts of his province, but all expended upon that work which we thought we had finished, and the capital account of which we had closed long ago ; the whole of that expenditure has been wasted on new locomotives and for certain other purposes on the Intercolonial Railway. Do the people of this country fully understand it ? Do they realize that the whole prosperity of the Dominion of Canada has been pitched in, has disappeared in what I declared before to be a useless expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway ? $22,000,000—who denies the figures ? Who dare contradict them to this House? I will give him item by item the whole expenditure on capital account, and the deficits on that road, and will show that the people of this country

have expended the whole of their surplus revenue in these prosperous times, for what purpose ? Building up the Intercolonial Railway ? No, for the purpose of disgusting the people of this country with the management of the Intercolonial Railway, so that it may become in a short time a property for some company or another to take off our hands, when the country will be so sick of it that it will be glad to get rid of it. The hon. gentleman says : Look at the comparison between the management of that railway now and what it was under the Conservatives ; the management and the deficits in the later years under the Conservative government were as bad as they are under my management. Yes, if the same system of book-keeping is followed he can make a surplus.

The proper way to look at the expenditures and receipts on the Intercolonial Railway is to see what amount of money is expended upon it and what are the receipts. Never mind the capital account, never mind the sidings, never mind the new rails, the new locomotives, or anything of that kind ; ask only : What money do you put into it ? The money you put into that road, as I said before, since the hon. gentleman has been administering it, is $22,000,000, or within $10,000 of that figure, more than the receipts of that road. That money would have given us one of the best systems of transportation in the world, that money would have built the Georgian bay canal ; that money would have put the Canadian people in possession of the best system of transportation in the world. Yet the whole resources of the country must be frittered away for the purpose of enabling these hon. gentlemen to maintain themselves in power by extravagant expenditures. Where is the justification for the 200 or 300 little lighthouses that the hon. gentleman is building down in Nova Scotia, somewhere ? This is not a penitent session. If it were the last session, as the hon. gentleman said, and votes of this kind were perhaps for the purpose of catching the electors without any intention of spending the money it might be different, but two or three years will elapse before an election takes place and it means that this money shall be expended. As I stated before the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals are looking after their provinces well. I cannot congratulate the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Mulock), I cannot congratulate other members of the government when I see the enormous sums of money taken out of the coffers of this country and expended in the useless manner in which they are being expended in the maritime provinces. If confederation is going to exist, we intend to, and we shall have our share of the moneys which are being levied on the people of this country and expended upon works of utility and for the use of the Dominion in other particular provinces. It is not sufficient, as it is in France and other countries, that the sole and only object of portions of the Dominion should be to see how much they can get out of the Dominion treasury. This must be put an end to ; there must be a fair division of the funds of the people between the different provinces or there will be an end to confederation. This practice was not pursued in the past. We built the Intercolonial Railway. Of course, they contributed, they contributed a sum towards it. We said : You may have the use of that railway without the people of the country expecting to receive a cent for it for the purpose of carrying your grain and traffic. It is, to a certain extent, of mutual advantage, but we never contemplated that after the people of this country had been drawn upon to the extent of $62,000,000 or $70,000,000 for the purpose of constructing that road that there should be an additional expenditure taken out of the coffers of the country to the extent of between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 a year. This is not fair to the rest of the community. If the country is prosperous and growing, the revenue resulting from the growth should be distributed fairly between the people of the country. We have always looked with pride to the growth of the North-west Territories and we have always expected that we would get a return from the development of those territories and from British Columbia. We are willing to make an expenditure in excess of the amount that is received from that country for the development and building up of that magnificent heritage of ours ; knowing that in the shape of trade and in other ways we will indirectly get a return from the development of that country. Our expectations have been verified and we are getting that return, but, from this expenditure down on the sea coast we are receiving no benefit whatever. Where is the expenditure for the purpose of improving our waterways ? Why cannot we have a magnificent harbour in Montreal ? Why have we not terminal facilities provided ? Why has not the St. Lawrence been deepened from Montreal to the sea so as to enable large ships to come to Montreal ? The people in every part of the Dominion are all anxious that this port should be developed. We are anxious to secure a fast Atlantic service and every man in the Dominion would be willing to contribute his share towards that object. What have we done towards that ? Not a single thing. Nothing has been done in the way of improving our transportation, and notwithstanding the abnormal development of our trade, nothing has been done for the purpose of improving our waterways or harbours. The hon. Minister of Finance takes pride in the development of the country. Can he put his hand on a single work in this country which tends to the development of this country which did

not have its initiation and commencement under the Conservative regime ? He cannot put his hand on a single work, and in that respect, instead of receiving any assistance from the hon. gentlemen who then were on this side of this House we had nothing but opposition to everything we undertook. We can point with pride to the past. We glory in the prosperity of the country at the present time, we hope the country will go on and prosper, but we expect from the administrators of the affairs of this country fair-play at least in the expenditure of the public money. We expect, instead of having the money frittered away in the manner in which it is being done from one end of the country to the other that there shall be some plan of transportation adopted and carried out, some project which will result in the development of our trans-Atlantic service and that there shall be something done to which the people of this country can point with hope and with pride. We have looked in vain for any such policy in the past from these hon. gentlemen. Their only object seems to be in each of the departments to get as much money as they possibly can to expend for the purpose of purchasing locomotives that cannot run over the road, for the purpose of putting down new rails on the road which was perfectly railed already, for the purpose, as the hon. Minister of Finance says, of taking the Dominion of Canada from a back street and putting it on a front street, so that all the nations can look at us and admire us. This expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is a useless one. The idea of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals getting from his colleagues in a country like this the enormous sums which he has got for the purchase of larger locomotives to carry freight when he has the evidence of his own deputy to the effect that it would be impossible to carry this trade in competition with the roads that are at present in existence. When he purchased the Drummond County Railway he knew that he could not run these locomotives over it from Lévis to Montreal, he knew, or at least, he ought to have known, that the locomotives that were in existence on the Intercolonial Railway, that the road-bed and that the rails were sufficient and equal to the traffic, that they were in first class order ; yet, he gets from his colleagues authority for an expenditure of $23,000,000 and it is not ended yet, because, I expect to find out from him how much of the road is completed and how much it will take to bring it up to the standard he requires. He now requires $23,000,000, a sum which ought to have built and equipped the road from beginning to end. The expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway when the road was first constructed was in the neighbourhood of $27,000,000. Of course, it is a longer road now, but the means of building the road are cheaper now. The hon. gentleman, as the evidence produced before the Public Accounts Committee shows, purchased 1,300,000 ties when the normal requirements were 400,000 ties, instructing his tie inspector to take them over or to inspect them in the form that he took some others, or, in other words, to take everything that could possibly be supplied at the time of an election.

In view of an election, the number of workmen was largely increased in excess of the requirements of the road, and kept on to the present day; contracts were let to Mr. Clergue for steel rails two or three days before an election, and the contract with the Kingston Locomotive Works which the hon. gentleman brags about, was made almost on the day of the election. Of course, all this was not done for the purpose of debauching the constituencies, because has not the Minister of Railways and the member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) stated that there are no politics now on the Intercolonial Railway ? Well, with these facts staring us in the face no one will believe that statement. The Conservative government can point with pride to its record. The comparison made by the Minister of Finance with regard to the public debt is absolutely misleading, and no one knows it better than he does. He knows well that he should not charge against us the debts of the provinces which we assumed, nor the $10,000,000 cash which we paid for lands to the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor, if he was just, would he charge against us the $62,000,000 for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway. However that may be, there is not one of these gentlemen over there who can explain how it is that in view of the solemn pledges they gave to the people when they were in opposition, they have largely increased the expenditure of this country even throwing out of the calculation the Intercolonial Railway, the Yukon, and the Post Office Department, as the Minister of Finance has asked us to do. Take these out, and even then let me hear the Finance Minister offer a justification for the enormous expenditure so much increased, in flagrant violation of the pledges of the Liberals before they obtained power.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. I. Tarte). Mr. Speaker, I happen to be in a most desirable position to discuss this question. Up to the year 1891 I belonged to the Conservative party, and for 20 years in my life I had to defend large expenditures and increases of the public debt. The country was prosperous; we were going on with large works, we were developing Canada, and I think my defence was successful. The chances of war placed me on this side of the House, and I have to defend to-day a large expenditure of money and also an increase in the public debt. I have heard over and over again speeches which were pretty

similar to that delivered to-day by the leader of the opposition. I have heard my hon. friends on this side of the House in times past predicting all sorts of disasters because the expenditure was so large. Will my hon. friend the leader of the opposition permit me to say, that he has made to-day what is essentially a party motion, but at the same time he has raised a great national issue. I do not ignore the existence in both political parties of a school which believes that we should not spend much money. I think I know this country as well as any other public man of my years, and I know that there is another school which I believe is in the great majority; a school which has confidence in the future of this country, and which is ready to make all necessary expenditure to develop the great national assets we possess. We are spending money. There is no doubt as to that. We are not spending too much money. I see on the opposite benches business men of first rank and standing, and they will not stand before any audience and declare that we must not spend even more money than we have spent in the past. I hope there are enough men in this House to rise above petty party questions on important occasions. We have to face to-day the competition on land and sea of our American friends. Large combinations of capital are monopolizing American railways and English and American steamship lines. Are we going to sit idly by and not do anything ?

Mr. BROCK. That is what you are doing.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I say to the contrary.

Mr. BROCK. What have you done ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I will grapple with the question in a moment. We have not been idle. We have before us to-day the motion of the leader of the Conservative party asking us to pause because we are spending too much money, and my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) tells me now that we are remaining idle and not spending enough

Mr. BROCK. What I say is that you are wasting the money that you are spending.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Oh, that is a mere play on words. When I have taken my seat, I invite my hon. friend to show where we have wasted any money. I know that my hon. friends on the other side will assail the Intercolonial Railway policy of the government. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways will defend that part of the government policy. I am not the Minister of Railways and Canals, and it is not my duty to take charge of the department of one of my colleagues, but my hon. friend (Mr. Blair) is quite able to take care of himself. Speaking of the general policy of this government, I ask : Have we been idle ? We have this year a magnificent crop of over 100,000,000 bushels of grain in the North-west. We have not been able to carry that crop to the seaboard through Canadian channels because we were not sufficiently equipped to do so. We all recognize that. Now, Sir, our duty is to have a strong and progressive policy of equipment by land and by sea. I altogether share the view of my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) when he says that the country expects that a fast Atlantic service will soon be established; and in connection with it we must have, as I have said before, a fleet of large carriers to take charge of our crops and trade. But, Sir, there is no government that may take charge of the affairs of this country that will not be obliged to spend more money even than we have spent. Why, Sir, our hon. friends opposite are afraid. The hon. leader of the opposition has invited us to shudder because the debt of this country has been increased during the last 6 years by about $10,000,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Sixteen million dollars.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, a private corporation, have just increased their indebtedness by $20,000,000. They have asked from parliament the power to increase their stock by $20,000,000, which means an expenditure of that much money and that much additional indebtedness. Why have they done so ? Because they have confidence in the future trade of this country. And why should a great country like this, full of resources, be afraid because we have been obliged in order to carry on large public works, to increase our indebtedness by the small sum of $10,000,000, when there are private corporations which have incurred a larger indebtedness than the Dominion of Canada itself ? One hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, an hon. member for Toronto, said a minute ago that we are wasting our money. I will not discuss the policy of the government with regard to the Intercolonial Railway. My hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Railways will deal with that part of our policy.

Leaving that aside, as it is not my business to take charge of it, of what waste of money are we guilty ? The hon. leader of the opposition has paid me a great compliment this afternoon, and I am very thankful to him for it. After years in this parliament, and after all the inquiries that have taken place in the Public Accounts Committee, he believes that he has been able to find out that one of my engineers has made a mistake, and that a little pond has emptied itself into the Atlantic ocean. Where is that pond ? I would like to find it. I pray somebody on the other side of the House to find it for me to-day.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It cannot be found.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals has invited me to place on the Table of the House the evidence that there is a pond, and that it has emptied itself into the sea. I hold in my hand the appropriation Bill of last year, and I invite my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to tell me where that pond is. I tell my hon. friend that there is no pond of that kind. Even if there were, even if one of my engineers had made a mistake, and had spent $500 or $1,000 in trying to build a harbour, we are not infallible in the Public Works Department, and I think my hon. friend might have spared me the trouble of looking for the pond. I am very much afraid that the effect of that pond on the Atlantic ocean will be just about as much as the effect of my hon. friend's speech on that point upon the country.

My hon. friend has also alluded to what he called a raid on the exchequer in connection with the construction of the Yukon telegraph line. There are a great many business men in this parliament, and I want to know who is the one among them who has never made a mistake in his life, or whose employees have never made a mistake? I would like to see his face. I have followed the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee in regard to this matter, and what has been proven there is this: Mr. Charleson, who had charge of the construction of that line, had with him a gentleman of the name of Rochester. It was understood that he would act as a foreman of the work. After they had been two or three months on the work, Mr. Charleson, rightly or wrongly—imprudently, I grant—let a contract to Mr. Rochester for the supply of poles. After having heard my hon. friend, one would think that millions of dollars had been wasted, thrown into some pond or other. What are the facts? My department was paying $3 each for poles to a local Yukon company. Mr. Rochester, who was a man of great experience, having been brought up in the lumber trade, made an offer to Mr. Charleson to supply the poles for $2 each. Mr. Charleson accepted his offer, Mr. Rochester supplied the poles, 6,000 of them; these poles were received by a gentleman, a former employee of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Richardson who in his evidence last year declared that the poles had not cost too much. These are the facts of the case, and this is the famous raid that causes my hon. friend to invite us to shudder. Well, it will require a little more than that to make the country believe that we have administered their affairs in an unworthy manner.

My hon. friend has also referred to the fact that the government have paid the rents of the residences of the judges in the Yukon. Rightly or wrongly, when Mr. Justice Dugas and Mr. Justice Craig were invited to take up their residence at Dawson, it was understood and agreed that the government would supply them with residences. We did not erect residences, but we paid the rents of residences for them. These are the facts, rightly or wrongly; but again the amounts involved are very small. My hon. friend will permit me, I am sure, without my meaning to be in any way offensive, to say that this is peanut politics, and peanut politics has never carried any party into office. I remember very well when on the other side of the House, after the death of the great chieftain, whom I followed as long as he was in public life, when the Conservative party changed their policy and became small and mean—and they became small and mean because there was at their head a man who was not a broadminded man—they started these petty cries all over the country. I speak here in the presence of some of my former companions in arms, and I say that when the Conservative party started a small and narrow policy, they were defeated at the polls, as they will be again defeated if they do not change their ways. The country never takes any stock in reproaches like those levelled at us by the hon. leader of the opposition. I grant immediately that the policy we have adopted in regard to the Intercolonial Railway is worth discussing. It is a large question; we have spent a large amount of money upon it. The question is whether that expenditure was right or wrong. The government have thought it was right. The country will judge. All the other railways are spending to-day large sums of money in order to handle the freight which is increasing in quantity every day. We have followed the same course. We heard all sorts of rumours when the Public Accounts Committee was sitting, but no scandal has been proved. Let me mention that in passing. My hon. friends, both of them, reminded us that in former days the leaders on this side of the House promised to reduce the expenditure and debt of this country. My hon. friend from North Victoria (Mr. Ross), alluding to a speech of mine yesterday evening, said that, generally speaking, a minister should not be held responsible for any of his speeches other than those he would make at the Mansion house. No doubt my hon. friends on this side have said in former days that we were spending too much. But times have changed, circumstances have changed. Mr. Justin McCarthy, in his life of Mr. Gladstone, says in so many words that the public man who would attempt to be consistent all his life would simply be an ass. And I think that Mr. Justin McCarthy is perfectly right. I appeal to all men who have brains—I do not appeal to those who have none for I do not care what they may say—but I appeal to those who have a thinking of their own, and who are able to think.

Where is there amongst us the man who thinks to-day at fifty, fifty-five or forty-five years of age, what he thought when he was twenty or twenty-five years old ? Where is he ? There is not one among us. Our minds have undergone evolution, we have studied, we have learned, we have observed, we have moved in the world. Public men move as well as private individuals. This is a great country, and those who are in office are responsible for its development; and whatever may be the speeches delivered twenty years ago, this government is in office to administer the affairs of the country and make it prosper, and to make it prosper it is necessary that we should spend money—not waste money, but spend it judiciously. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock) said a moment ago that we had stood idle. In that my hon. friend was not accurate. He knows better. We have been going along at a high speed developing our waterways. There is no use in denying it. Let my hon. friend count the number, for instance, of new elevators on the great lakes. Let him count the number of harbours improved. Let him consider the large sums my department has spent in developing harbours and deepening our rivers and waterways. The hon. the ex-Minister of Railways said a moment ago that with the money spent on the Intercolonial Railway, we could have deepened and widened the St. Lawrence. Well, that work will be completed in a very short time. It is going on now.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I said it would build the Georgian Bay canal.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me beg my hon. friend not to call that splendid French river a canal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A waterway.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let him say that the French river should have been improved. But public education has to be made as well as private education. Great public works have to be carried out gradually. This country is spending large sums on its railways and cannot do everything at once. My hon. friends say we are spending too much, and two minutes later they say that we should have spent more. They tell us that the French river should have been improved, and the Georgian Bay canal should have been built. Well, if the whole system of canalization of the Ottawa river were attempted to be carried out by this government or a private corporation, it would cost in the neighbourhood of $80,000,000. The country is not yet prepared to incur that expenditure, but when the country is more advanced, when we have a greater population, perhaps it will then be ready to take hold of that undertaking.

My hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways has uttered words which, when he reads them in 'Hansard,' will appear to him as very imprudent indeed. He has said that unless we take care not to spend so much money in the maritime provinces, something wrong will happen. He has spoken of the disruption of confederation. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are masters of the situation. Should they find we are spending too much on the Intercolonial Railway, they will say so. They will not destroy that magnificent fabric of confederation. I hope that there is not in this country a public man who would destroy it because an unwise expenditure of money should happen to have been made. Even if we should make an unwise expenditure, let us not speak in such a manner. We are old men. We may not take for granted everything that is said here, but there are in this country people who are not as old as we, and who perhaps might interpret in a serious way words of that character. Let us not speak of destroying confederation. We are a very happy people. We have only to stand by our country and strive to understand each other as well as we can, and we have a great future before us. There is no reason for destroying anything, but there may be reason for improvement. There is always room for improvement. Let us go on and improve.

I do not see that there is much more to be added by me. A moment ago I alluded to the inquiries that have taken place in the Public Accounts Committee. The officers of a great department are no more infallible than are any other employees, either of a bank or a commercial firm. My own employees may make mistakes. I have made mistakes myself. I know that some of my hon. friends have tried very hard to prove that in the purchase of certain things for the quarantine station, we paid too much. Perhaps we did. I do not deny that on certain occasions a public employee may be just as well imposed upon as many another man. There are able men in this House. Where is the one who has never been imposed upon by anybody ? My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, is a very able lawyer indeed. He has argued many cases and he has lost, no doubt, a lot, but that does not prove that he is not an able man. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Brock), who conducted the inquiry in the Public Accounts Committee, is a very able man and a great manufacturer. I want to ask him whether he has never made a mistake, or whether any of his employees have never made mistakes ? We are all apt to make mistakes, but, speaking for the department over which I have the honour to preside, I challenge the fullest investigation as to any of my employees having ever participated in any dishonest deal. My department is an open book. I have nothing to hide. I may have made mistakes. But there has not been any money stolen, to my knowledge, and outside of my knowledge it has not been proved that any dishonest acts have ever been committed.

In closing, let me repeat what I said in beginning these few remarks. Last year, the appropriation of the department of Public Works, including both main and supplementary estimates, reached the very large amount of $8,454,000. In all those large appropriations the fault has been found only with two or three small items that have been mentioned here. No greater compliment could be paid to me or to the able officers who administer that department with me. Before I sit down, perhaps the House will permit me to thank hon. members on both sides for the courtesy that has been extended to me not only this year but on other occasions. I have been a sick man for a year or two. On every occasion I have had extended to me on both sides of the House the greatest kindness.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) seems to be a good judge of human nature. He has thrown himself upon the mercy and charity of the House, so that hon. members may not deal too harshly with the shortcomings of himself or his colleagues. In the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman said: We have spent money lavishly, it is true—

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. SPROULE—because the development of the country requires it and the necessity of the country justifies it. Now, so far as that expenditure is needed, so far as it is in the interest of the country, so far as it was properly and economically carried out, we have no complaint to make, but it is because of unwise expenditure, because of improper and extravagant expenditure that we are justified in complaining. The history of this government has been one of great expenditures and extravagances. I make that broad and general statement, and I am sure it is susceptible of proof from the public accounts not only with regard to the government as a whole, but with regard to every department of it. The amounts appropriated for the current year were $65,801,000. And yet, when their predecessors proposed to expend over $15,000,000 less they declared that that was far too much for the requirements of this country. How then, can they deny that this last vast expenditure of theirs is a lavish and unnecessarily heavy expenditure? For next year, that is the year ending June 30th, 1903, we have already voted $65,564,042. And, before the year is out, when we come back next session, no doubt we shall be called upon to vote $4,000,000 or more to cover various shortages that will be found. We are justified in assuming that that will be the case, for it was the case this year and last year and the year before. So, before the next fiscal year is over, we shall have been called upon to vote supplies for the year of about $69,000,000. Yet the Minister of Public Works tells us that while they have been somewhat lavish in their expenditure yet they have spent no more than the demands of the country have required. It is with nations as with individuals in matters of economy. It is very easy to be extravagant, and a nation like an individual can form a habit of extravagance. And, with the nation as with an individual, it is the most difficult thing in the world to curtail extravagance, and, after an era of extravagance, to practice economy. We know how it is with young men commencing life or with men of any age. Supply them lavishly with money and they will be apt to make their expenditure even more than their incomes. If adversity comes they find it almost impossible to economize. Hon. gentlemen opposite enjoyed a season of overflowing revenue, but large as has been their revenues, their expenditures have been still greater. When their revenues are less buoyant, when hard times come and the question of economy must be faced, what will be the condition of the country? It will be a condition of economic disturbance, of curtailed trade, and of sorrow for the people. We are writing a new page in the history of our country, a page which will, for all time to come tell not to the credit but to the discredit of hon. gentlemen who to-day control the affairs of the nation. Because their performance is the very opposite of their promises to the people, the page of history that these hon. gentlemen are writing they are writing to the everlasting disgrace of themselves and of the party to which they belong. They promised us stringent economy, they have given us increased expenditure in every line. Although our revenues have been so large that we had surpluses in a few years amounting to no less than $19,743,537, yet, as the Minister of Finance has admitted, the public debt of Canada has been increased in the same time by $16,000,000. This cannot inure to the credit of hon. gentlemen opposite, but must stand to their disgrace in the history of the country. We are told that the public debt has not increased rapidly. And the Minister of Public Works gave a comparison which he said justified the House and the country in coming to the conclusion that the management of the present government compared favourably in this respect with the management of their predecessors. How did he endeavour to prove that? By taking a few years of the eighteen years of his predecessors, during which the expenditure was exceptionally heavy, and made so in order to carry out the obligations entered into before confederation, such as building the Canadian Pacific Railway, taking over the debts of the provinces, giving them assistance when they had almost fallen into bankruptcy, taking back 10,000,000 acres of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway and

giving them $10,000,000 in money instead, adding all that to the public debt. During three years of those eighteen the minister said the increase had been $6,000,000 a year, whereas under the present government it has been only $1,900,000 a year. But had the hon. gentleman desired to be fair in that comparison he would have shown a very different state of affairs under the present government. But take these years out of the eighteen years and the public debt increased during the balance of the time on an average at the rate of $3,000,000 a year. Taking the whole three years out and it would show an entirely different condition of things in the interest of the Conservtive party.

Now, the revenue expected for the present year is $56,800,000, the highest revenue Canada has ever had. When $38,000,000 were taken out of the people under the Conservative administration the Minister of Trade and Commerce said Canada was being bled white by taxation. This year he is taking out of the same people $56,800,000, yet he has not a word to say against it. He is perfectly satisfied so long as he is allowed to remain in office and draw his salary, and have the honour of the situation.

The Minister of Finance gave us a very interesting exhibition for a few minutes this forenoon. I watched him carefully, and he reminded me of a certain little fish very common down in his part of the country. Whenever it sees danger approaching it commences to work its tail at an awful rate of speed, mixing up sand and mud and water until it surrounds itself with a cloud that hides it from view. That is exactly what the Minister of Finance did. Or as another hon. gentleman suggested, he reminded us of a badger in the North-west Territories. Whenever you frighten it it makes one race for its hole, and it runs with such rapidity that it raises a cloud of dust around it which conceals it from view until it gets into its hole. So it was with the Minister of Finance. Like that little fish, he worked himself into a state of excitement, and so stirred up the muddy waters around him that he thought he could hide himself from the criticisms directed against him.

He says the country will take no stock in charges of extravagance, because it knows the money is wisely spent. I ask him if the money was wisely spent in the Yukon in connection with the telegraph out there ? I have here some expenditures made by the government in that connection, and I would ask the people of this country to say whether they have been wisely made. They send a party out there to build a telegraph line, and they think they must treat some of their employees very much like themselves, as if they owned the whole country and all its resources, and were entitled to live in luxury on the fat of the land. They sent out Mr. Charleson with a party, giving him carte blanche to build that telegraph. I have looked at the public accounts to see what supplies were furnished these men, and I will give you a few items by which the people will be enabled to judge whether their money is being wisely spent. The government are purchasing clothing for their employees, 8 dozen pairs of cashmere socks at $5 a dozen, the very best class of goods they could possibly buy. I ask the labouring man who is working in the streets of Ottawa if the man who employs him furnishes him with that quality of garment. Then eiderdown quilts at $25 a piece. What farmer in this country would be so extravagant as to furnish even his choice bedrooms with quilts at $25 a piece ? I want the farmers to see the way their money is being spent, and I am sure they will tell the Minister of Finance that they have analysed his statements and that they do not believe them. Caps, 6⅔ dozen at $18 a dozen ; yet the country has nothing to complain of says the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Does not the hon. gentleman know that all these articles were bought to be sold back again to the men ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have not seen anything in the accounts to show that they are charged to the men at those prices. Then we have three waterproof coats at $25 a piece. The prices are most extravagant all the way through, yet I have taken them from the Auditor General's Report. Three cases of Abbey's Effervescent Fruit Salts at $5.25 a case. They must have all the luxuries of the country.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To be sold back again to the men.

Mr. SPROULE. Ten gallons of lime juice at $1.10 a gallon.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To be sold back again to the men.

Mr. SPROULE. One hundred and twenty-five pairs of boots at $4.50.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To be sold back again to the men.

Mr. SPROULE : Twenty pairs of boots at $9 a pair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To be sold back again to the men.

Mr. SPROULE. Do the labouring men of this country invest their wages in goods at that price ? Do they pay back $9 a pair for these boots ? Thirteen pair of boots at $8 a pair ; 23 pairs of boots at $6.50 a pair ; 7 pairs at $5 a pair.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. To be sold back again to the men.

Mr. SPROULE. Ten dozen pairs of moccasins at $33 a dozen ; 5 dozen of rubbers at

$44 a dozen. I want to ask if these are sold to the men as well ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Yes, all those goods were in stock, and kept in stock, and were sold to the men.

Mr. SPROULE. And was the money taken out of their wages, because I have not seen any account of it yet.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. It has been proved that these goods were kept in store as any other business firm working in the bush keep goods in store for their men. How could they get those articles in any other way ?

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister tell me if he knows of any labourers in the city of Ottawa who are paid that rate of wages, and who purchased goods at those prices ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Is it true that the hon. gentleman will compare wages in the Yukon with wages in Ottawa ? If so, I will leave it to the country to judge whether the comparison is fair.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no comparison between the two because the difference is so great that there can be no comparison. But, the hon. gentleman tells us that these men bought all these things. They bought two cases of Hennessy's B. O. brandy, $16.75.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Was it unreasonable that men who went into that wilderness should have their whiskey or their brandy ?

Mr. SPROULE. They were supplied with all the luxuries of life and they were given these luxuries because they were enabled to fall back upon the public treasury to pay for them. They were allowed to have all these extravagant luxuries of life because they were employed under the hon. Minister of Public Works. Ten gallons of rum, at $5.25 per gallon, for the poor labouring men up there. How many of the poor labouring men employed on the streets of Ottawa are able to buy rum at $5.25 per gallon ; or how many employees are there who would do it for them ? It is only when men are employed by the hon. Minister of Public Works that they are treated in this fashion. Three thousand Representative cigars, $180. This sum was expended for the choicest cigars that can be produced, to be sent up there to add to the luxuries of these men. Then, there were 1,000 of another brand, Flora Espana cigars, at $45 a thousand. Ask the boys who are going around Ottawa smoking 5-cent cigars, how they would like to be employed by the hon. Minister of Public Works, and be enabled to smoke these expensive cigars. One thousand El Bondoso cigars, at $37 a thousand; 105 pounds of Myrtle Navy tobacco, $73.50 ; 70 pounds of Tuckett & Billings tobacco, $51.80; 86 pounds of Prince of Wales tobacco, $58.48; 1,000 Manual Garcia cigars, $75 a thousand. These men were supplied with the most expensive luxuries and the best cigars that the country could provide when they were sent up there to build that telegraph line by the hon. Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman has done this because he is drawing upon the public chest, and yet the hon. Minister of Finance says that the country will take no stock in the statements we have made as to the extravagant expenditure of the country's money. Well, the information is before the country, and it is for the country to say whether it takes any stock in it or not. In my judgment it will take a great deal of stock in it.

Now, I will deal with another point. The hon. Minister of Finance asked us why we did not go before the Public Accounts Committee if we thought there had been anything wrong and prove it. Did we not go before the Public Accounts Committee, and attempt to prove it ? We did. But when the men who could give evidence in regard to this wrongdoing were asked for information they were not allowed to answer the questions. For two years we attempted to get Mr. Charleson before the Committee on Public Accounts, but as soon as the order went out to bring Mr. Charleson before the committee his coat tails were seen flying out of Ottawa, and he was absent for the rest of the session. He was here until the subpoena was issued, but he left immediately for the west and we could not get him back. The excuse was that he was obliged to go away.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether Mr. Charleson has not been here during the whole of the session ?

Mr. SPROULE. He has, but owing to the short session we have not had time to get him before the committee. The Public Accounts Committee has not been called once for five times it ought to have been called, and we have been unable on that account to pursue the inquiry in regard to Mr. Charleson to the extent that we would have liked to. We desired to secure the attendance of Mr. Charleson before the committee and we would have done so had the length of the session enabled us to do so. But when we do get people before the committee we cannot get the information out of them. It would have been possible to have proved the charges that we have made but for the impediments that have been thrown in the way by the government of bringing the witnesses before the Public Accounts Committee whom we desired to have. But, we did have a few witnesses before that committee. We had Mr. Rochester, who gave us some information about a contract for the supply of telegraph poles. We endeavoured to ascertain how

much he paid for these poles. We were told that Mr. Rochester bought these poles for 90 cents apiece and sold them to the government for $2 apiece. When that question was asked, who objected to the answer ? I am told that it was the hon. Minister of Public Works.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not do that.

Mr. SPROULE. It was said that the hon. gentleman instructed him not to answer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I did not do that.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not at the meeting, but I am told on reliable authority that it was the hon. Minister of Public Works, and no other. With these impediments thrown in our way we could not prove what otherwise was capable of being proved, if we could have got the evidence which the parties should have been able to give and which should have been taken on oath in regard to these transactions. Something was said in regard to the Intercolonial Railway. We presented allegations of extravagance in connection with that road and we brought before the committee different employees to prove them; or, to speak more correctly, we asked that they should be brought up. They were not brought up. We asked to have Mr. Archibald summoned before the committee. We fought it out in the Public Accounts Committee for a whole day, and we fought it out in this House for a whole afternoon, but the government called upon their majority to vote down our request and we were denied the right of having the evidence of Mr. Archibald before the committee. We were told that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals bought 1,300,000 ties when an election was going on when there were not more than 400,000 ties required for that year. The hon. gentleman bought them to help the friends of the party to control the election and when we desired to prove that there was extravagance in the administration of that road the witnesses we required were not allowed to come before that committee. Mr. Archibald was not allowed to come here and we were in this way unable to prove what, under other circumstances, was perfectly capable of being proved, because, when we attempted to bring a witness before the committee, or to elicit information from a witness who did appear, obstacles were placed in our way by hon. gentlemen opposite. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. Fielding) says that the country will not take any stock in our statements about the extravagant expenditures of the government. They have been quite proper, says the hon. Minister of Public Works. How about the expenditure that we will be called upon to vote either to-day or to-morrow for indemnifying Mackenzie & Mann for a contract which ought not to have been made amounting to $328,000, an item for which appears in the supplementary estimates ? What will this be after we have voted it ? It will be a monument to the eternal disgrace of the present government, a monument to their folly and incapacity as public men and to their lack of business ability. It will stand as a matter of record against them. They made a contract that should never have been made.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that it is not regular to discuss a vote which is to be submitted to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. SPROULE. I will say the expenditure which we will be called upon to make in payment of the award of the Exchequer Court, to which the government referred this disputed question. The Exchequer Court has given an award in favour of Mackenzie & Mann that will mean an expenditure of $328,000. Is this wise or otherwise ? Will the people of the country say whether it is wrong or right ? I will leave it to the people and I have no doubt what they will say about the payment to Mackenzie & Mann for the loss of that contract. But, we are told that the expenditure has not been extravagant and that it has always been wise. What about taking the census ? Let us give the House and the country a little information about that. Has the expenditure for taking the census been extravagant or economical ? That work has been done before and we have a fair opportunity of making a comparison. The predecessors of the present government twice performed work of taking the census of the country. Let me make a comparison of the cost of taking the census so that the people of the country may know whether the present government have been spending money extravagantly or economically.

The census of 1891, taken under the Conservative government, cost the country $548,000 all told, but the census of 1901, taken by the present Liberal government has up to date cost $980,000, and we are told it will cost $170,000 more, making in round numbers a total cost of $1,150,000. It is true that the population has slightly increased, and no doubt there was a little more work to be done, but the last census cost $602,000 more than the census taken by the Conservative government, and that enormous increase in cost can be pointed to by any honest man as a sample of gross extravagance on the part of this government. Every act of this government proves that there is a system of extravagance reigning which is not compatible with economy and wise judgment. The Minister of Finance told us that our expenditure on consolidated revenue account in 1895 was equal to 15 per cent, while last year it was only 12 per cent, thereby trying to prove that the present expenditure was compar-

atively less. Well, it is easy to prove the fallacy of that comparison. The revenue of 1895 was only $33,000,000, whereas last year it was $52,000,000, and 12 per cent on $52,000,000 is proportionately larger than 15 per cent on $33,000,000. We cannot turn our face to any quarter without seeing evidences of this extravagance. Look at the Galops rapids. The Minister of Railways was obliged to admit the other night that he had a company of contractors dredging these rapids all last year, and he did not know it, and yet the country will have to pay for it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why does the hon. member state that I had them there, when they were distinctly instructed that they should not go on, and that there was no appropriation?

Mr. SPROULE. I am justified in saying that the minister had them there in view of the fact that his own engineers were on the boats all the time directing the work. And yet the minister did not know it, and his chief engineer did not know it. But the company has rolled up an aggregate claim for $50,000, while the minister did not know that this work was going on. There is no doubt in the world but that this amount will be paid. The minister says he notified them there was no vote, but he let the contractors go on.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Why do you say I let them go on ?

Mr. SPROULE. So far as ministerial responsibility can be brought to bear the minister did that, because his subordinate officers were superintending the work and keeping the accounts which were presented to the minister when the time came to pay them. Is that proper management of the affairs of the country ? I leave the people to judge. I have given a few samples of extravagance and waste on the part of this government, and I could give many more. I could speak of the Yukon railway, the Drummond Railway, the Yukon telegraph lines, the purchase of ties and rails on the Intercolonial Railway, the Mackenzie and Mann contract, the census expenditure. I could speak of all these and I can submit them to the unbiased judgment of the people of Canada, feeling sure that the verdict would be that this government is spending the money of the country extravagantly, unwisely, improperly, dishonestly and corruptly.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). I know that any person who attempts to speak during this debate at such a late period of the session, incurs a serious responsibility, but some sentiments were expressed this afternoon by a veteran politician on the other side which I think require reply from a member representing a constituency in the lower provinces. One would think from the style and quality of the remarks of that hon. gentleman, that there might be a provincial election pending in one of the western provinces, because the attack was made under the guise of a criticism on the expenditure for great public works, whereas, divested of that adventitious envelope it was nothing more than an unjust attack on the maritime provinces. The gentleman who made these observations is, and ought to be, perfectly cognizant of the fact that the maritime provinces have given uniformly and without stint their support to every expenditure that was for the benefit of the country, and was a wise and legitimate expenditure. Whether that expenditure was made in Quebec, or whether in Ontario, or whether in the North-west, the votes of the lower province members have been in favour of such expenditure for wise public works. We regard it as a very unreasonable and a sectional cry, when the lower provinces are held up as a butt, and represented as partaking in the expenditure of public money for electioneering purposes, and from which no adequate return comes. I allude to the remarks of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart). He has had a good deal of experience in this House; he occupied for a considerable time the responsible and honourable office of Minister of Railways, and he ought to know better than he speaks. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman that the money spent on lighthouses and wharfs and other works in the lower provinces is a very insignificant sum indeed when compared with the very large amounts which have been voted for public works in the other parts of the Dominion. We, from the maritime provinces have not quarrelled with this expenditure in the other provinces. We have not regarded it, that every dollar expended in Ontario and the North-west and on the St. Lawrence was so much taken from the lower provinces. We have no such narrow or limited or sectional feeling.

Now, Sir, I know the generosity of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) ; I know his disposition and I know that his heart is perhaps capable of responding to any just appeal. I would like him to take a trip down to the lower provinces, especially around the shores of Nova Scotia, and enter into the lives of the fishermen and others there. He would observe at once that he was among an entirely different population from those with whom he was familiar, the farmers and others of the province of Ontario. If he did so, we would not again hear him complain that so much money was taken from the coffers of the country to be expended in aiding those poor fishermen in their precarious avocation. It is important to the business of these men that these public grants should be made for the construction of public works in their vicinity. They have no railroads, and they do not partake of the benefits of many of

the expenditures in other parts of the country. Their whole interest is in the sea. Suppose that for the want of a paltry grant of $100 for some lighthouse, all the inhabitants of one of those fishing districts should be swept away in consequence of not being able to make a port in a gale of wind. Again, in regard to the expenditure of $4,000 on the breakwater of Herring Cove, which is one of the subjects of discussion to-day, last year an Atlantic gale swept over that unhappy village, and carried away all the possessions of the fishermen of the place. It swept away their boats, their nets, their fishing houses, and all the means they had of getting a living. One of these Atlantic gales is sufficient sometimes to dam up the mouths of these little harbours, and destroy a whole year's living for the fishermen. It may be a most serious matter for them, because the fishing business is not a steady business like farming in the Northwest, but is a most precarious business. Sometimes two or three years will go by without the fishermen being able to obtain enough to pay for one year's living. Suppose the welfare of a community depends on the trifling expenditure of $100 for a lighthouse, what man in this House would rise up and give his vote to the proposition of my hon. friend from Lanark to withhold an appropriation of that kind, when so trifling an expenditure would be attended with such beneficial results? Then there are people along the shores who have no means of communication, who have to carry their goods to and from vessels in their boats. What man who has any understanding of the difficult business of these men, and the very small amount of money that passes through their hands, would withhold a grant of say $1,000 for a wharf at some place where there is no man with sufficient money to build a wharf for the accommodation of the people? And so, when the hon. gentleman rises and in his grandiloquent way inveighs against the waste of public money in the maritime provinces, I think I can see the poor fishermen in those localities reading that speech—and I will take care that it is read by a good many of them. When the hon. leader of the opposition goes among them to solicit their votes—and he has obtained a good many of them—I do not think he will promise that when his government comes into power, he will withhold the expenditure on wharfs, harbours, breakwaters and lighthouses in the maritime provinces, and especially in the county of Halifax. My hon. friend from Lanark dealt with the expenditure in a department with which he is supposed to be more familiar than he is with lighthouses, breakwaters and wharfs; and I would answer him, as other gentlemen have been answered on other occasions, and he knows it very well, that the maritime provinces were not disposed to enter into the union with Canada except on the express stipulation that the Intercolonial Railway should be built to connect the provinces, and that it should be efficiently maintained. The maritime provinces were not disposed to enter into the union with Canada, and that was held out to them as an inducement. Now, Sir, it has been a favourite subject in Ontario and perhaps elsewhere to describe all the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway as expenditures for the exclusive benefit of the maritime provinces, and as matter of indifference to the other provinces—as a matter in which they have no pecuniary interest, but as a sort of boon to pacify the maritime provinces. It is no such thing. A large portion of the province of Nova Scotia has no direct connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and a great many of the inhabitants derive no benefit from it whatever. The province of Nova Scotia, in common with the other provinces, enjoys the benefit of transport over the Intercolonial Railway, but it enjoys no special benefit. It is true, some of the productions of the maritime provinces, a very limited number, are carried over the Intercolonial Railway; but the large bulk of the products carried over that railway have their origin in the province of Ontario, and that province derives very much more benefit from the Intercolonial Railway than the province of New Brunswick or the province of Nova Scotia; and any hon. gentleman who rises in this House and describes that railway as being maintained for the benefit of the maritime provinces simply errs in judgment and mistakes the fact. The great bulk of the benefit is derived by the province of Ontario in the transport of its productions to the markets of the maritime provinces, which take almost every production that originates there, and welcome it gladly as the production of one of the sister provinces of the Dominion. We make no complaints on that score, nor on the score of the expenditures lavished on the canals or on other projects in the western part of the country; but we hear it with ill grace from a mature and veteran statesman like the hon. member for Lanark, when he rises in his place, and, perhaps for the purpose of securing some votes or some eclat in the province of Ontario, denounces the expenditure on these public works which run through the maritime provinces, but which are not for their exclusive benefit. I warn the hon. gentleman that if he expects his party ever to return to power, he should not place before the eyes and ears of the inhabitants of the lower provinces these denunciations of expenditures which are identified with the daily life and avocations of the working people in those obscure localities and, which they could not carry on successfully without these necessary public expenditures made by the Department of Public Works.

House divided on the amendment of Mr. Borden (Halifax).

YEAS :

Messieurs

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Barker,	Lavell,
Bell,	Lefurgey,
Birkett,	Lennox,
Blain,	MacLaren (Perth),
Borden (Halifax),	Maclean,
Boyd,	McGowan,
Brock,	McIntosh,
Broder,	Monk,
Bruce,	Morin,
Carscallen,	Osler,
Casgrain,	Robinson (Elgin),
Clarke,	Rosamond,
Culbert,	Sherritt,
Earle,	Sproule,
Hackett,	Taylor,
Haggart,	Tolton,
Johnston (Cardwell),	Vrooman,
Kaulbach,	Wilmot,
Kemp,	Wilson.—41.
Kendrey,	

NAYS :

Messieurs

Archambault,	Legris,
Ball,	Lemieux,
Bazinet,	Lewis,
Belcourt,	Logan,
Bernier,	Lovell,
Blair,	Loy,
Borden (King's, N.S.),	Macdonald,
Bourassa,	Mackie,
Bourbonnais,	MacLaren (Huntingdon),
Brown,	McCool,
Bruneau,	McCreary,
Brunet,	McEwen,
Bureau,	McGugan,
Calvert,	McLennan,
Campbell,	Madore,
Champagne,	Marcil (Bagot),
Christie,	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Copp,	Martineau,
Costigan,	Matheson,
Delisle,	Mulock,
Demers (St. John),	Oliver,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dugas,	Préfontaine,
Edwards,	Proulx,
Farquharson,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fielding,	Riley,
Fisher,	Roche (Halifax),
Fortier,	Ross (Ontario),
Fraser,	Ross (Victoria, N.S.),
Gallery,	Rousseau,
Gauvreau,	Schell,
Geoffrion,	Scott,
German,	Sifton,
Girard,	Stewart,
Gould,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Harwood,	Tarte,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),	Tobin,
Johnston (Cape Breton),	Tolmie,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tucker,
Laurier (L'Assomption),	Turcot,
Lavergne,	Turgeon,
LeBlanc,	Wright.—84.

PAIRS :

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Hyman,	Gilmour,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Tupper,
Johnston (Lambton),	Simmons,
McColl,	Ward,
Horsey,	Pringle,
Dyment,	McCormick,
Emmerson,	Fowler,
Harty,	Reid (Grenville),
Charlton,	Tisdale,
Bickerdike,	Cargill,
Parmelee,	Pope,
Sutherland (Essex),	Northrup,
Cowan,	Bennett,
Fitzpatrick,	LaRivière,
Murray,	Cochrane,
Beith,	Hughes (Victoria),
Guthie,	Calvin,
Kendall,	Roddick,
Thompson,	Ingram,
Erb,	Clancy,
McCarthy,	Smith (Wentworth),
Gibson,	Robinson (Northumberland),
McIsaac,	Hale,
Davis,	Roche (Marquette),
Lang,	Henderson,
Ethier,	Ganong,
Heyd,	Seagram,
Holmes,	Richardson,
Meigs,	Halliday,
Wade,	Clare,
Stephens,	Kidd,
Morrison,	McLeod,
MacKinnon,	Gourley,
Talbot,	Porter,
Flint,	Avery,
Angers,	Léonard,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for East Bruce (Mr. Cargill), East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), East Durham (Mr. Ward), East Kings, N. B. (Mr. Fowler), have not voted.

Mr. CARGILL. I have paired with the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike).

Mr. POPE. I forgot that I was paired with the hon. member for Shefford, and wish my vote erased.

Mr. FOWLER. I was paired with the hon. member for Westmoreland, (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. BALL. On this question I made a sign that I wished to vote on the side of the government but being essentially a Conservative the deputy clerk of the House paid no attention, and my vote was not recorded either on one side or the other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the main motion is carried, I wish to say the hon. Minister of Justice has handed me the Bill with regard to Joint Stock Companies, together with a brief, showing what portion is new and what is old. I have looked over the portion that is new and have no objection to the Bill being proceeded with at some convenient time to-day.

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

To pay amount of judgment of Exchequer Court in favour of Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann to recoup them for their outlay in connection with proposed contract for a railway from Stickeen river to Teslin lake.. .. ..$327,678 10

To pay amount of costs, including disbursements for evidence, witness fees, &c..	$830 20
	$328,508 30

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. POPE. No, some one ought to father this item. We do not know whom to look to, whether the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Railways and Canals. The original Bill for the construction of this road was introduced by the Minister of the Interior.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. This amount covers the judgment of the Exchequer court in respect of the claim of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann under the contract made with them by the government for the construction of a railway in the Yukon. The amount of the award itself was $327,628.10. The cost including evidence, witness fees, &c., amounted to $830.20. This makes a total of $328,508.20, the amount of the resolution. The original claim was for $493,785.32. The present award includes the amount allowed by the Exchequer court with interest after deducting sales made of the supplies which had been taken into that country by the contractors.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Can the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals tell us how long before the opening of parliament in 1898, this agreement was made ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, the original papers have passed out of my department, but my information is that they are in the Exchequer court as yet. Speaking from recollection, not only from my own but the recollection of other members of the government, this agreement was made a month or thereabouts before the opening of parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). According to the Order in Council, the agreement was made on the 25th of January, 1898, I think the House met that year on the 2nd of February.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Was it so short a time before the session as that ? The hon. gentleman had all the papers laid on the Table some weeks ago, and they would show the date of the agreement.

Mr. BELL (Pictou). The House met on the 3rd of February.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So, the agreement was made eight or nine days before the opening of parliament. Of course, so far as those contractors are concerned, I think it was recognized, to some extent at least by some members of the House, that, inasmuch as the contractors had proceeded at the instigation of the government before parliament had sanctioned the contract, there might be some claim on their part to be reimbursed for their actual outlay. Therefore, in any remarks I make, I direct attention to the government who are responsible for the loss to the country and not to the contractors themselves. It seems to me a new phase of parliamentary government that this contract should have been made, signed and sealed just eight days before the meeting of parliament and made subject to the approval of parliament, and yet the contractors should have been directed by the government to proceed with the work immediately. I do not recollect that there were any circumstances which would justify the government in taking the course they did in this matter. Subsequent events in that country have not shown that there was any cause for the very extreme haste with which the government insisted upon these gentlemen incurring liabilities at the expense of the country before parliament had any voice in the expenditure. I have had my attention directed, not during the present session, but during last session to the English practice in regard to such matters, and I think the government departed from the principles of constitutional government, and the due administration of public affairs in taking the course they did, and that they are reprehensible for causing this loss of public money by acting without the sanction of parliament and by urging the contractors as this Order in Council shows they did, to proceed with the construction of this work before parliament had an opportunity to pass upon it.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the minister if the correspondence—I suppose there was some correspondence calling upon the contractors to proceed with the work pending the decision of parliament—has been laid before the House. I presume that there must have been written instructions, because under the terms of the contract, strictly there would be no claim for damages. But, presumably because the executive saw fit to order them to proceed with the work we are called upon to pay this large amount. What explanation does the minister give as to the instructions given by the government before the decision of parliament ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All the correspondance exchanged between the contractors and the government or any department of the government has been laid on the Table. I know of no verbal instructions having been given. Perhaps the Minister of the Interior might be able to throw some light upon that, if there was any verbal instruction given. As I recollect the circumstances, our action was necessitated by the extreme urgency of the case at that time. We had a very grave problem pending before us with which we had to deal, and, according to the view we took of the question of urgency we could not allow any time to be lost.

Mr. MONK. I think that when we are called upon to vote such a large item as this, we are entitled to have from some member of the government a statement of the negotiations which led these contractors against whose claim I have nothing to say, if they received instructions to proceed at any rate and under any circumstances—taking the course they did, what instructions were given at the time, and who gave them those instructions. Having such a judgement I think some member of the government ought to be able to tell us how it came about that, although there were only eight days intervening, even less I think, between the signing of this contract and the meeting of parliament—three days, my hon. friend from Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) says—still we are called upon to-day to pay an immense amount when parliament itself is not at fault. I think somebody ought to explain how such a very large bill was run up against the country. If it was a judgment, I would have nothing to say. From the little I know of the circumstances, I think the contractors were entitled to a petition of right. But this is merely a reference establishing the quantum of damages.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would like the government also to give this explanation: Is this a judgment by the Exchequer Court, or did the government admit its liability, and only go to the Exchequer Court judge to have the amount settled which would be paid to these contractors? Is the item which is now before us founded upon a judgment by the Exchequer Court after the parties have been heard, or did the government admit its liability?

Mr. OSLER. This is evidently a very expensive coffin for a still-born child, and the child is so monstrous that the members of the government would be glad to have it buried out of their sight at any expense.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was undoubtedly a hearing before the courts. It took several days and witnesses were examined.

Mr. CASGRAIN. At the same time there is something very singular about this. This is a large amount of money. Was there a petition of right filed? Was a fiat given? Was there a case made out before the Exchequer Court? Was the Crown heard? And if the Crown was heard, and judgment was rendered, how is that no appeal has been lodged from this judgment? If it is a judgment, it seems to me a most extraordinary one. That a court should deliver judgment against the government on a claim of this kind, when it was stated in the contract in so many words that it would be subject to the decision of the House—the whole thing seems very strange. Then if that is true, the contractors took this contract and began work subject to this condition, and the government and the House not having approved of the contract, I cannot understand how the Exchequer Court could have rendered judgment holding the Crown liable under these circumstances.

The PRIME MINISTER. I think the award and reference, not to the Exchequer Court, but to the judge of that court acting as commissioner, have been placed upon the Table of the House. At all events, the Minister of Justice was to produce them, under my instructions. I do not see them on the Table, therefore I will have to give the reference by memory. The circumstances out of which this whole matter arose are familiar to the House. But though they may be familiar, in order to make the thing more intelligible, and the present appropriation better understood, perhaps it is just as well that I should give a history of the circumstances from the beginning. The House remembers that in 1898 the government introduced a Bill to construct a line of railway from Telegraph Creek up to Teslin Lake, which was to be the means of communication between the eastern world and the Yukon. The matter was brought, I admit, hastily to the attention of the House. The contract was made in the month of February, if, I remember right, and our intention was that the contractors should proceed immediately with the work, that they should put themselves at once in motion, and have everything ready so that at the opening of the season they would be able to go on at once with the work. What was the reason of this haste? Why did we instruct the contractors to proceed at once without any delay in order to begin work with the opening of the season? The reason was that in the previous session, that of 1897, the parliament of Canada passed an Act authorizing the construction of a railway from Skagway, on the Lynn canal, to the waters of Lake Bennett, that is to say to the source of the waters of the Yukon. This Bill was passed, as a good many Bills have been passed every year, without the government or parliament having any knowledge of the conditions of that country. The Yukon at that moment was a terra incognite. Nobody knew that it contained the vast wealth which events have subsequently shown it to contain. Undoubtedly if, when this charter was granted in 1897, parliament had been informed of the existence of this vast wealth, as it was later on informed in the summer of 1897, when the great discovery of gold was made, this charter would not have been granted. For my part I would have opposed it with all my might; and I am sure the same sentiments which would have actuated me to oppose it, would have actuated every other member of this House. This charter was granted from the waters of the Lynn canal towards the Canadian portion of Lake Bennett, that is to say, from a point which is now, and was then, in possession of the United States, from Skagway up to Lake

Bennett, which is undoubtedly in Canadian territory. The parties who had that charter had also a charter from the American Congress to build a railway from the waters of the Lynn canal through Canadian territory. I say Canadian territory, because the boundaries had not then been settled, we did not know where the true line was. We knew it was somewhere between the waters of the Lynn canal and the waters of Lake Bennett. It has since been established that the boundary is some fifty miles from Skagway. But we were in ignorance of the country then.

Mr. BELL. But that point is not accepted as the boundary.

The PRIME MINISTER. I meant to say the provisional boundary. It has not been accepted, but it has been recognized to be the boundary, at all events, it cannot be worse for us than it is at the present time. The boundary can be extended from the summit between the waters of the Pacific and the waters of the Arctic ocean. But in the summer of 1897 this gold discovery was made. There was a rush, we had to provide at once for a system of communication between the eastern world and the Yukon. We then made the contract with Mackenzie & Mann for the construction of that railway. The great object we had in mind was to have a railway, not from Skagway, but from Telegraph Creek, from one point in Canadian territory to another point in Canadian territory. Under that contract we intended to provide at once for the construction of a railway which would be altogether under our control. I may say it was only a provisional contract, because the Stikine river, though we have the right to navigate it, empties into American territory. But if our contract had been carried out we would have realized our intention to bring this railway to the waters of Observatory Inlet. We made haste to complete that contract for this reason, that if we did not take advantage of the time which was at our disposal, then the other charter which was given a year before would be proceeded with, and a railway would be constructed from the waters of the Lynn canal, at Skagway, up to the waters of Lake Bennett, and of course this railway being built, it would be a great detriment to our national railway. If our idea had been carried out, if the Bill which passed in this House had not been rejected by the Senate, then this railway would have been constructed, the railway between Skagway and Lake Bennett would not have been constructed, and we would have to-day an all-Canadian route in the Yukon, instead of having a hybrid route such as we have at the present time. That was the justification in our judgment. That is why there was such haste to have this railway built. The White Pass Yukon Railway people had been watching and were ready to proceed with the construction of their railway, and our own contractors were also ready to proceed. They made haste, there was a great deal of work to do, they sent provisions into the country, they purchased materials, they proceeded to carry on the work in the hope and expectation that their efforts would be approved by the Canadian parliament, that the contract would be ratified, and that as soon as spring was opened they would be ready to proceed and have the railway built during the season of 1898. They spent a large amount of money with that object in view. Unfortunately, the Bill, after having passed this House, was rejected by the Canadian parliament. These contractors made a claim upon us to be recouped for the expenditure which they had made. We asked them to furnish us with a detailed account which they did, but, before we proceeded to have the account settled, we asked them to dispose of all the material they could dispose of, which they did. Lastly, we had the account audited by judicial authority. We referred the matter to Mr. Justice Burbidge, who audited the account and examined it carefully. Mr. Justice Burbidge made a report to the government that Mackenzie & Mann had honestly expended the sum that is established now to be in the neighbourhood of $300,000. Of course, I am bound to say at once that there is no legal recourse against the Canadian government which can be enforced in a court of law, but we admit that Mackenzie & Mann have a moral claim against the honour of the Canadian people, against the honour of the Canadian government, and against the honour of the Canadian parliament, for the money which they then expended in an enterprise which was national in its character and which in my opinion, though, perhaps my opinion is not shared by all the members of this House, in an enterprise, which, if it had been carried out, would have been of the greatest advantage to the Canadian people at large. For these reasons we submit to the Canadian parliament that these men should not be subjected to the heavy loss which would be entailed on them, but as this is a loss which must be borne by somebody, it should be borne by the country and not by the contractors. We may be told that they were hasty, that they should have waited until the contract had been ratified. The excuse and the reason for this haste, and in my estimation it is an ample reason, is that there was not a minute to be lost, that time had to be taken by the forelock, that they had to proceed immediately to collect the materials and to take the measurements necessary in order that as soon as the spring was opened they might be enabled to go on with the work of construction. Of course, if it had not been for the charter which parliament had granted—I will not say improvidently or imprudently granted—but granted in ignorance of the conditions existing in that country, there would not

have been any necessity for such haste. But, this haste is justifiable by the events which have taken place since. As soon as the contract which we made with Mackenzie & Mann had been rejected by the Canadian Senate, the charter which had been granted by this parliament and by Congress to the White Pass and Yukon Railway Company was availed of, and in the spring the company proceeded with the construction of the railway between Skagway and the Yukon. This makes it a task of great difficulty for us now to have a national railway on Canadian soil. Under the circumstances, we say, and it is the only ground upon which we put it before the committee, that Mackenzie & Mann have against the Canadian people a moral claim which ought to be satisfied. The country can bear the loss, but individuals could not bear such a loss as that. The money was expended honestly and in good faith, the money was expended for a good purpose, the money was expended for a purpose, which, if it had been carried out, would have been of untold advantage to the country, and for these reasons I appeal strongly to hon. members on both sides of the House. As to the amount, as I have said, we thought we should not deal with the matter ourselves, but that we should refer it to a person most competent to deal with a matter of this kind, that is to say, to a judge of the land, who has carefully investigated and audited the account. We believe that on moral grounds Mackenzie & Mann should be repaid the amount they have expended, and for these reasons we have asked for this appropriation.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. This is the result of an infringement of the law by hon. gentlemen opposite, when they entered into this contract with Mackenzie & Mann. This system of entering into contracts without the authority of parliament should be put a stop to in some manner or other. It is unconstitutional. One of the principles that is laid down by the authorities as being one of the conditions on which a contract should be made is that:

> It is equally clear that the government have no constitutional authority to make a contract which shall be binding on the House of Commons——

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) admits that.

> ——by whom the necessary funds for carrying on the contract must be supplied; and the consent of parliament should be first obtained to all new contracts.

The contract was entered into only eight days before the meeting of parliament, and therefore hon. gentlemen could have obtained the consent of parliament by waiting for eight days, which would have been a very short time indeed to have waited.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was a delay——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman speaks in reference to the delay. As to the advantage of building that railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, he says that we would start on our own soil and that the railway would be built through our own country and be independent of the United States. The hon. gentleman forgets a fact which was pointed out to him in the House at the time, that in order to get to Telegraph Creek, the road would have to pass through American territory, or through American waters, over which the hon. gentleman alleges we have a right of navigation. The Americans have the right of navigation down the St. Lawrence, but one of the conditions we have a right to impose is, to require that their vessels shall call at the custom-house, that they shall make an entry and go through other formalities, and the Americans require the same of us at Fort Wrangel in American territory, through which we must go on our way to Telegraph Creek. The disadvantage of building that road was pointed out again and again in the debate which occurred in the House at that time. As a commercial undertaking, the absurdity was made clear of attempting to compete with a railway built either from Skagway or Pyramid Harbour. There was authority from congress to build a road from Skagway to the American boundary, wherever it might be found, and there was the authority of this parliament to continue it. In view of such legislation, no matter how rapidly you might build a road from Telegraph Creek to Teslin lake that undertaking could never enter into competition with the other road. However, that question has been threshed out again and again. What is the position to-day? The right hon. gentleman says that there was not a legal submission to the Exchequer Court. Is it a part of the duty of that court to pronounce on hypothetical questions submitted to it. The Supreme Court does on constitutional questions submitted by this parliament, but I thought that the judge of the Exchequer Court had stated in connection with the hard-pan cases that he would no longer deal with such cases as that; that he would no longer deal with such cases unless they were submitted under a petition of right, when he would decide them according to the law of the land. There is no petition of right here. As a matter of fact the claim is admitted by the government before they go to the Exchequer Court, and the case is submitted to the judge under a special condition. Indeed, it was not a case at all; it was simply a reference to find the amount, and the fact is that the amount found was $302,000 which was exactly the amount agreed upon between the department and Mackenzie & Mann after deducting the value of material sold. In fact the Exchequer Court accepted the arrangement come to between the two parties. Eight days before parliament met the gov-

ernment entered into a contract which it had not the right to do without the authority of parliament and unless it was made conditional that parliament should give authority afterwards. To show how jealous they are in England in repect to this, I may quote the following authority :

An amendment was proposed in Committee of Supply to reduce the vote for work on the House of parliament by £2,500 with a view of censuring the office of works for undertaking a new kind of decoration with mosaics in the central hall because it had been contracted for previously to being sanctioned by a parliamentary vote. After a short discussion the amendment was negatived, but on July 8th, on report of the resolution an amendment was again moved to reduce the vote by £5,500 in order to prevent certain structural alterations to the central hall as well as to condemn the decoration thereof with mosaic work. Another amendment was then offered by the commissioner of works, Mr. Laird, to reduce the vote by £3,000 only as a guarantee that the proposed structural alterations in the central hall should not be undertaken until approved of by parliament.

Therefore we see that even adornments of a building which is authorized by parliament and which introduced a structural reform were not permitted before parliament voted the money ; so jealous is the English House of Commons of its right to control contracts made by the executive. It has been the habit in this country, contrary to all law, for the Department of Railways and the Department of Public Works to enter into contracts for which they have no more authority than has the man on the street. Each department is limited to the expenditure voted by parliament, but that law is constantly contravened by this government. The Minister of Railways gives a contract for 11 miles of road and he extends that contract for 30 miles more without the slightest authority in the world to do so. I admit that it is pretty hard that a contractor should suffer after having entered into a contract in good faith with the government. I suppose they thought that the House of Commons was at their back, that the scheme would go through, and so they made a large expenditure and wish now to have it recouped. But it seem to me that in eight days or in sixteen days, or even in a month, $328,000 is an enormous sum to have lost on preparations of that kind. I have not looked into the accounts and I do not know anything about them, but it is clear that there was an agreement between the government and the other party as to the amount due and that the courts simply accepted that agreement.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has looked into some of the papers, I suppose ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He has observed, no doubt, that the account of materials furnished was carefully gone into, and that one of the officers of the Railway Department, Mr. Shannon, a very competent and a very reliable man, went out to this portion of the country, and compared the materials and merchandise there with the items of the Mackenzie & Mann claim, ascertained wherein he thought it was in his opinion excessive ; ascertained as to the correctness of it, and made his report accordingly. The account was not by any means submitted to the judge of the Exchequer Court without having been inquired into previously in the most thorough and exhaustive manner by a competent officer of the department.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not saying anything about that. I say that the judgment of the Exchequer Court is for the precise amount that was recommended by the officer of your department. The contractors claimed a certain amount ; they agreed that a certain amount should be deducted ; afterwards the sale of material reduced that amount, and the award was for the amount that remained.

The PRIME MINISTER. I find no fault with the position laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) as to the status of parliamentary government. He says that the government should not enter into a contract unless they have previous parliamentary authority or unless it is provided that the contract shall be ratified by parliament. That is exactly what was done in this case. The contract which was entered into by the government with Messrs Mackenzie & Mann provided that it should be ratified by parliament, and it failed of its ratification. My hon. friend asks why the contractors engaged in the work of the contract before it was ratified. Of course, if it had been like the case mentioned by my hon. friend a moment ago, simply for the adornment of a public building, they would not have been so hasty to do so. But he understands that from the very nature of the work, and from the fact that it was to be carried out in a part of the continent very difficult of access, they could not wait, but were obliged to have their materials on the spot so as to be in a position to go on with the construction as soon as the season opened. There was not an hour to be lost, and they proceeded on the expectation and the presumption that the contract would be rafified by parliament. I repeat that we do not pretend that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann have a legal claim against the government.

Mr. BELL. Had they nothing more than the presumption that parliament would ratify that contract to warrant them in going on ?

The PRIME MINISTER. They had the presumption and the necessity of the case, which would have made their efforts absolutely fruitless unless they had taken advantage of the winter season to send their

materials to Telegraph Creek. When the accounts were presented to the government they were carefully inspected and audited by an officer of the Department of Railways. But we were not satisfied to have that audit alone. We thought that a judicial audit of the accounts should be made, and we appointed Mr. Justice Burbidge to make that judicial audit; and I call the attention of the House to the very terms of the reference under which Mr. Justice Burbidge proceeded :

> The minister, therefore, recommends that the said claims be referred, under the statute, in that behalf, to the Exchequer Court of Canada, for investigation, adjustment, and judgment, but that no claims which do not come within those mentioned in paragraph 4 of this minutes of council and the sum total of which is given in paragraph 5, be inquired into.

Paragraph 4 says :

> The minister considers that the claims which should be recognized are for time and services and money losses actually sustained and money expenditure actually made or liabilities therefore incurred in good faith in connection with said agreement, and in preparing to carry out the same, and in procuring and transporting men, materials, plant and supplies therefore, and in carrying on the works so far as they may have been proceeded with, and the interest paid on the moneys expended.

This was the nature of the claim which was referred to the judicial audit of Mr. Burbidge. He investigated the claims and made his report, and accordingly, this appropriation is now asked for. I have only to repeat what I said : we cannot present the claim as a legal one ; we present it simply as an equitable one which ought to appeal to the sense of fairness and equity of hon. members on both sides of the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. When the right hon. gentleman interrupted me I was going on to argue that the Crown has no power to enter into a contract unless the money is voted by parliament or unless the Crown makes it a condition of the contract that it shall not come into force until the money is voted. But here is an expenditure which fell upon us the very moment the contract was entered into. There is no provision in our constitution for anything of that kind. If there is a necessity for any extraordinary expenditure, or if any emergency arises which justifies an expenditure, the only other method by which it can be incurred is by a Governor General's warrant. But no government has a right to enter into a contract by which any expenditure of money can be made before the money is voted by parliament. It is an attack on the privileges of parliament to enter into any such contract. The contract may be made subject to the approval of parliament, but no expenditure under it is justified until parliament votes the money.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That proposition is all right stated in a general way and applicable to ordinary circumstances; but the British constitution recognizes that in a case of great urgency, such as the purchase of the Suez canal shares by the British government—a case in which the government considers the matter is of such supreme importance it will be warranted in taking upon itself the risk of getting the approval of parliament in acting without previous parliamentary authority. This has been done more than once, and is regarded as being within the purview of the constitution, although no constitutional sanction is granted to it.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The hon. gentleman cannot give any authority for that.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg pardon. The constitution is of that elastic character that it recognizes that such a contract can be made if it is made on the responsibility of the government, and if the sanction or approval of parliament follows, although it is not a thing that is regular or usual.

At six o'clock committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There is a remark or two I desire to make in reply to the hon. member for South Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) which I did not have an opportunity of making before the House took recess. The hon. member pointed out that there was no reason whatever for the government entering into this agreement with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann eight or ten days before parliament met. We could have waited, he said, until parliament met and consulted it at the earliest moment, and the transaction could have been done in the ordinary and customary way and in a strictly legal manner. In making that criticism, which would, on the spur of the moment, seem to have considerable weight, he entirely ignored not only the fact of the extreme urgency which the case demanded but also that it would have been impossible to have secured any action by parliament for weeks or months after the opening of the session. That proved to be the actual fact. The Bill legalizing and affirming the agreement was submitted to parliament shortly after its opening, but there was such a determined opposition made to it that the session was well advanced before it could be sent to the upper chamber. Finally it was approved by the House of Commons, and whatever the contractors may have done and no doubt they did a great deal, in the intermediate period, to prepare themselves for the opening of navigation on the Stikene and the commencement of the work—they would be confirmed in going still further with these

preparations when the representatives of the people, who were the proper persons in the ordinary sense to determine whether or not a contract of this kind should be confirmed, had pronounced in its favour. It would be considered ordinarily as rather a stretch of the functions usually exercised by the Senate—although I do not say it is not within the right of that body—to interfere with Supply, and this Bill was of the same nature as a Supply Bill. The Senate, however, threw out the Bill, with the consequences which we all know—consequences very serious to the interests of Canada, not the interests of that particular portion of Canada alone, but of Canada in general. We found the complaint freely made that the American people were acquiring a very large share, if not almost the entire control, of the business going into that country, so much so that even the leader of the opposition of that day (Sir Charles Tupper) was impressed with the urgent importance of having the railway put through, and declared himself in favour of that policy, and two years later confirmed the opinion he had in the first instance expressed in favour of an early and immediate construction of the line by the government, as a government work. So much for that argument of my hon. friend.

The hon. member for Lanark further argued that we had entered into a contract without any authority whatever of law. I recognize at once that, in all cases, legislative authority is necessary in order that the government may legally enter into any contract which involves a charge or burden upon the treasury. That is the essential requisite. Nobody questions that. The government has no power in itself, and can only get power to make a binding contract, one which can be legally enforced in the courts, from this parliament. My hon. friend went on to say that this government is in the habit of doing that continuously. He asked what the government had done with respect to the Murray Harbour Railway, and he went on to say that, without any authority from parliament, the government extended the contract which had been given for a portion of the line to another portion. It must be plain to any one who considers a moment what the hon. gentleman has been contending for, that he is confounding a constitutional Act with an Act by legislative authority. He is confusing what the government may have authority to do, such as, when an appropriation has been made, to enter into a contract without inviting public tenders, with the case before the committee. There is no similarity whatever between the cases. The hon. gentleman cannot show it because it is not true, that with respect to the contract made by the Department of Railways and Canals for the extension of the Murray Harbour Railway, that contract was not made by authority of law. There was an appropriation, and the only question that can be raised is whether or not that contract should have been extended without again inviting tenders. Hon. gentlemen opposite are quite free to contend that we should have invited tenders. But it is a totally different proposition to say that we entered into a contract without the authority of law, because we had the authority of law in the appropriation authorizing us to carry on the work.

This question no doubt is an interesting one. The hon. gentleman can readily recall his own acts. These will throw some light upon it and help my hon. friend to reach a sound conclusion. He will remember his own act when he gave a contract to Hugh Ryan & Company for the purpose of constructing and putting in valves and other works for the filling and emptying of the Sault Ste. Marie canal. My hon. friend had authority from parliament to do this because the money had been voted for the purpose, but though he had the authority of parliament to do it he did not ask for tenders. The hon. gentleman handed the work over to Hugh Ryan & Company. Nobody was invited to tender. No one was given the opportunity of saying whether he could do it any lower than Ryan & Company. My hon. friend exercised his discretion, and no doubt he took the authority of his colleagues in council and they approved of the contract, and it was given. Does my hon. friend say that the contract made with Mr. Hugh Ryan & Company was not, under the circumstances, a contract made by the authority of law. He cannot do it. I would be very sorry to say that because it is not the case. All the same, he did not ask for tenders, and that case is on all fours with the Murray Harbour Railway case.

I could give a number of instances for the information of my hon. friend which are parallel to the present one. Let me give him a stronger case, the case of the contract which he entered into with Mr. M. P. Davis for the erection of the Sheik's island dam, to cost near half a million. Mr. Davis was not entering into competition with any one when he got that work. He got it from my hon. friend without competition at all, and there was no calling for tenders. My hon. friend talks about this government extending this contract to the contractor of the Murray Harbour Railway as though nothing of the kind had ever happened before and as though it outraged his sense of what was proper.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I invite him to distinguish between the case of the half a million or four hundred thousand dollar contract which he gave to Mr. M. P. Davis for the building of Sheik's Island dam and the case of the Murray Harbour Railway work, which he condemns so unhesitatingly.

My hon. friend can do so if there is any possibility of distinguishing between them, but I think he will find it more difficult than he seems to think. It is an interesting question. I could furnish my hon. friend with a number of similar instances which would occupy his consideration, and he might probably be able to tell us wherein the contracts were perfectly legal in the one case and absolutely null in the other. It is germane to this subject, because my hon. friend has dragged in this Murray harbour affair for the purpose of pointing the argument against us in connection with the Mackenzie & Mann contract, to show that the Mackenzie & Mann arrangement was in line with the policy we were in the habit of pursuing. While I am upon this point, I wish to say a word with regard to the general question of inviting tenders for public works. I do not think there has been any department of the government, either under the present administration or under the former administration, in which there has been fewer cases of contracts being given without public competition than in the Department of Railways and Canals during the past five or six years. But cases will occur, and may properly occur, in which that may be done. If the people and parliament have confidence that the government and the minister will only take that course when the case justifies it, and when the contract is a proper one for such treatment, why should not the public interest be furthered, as it often may be, by placing the contract for work of this character in the hands of a responsible man? Some people fall down and worship the idea of publicly inviting tenders for every contract, as though that alone would secure the best results for the country and for all concerned. But that is not my view. I do not think that is a position which one who has had any experience in public affairs would feel called upon to adhere to. I think if it were the ideal and the only proper way in which contracts could be given by the government, it would have been followed in that country to which we all look for what is wisest and best in the administration of government. But they do not follow this course in England. They very rarely, so far as I can learn, publicly invite tenders. If they want competition among men for any particular service, they privately notify chosen parties by sending circulars to them, and from the tenders received they chose the man who shall receive the contract. But they do not by any means bind themselves to give the contract to the lowest tenderer even then. Nor are the cases infrequent, as anybody who has followed the subject must know, in which tenders are not invited at all. I believe that it is often the best and wisest course, where you have a man who is already carrying on a work who is responsible, and is doing his work satisfactorily, and at prices which are just and reasonable, to give the contract for any extension of the work decided on. It is better that such a contractor should be permitted to continue —better for the government and for all concerned. I think that one of the last things that any man who has had experience in these matters would wish is that a contract which he has to let should fall into the hands of incompetent people, people who know nothing about how to do the business, but who are ready to jump at every opportunity of getting a contract and who, very often, when they have a contract, do not know what to do with it. It is not at all the best thing for the government always to get the work done at the lowest possible prices. On the contrary, it is the best thing for the government that its contracts should be let at prices which are fair and reasonable and will allow a fair—not an exorbitant, but a fair—return to the contractors for the investment they make and the work they do. These are the conditions under which contracts should be let. Whatever the nature of the work may be, whether the construction of a railway or the putting up of a public building or other works of that character, the very greatest difficulty arises if the contracts get into the hands of men who are really undertaking to do the work for less than will give them a fair return for their labour, or is being done at a loss. With such people, you encounter trouble at every turn. You cannot have staff enough to see that such people do not evade you. They have every motive to do so, and sometimes even the motive of saving themselves from ruin; and they resort to all sorts of expedients for the purpose of evasion. If we were not opposed to one another here, some on one side of politics and some on the other, if we were not discussing this question from two sides of the House, there is no hon. gentleman who would not admit that the public interests will be best served by having contracts placed in the hands of responsible people and at prices that will give the contractor a fair return while being also satisfactory to the government. So, I say, I do not admit at all that cases may not properly arise in which the action should be taken which was taken. I do not criticise the action taken by the hon. gentleman—I have no doubt he has good reasons for recommending it to his colleagues. But cases will arise in which it is necessary for the government to take this course in the public interest. Now my hon. friend has not given to this committee, it appears to me, by any of the arguments he has presented, any reasons why this item should not pass. He has admitted that it would be a great hardship for these people to be called upon to bear this loss, and that parliament would not be willing under the circumstances, that these people should bear the loss. With the best intentions and with the fullest confidence that parliament would ratify the arrangements made, and yielding

to the strong opinion which was entertained in the country that something must be done immediately for the Yukon, this work was proceeded with. People were rushing in there, and predictions were freely made that fifty thousand people would go in during that season. These people had no means of carrying with them sufficient food to maintain them for any lengthened period. So, it was necessary that, as speedily as possible, easy means of transport should be provided by which the needed supplies could be carried into that country. The government were aware of that necessity. Not because they wanted to act hastily, or because they felt they were acting hastily, but because they felt the responsibility resting upon them, and that failure to do what was best would lay them open to criticism and condemnation, they took this means to insure, to the utmost extent of their power, the providing of the best means of communication at the earliest possible moment. The contractors guaranteed us that by the end of September there would be a railway to Lake Bennett, and that at the earliest possible moment we should be able to get through that otherwise impassable barrier the supplies that were needed by the people who were rushing into that country.

Mr. MACLEAN. I am not going to argue with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blair) whether party government is a failure or not, or whether public competition should or should not be abandoned, both of which principles he supported in the address he has just made. But I would like to ask him a question which is pertinent to the subject under debate. Did the government as a whole or did any member of the government—and if so, which one—give instruction to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to go on with this contract and incur this expense pending the ratification of the contract by parliament? That question has been asked two or three times and we have not had an answer yet.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The question which my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) asks is a perfectly fair and pertinent question. There were no specific instructions given by the government or any member of the government to the firm of Mackenzie & Mann, or any of their agents, to proceed with this work before it should be ratified by parliament, that is to say, no member of the government gave specific instructions.

Mr. MACLEAN. Were there any general instructions?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. No general instructions, no instructons at all.

Mr. MACLEAN. Then the contractors proceeded of their own notion?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes. But first I want to refer to the question which the hon. member for Lanark (Hon. Mr. Haggart) has brought up. I desire to say to my hon. friend that he seems to be very anxious that the constitution should be observed in all respects. I think it is very creditable to the hon. gentleman that about once a day he points out the necessity of sticking to the constitution. There need not, however, be any haziness upon the constitutional question involved in this contract. Every member of parliament, I apprehend, without being a lawyer, understands exactly what the position is in that respect. The government have no power to make a contract which binds the country, nor have they any power to expend any money, nor have they any power to incur a liability which the country is bound to pay without the sanction of parliament. That is sufficiently evident, even in the circumstance with which we are dealing at the present time; because the government could not pay the amount without a special appropriation of parliament.

But while the rule is abundantly clear and not to be disputed by any person, that contracts cannot be made without the sanction of parliament or without parliamentary authority in the shape of an appropriation, yet that rule is subject to exceptions. While I am not desirous of going over the ground which was gone over at such wearisome length when this contract was under discussion in parliament, I may simply refer to the fact that it is well recognized that in some cases the government does, in the exercise of its functions as a government responsible to parliament, decide that it will take the responsibility of departing from this well recognized rule. If we were a government such as, for instance, there exists in the United States, where they have a President bound by the limitations of a written constitution, such a thing of course could not occur, because the president could have no authority, and could not be justified in taking such responsibility. But inasmuch as our government is differently constituted we have the power of taking that responsibility upon ourselves, being bound to account to the House of Commons, from which we derive our authority, for the exercise of the power that is vested in us, and bound to account for the step which we took in incurring that responsibility. We took the responsibility because we thought that circumstances demanded it. It would be a wearisome waste of time to undertake to go over the circumstances which were discussed in this House, I think more lengthily than any other subject which has been debated since I have been a member of it. But we did take the responsibility of deciding that this action ought to be taken, and we caused this contract to be executed.

Now, for my hon. friend's question. No specific instructions and no general instructions were given to the contractors to proceed; but every member of the government perfectly understood, and the contractors perfectly understood, that they were expected by the government to proceed, because the very terms of the contract—if my hon. friend will take the trouble to look at it again—necessitated the contractors proceeding immediately to expend a large sum of money if they were to fulfil the terms of the contract and the obligations which they had entered into with the government. So the question whether there were or were not any specific instructions given to the contractors, is of no account whatever in endeavouring to arrive at the merits of this question. Undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman, the contractors were perfectly justified, in so far as their relations with the government were concerned, in proceeding with the work. They perfectly understood that the government expected that they would go to work and put themselves in a position to fulfil this contract, and they could not possibly have done that if they had not anticipated the meeting of parliament by taking the action which required the expenditure of a very considerable sum of money.

Now, as to whether it was wise that the government should come to the conclusion that circumstances were so urgent as to require this departure from the regular usage, is a question in regard to which we are quite prepared to take our stand, and to accept the responsibility before this committee, before parliament, and before the people of Canada. My hon. friend will, I think, admit that some of the circumstances, at least, would assist in justifying the government in coming to the conclusion that there were circumstances of peculiar urgency. Suppose that some time about next September or October, some very peculiar set of circumstances should arise, which, in the opinion of the community, seemed to demand special action, and my hon. friend the leader of the opposition should come to a member of the government who was particularly charged with dealing with that special emergency, and urge upon him to take special action in regard to it, to take it immediately, without waiting for a meeting of parliament, then I think that we would be justified in assuming that there were some grounds at least for supposing that a strong case of urgency had been made out. It is within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen, I think, that while that contract was under discussion Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the opposition, came to my house and urged that the contract should be made; and when I said that the terms were under discussion and that the government had difficulty in agreeing upon the terms, the expression of Sir Charles Tupper was that it was not necessary to stand so much on the question of terms, but that time was the important thing; that the question was one of extreme urgency, and we should act at once; that the contract should be made for the construction of a railway. And by what route ? By the Stikine route, by the very route which we were adopting at that time. And the hon. gentleman, who then occupied the position that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition now occupies, then and there joined hands with the government in the action which they took in that respect. Surely, Mr. Chairman, we had a right to expect that the honour and good faith of the Conservative party were pledged to us in that undertaking, surely we had a right to expect that a man of his years, and experience, and high position, having come voluntarily, of his own motion, to a member of this government for the purpose of suggesting the very action which was taken, would not allow himself to be put in the position of swallowing his own words, dishonouring himself, and going back upon the position he had just taken. I think, Sir, our hon. friends upon the other side of the House have placed themselves in a very invidious position, when, knowing that their leader had gone so far as to indorse the position which the government had taken, they practically took him by the throat and in broad daylight, before the whole people of Canada, compelled him to swallow his own words, to dishonour himself and the Conservative party in this House, as he did upon that occasion. There is at least fair ground, I think, for the suggestion that the case was one of urgency where the responsible leader of the Conservative party in this House went so far as to pursue the very extraordinary course that he did, in coming and urging upon the government the very course which the government afterwards pursued.

I am far from undertaking to justify the action of the government by anything that was said by the then leader of the opposition. The government does not require to go behind the leader of the Conservative party or any member of the Conservative party for the purpose of justifying its action. The government is prepared to take the responsibility of its action ; and if hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to take the responsibility before the people of Canada, for the present position of affairs in the Yukon territory, then this government is prepared to take the responsibility of paying $328,000. We will take our share if hon. gentlemen will take their share, which they have placed upon themselves.

Now, after the firm of Mackenzie & Mann had gone on in good faith—and I apprehend from the tone in which this claim has been discussed that our hon. friends on the other side are not disputing the righteousness of paying the claim, or paying whatever may be found to be a proper amount, but after that contract had been executed, and the firm had gone on and expended their money in

good faith, the contract, as the members of the commitee are aware, was thrown out by the Senate at the instance of friends of the Conservative party. After the contract had been drawn up and the operations had been called off, the members of the contracting firm came to the government and explained the position in which they were and asked what redress they were to have and how their claim was to be recognized. The government came to the conclusion, that it was a fair and proper thing that the firm of Mackenzie & Mann should be paid the actual moneys which they were out of pocket, not any profits upon the operation, not any damages for the failure to ratify the contract, but the actual amount of money which the firm were out of pocket in consequence of the operations which they had undertaken for the carrying out of the contract which they had made with the government. I make that statement clearly and definitely so that this committee might understand exactly what the government decided to do. We decided, that, under the circumstances of the case which the members of the committee are perfectly familiar with from first to last, it was fair and reasonable and right that the government of Canada should pay to these contractors the actual amount of money which they were out of pocket in connection with the carrying out of the contract insofar as they had gone. Then the question arose as to the adjustment of these moneys, as to the proper ascertainment of the amount which the government should pay. They were told to file their claim with the Railway Department and that their claim would be considered. They filed their claim with the Railway Department and the officers of that department examined and audited the accounts. The government had no other way of arriving at the amount which should be paid except by referring the claim to the proper department of government where were officers skilled in the examination of such accounts and knowing thoroughly well whether the figures, the items, the prices which had been submitted to them were just, or reasonable, or proper. That is the only way in which the government could proceed in the adjustment of these accounts. We did proceed in this way and the accounts were sent to the Railway Department and they were audited by the officers of the department. I am not familiar with the names of the officers who audited these accounts. They were sent there and under the direction of the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair) they were placed in the hands of the proper officers and audited. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says that the award of the judge of the Exchequer Court agrees with the amount which had been agreed upon between Mackenzie & Mann and the officers of the Railway Department. This is not a correct statement of the facts. The officers of the Railway Department made no agreement as to any amount with Mackenzie & Mann, nor did the government make any agreement as to any amount with Mackenzie & Mann. The officers of the Railway Department had no authority to make any agreement. It was the business of the officers of the Railway Department to make a correct audit of the accounts that were placed before them and to report to the minister the result of their examination.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The officers of the Railway Department went out to that country, made an investigation as to the goods, materials and supplies which they had on hand.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I was not aware of that, but I know that the greatest care had been taken, because, at the time, the government took the position that the most careful overhauling of these accounts should be made, because, as hon. gentlemen have said, and as the government quite agree, the amount was very large, much larger even than we had any expectation it would be. What the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) should have said was that the finding of the judge of the Exchequer Court proved that the officers of the Department of Railways had properly audited the accounts. That is what the finding of the judge of the Exchequer Court proved. After the examination had taken place by the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals and after they had reported as to the amount which they found these accounts totalled up to, and which constituted their finding upon the claim which was filed there, we were in this position : Should we bring that claim to parliament, or should we accept the finding of our officers, the officers of the Railway Department, or, should we require some further examination of these accounts? We were quite aware that parliament would required that the utmost care should have been exercised in connection with the auditing of these accounts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) proceeds from that point was there not an agreement or understanding between Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann and the Department of Railways and Canals as to the prices or the amount ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, there was no arbitration, none whatever.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Not that I ever heard of.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am not saying that there was an arbitration. Was there not a settlement between the representatives of Mackenzie & Mann and the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals as to the prices, the amounts, and the reductions ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, not in the Department of Railways and Canals.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We decided as a government that Mackenzie & Mann should be paid the moneys which they had properly expended in attempting to carry out this contract. They filed a statement of their account, we sent it to the Department of Railways and Canals in order that the officers might decide as to what was the proper amount. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) asks: Was it agreed? If he calls it an agreement that when the contractors filed their accounts in the Department of Railways and Canals the officers decided what they were willing to recommend and allow, then, that was an agreement. That was exactly what the accounts were sent there for, but the officers did not agree that the amount should be paid. The officers were in the position simply of auditors for the purpose of making an audit. As to whether that amount should be paid or not, or whether a smaller amount should be paid, was a matter respecting which they had nothing to do, and the government was in no way bound by the result of the examination which they made. I was going to say that we fully recognized the facts that this House would not take it as reasonable that they should be asked to sanction a payment of this character unless a very full and thorough examination of the accounts had been made. Therefore, after the audit had been made by the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals, in order that there could be no possible question about the amount, in order that there could be no possible suggestion that the accounts were cooked, or that they were padded, or that it was unfair, or unreasonable that any of these accounts should be paid, we sent the accounts to the judge of the Court of Exchequer for the purpose of having his findings upon these accounts.

It is upon the finding of the judge of the Exchequer Court in review of the result of the examination of the officers of the Department of Railways, that we bring this amount before the committee for the purpose of being authorized to pay it to these people. I cannot conceive at this moment of anything more that the government could do for the purpose of getting at a fair adjustment of this account, and I venture to say that hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House will not in the course of the discussion be able to suggest anything further that the government could have done, or that the government ought to have done for the purpose of adjusting this account, than that which we have done already. We have endeavoured to protect the treasury, we have endeavoured to protect the public, we have endeavoured to protect this House in every way, and in the only way which was open to us. Under these circumstances, so far as the question of the amount is concerned—although it is large upon the face of it; larger perhaps than any of us anticipated—yet we are not in a position to say that it is not a fair and reasonable adjustment.

What is the position therefore in which we are placed as a government in connection with this matter? It is, that we decided upon a certain line of action at a certain time, and that we took the responsibility of taking that action. We were burked in our endeavour to carry out that project by our hon. friends on the other side of the House, who, not having a majority in the popular Chamber amongst the representatives of the people, sought to prevent us from carrying out our wishes; sought to prevent the majority in this House from having its own way in regard to the handling of the public property of this country, by having the Bill thrown out in another place. So far as we are concerned we are prepared to accept the responsibility of our action. I venture to say that hon. gentlemen upon the other side will not find as time goes on, that their position in connection with this transaction will be regarded by the people of Canada as flattering to them. If this transaction had been allowed to be consummated as it was intended it should be, we should have had a Canadian railway to the Yukon Territory; we should have had a railway which we would have reached in the first instance by means of a stream over which we have the right of navigation, and we should have been able to reach our own territory by a Canadian route. The scheme of that railway contemplated an extension to a port in British Columbia, and if the first section of the road had been built, undoubtedly the second section would have quickly followed, and long before this we should have been enjoying the benefit of an ocean port in British Columbia, from which we would have running a railway over Canadian soil which would have enabled us to reach the Yukon Territory without crossing American territory. That would have been the position in which the country would have been placed to-day. It would not have cost the exchequer of this country a single copper, and as to the importance of it, I may say that during that very session or the next session of parliament, we had the admission of the responsible leader of the Conservative party, when he stood upon the floor of this House and actually suggested that this government should propose legislation under which we should provide that that very same railway should be built out of the public funds of this country at an enormous cost. That is the position which the Conservative party committed itself in parliament at that time.

But what are the conditions at the present time? Instead of a Canadian railway and a Canadian sea port, and a Canadian trade,

what have we got ? If our friends opposite think that the present position is a satisfactory one and that it flatters them, I wish them all possible joy of it. We have at the present time a territory rapidly developing, in which there is a great and growing trade; a territory which we absolutely cannot reach, speaking in a commercial or economic sense, except over territory which is occupied by the American people. We are absolutely in the hands of the American people in regard to our dealings with our own territory there. At the present time the steamboats which run from the ports upon the Puget Sound to Alaska are making it almost impossible for the Canadian boats to carry on business, and this government has an application before it from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company asking for assistance to enable them to maintain their line—the only Canadian line upon the route —because they are subjected to such unfair competition from the Americans. That is the position in which we are in respect to shipping. So far as trade is concerned, if hon. gentlemen opposite will look at the returns they will find that a vast proportion of the trade is done by the Americans. Upon the upper Yukon it is altogether in the hands of the Americans. The large commercial companies are American companies, and by reason of the fact that we have to pass through American territory, and that we are handicapped in every respect in connection with that trade, it is almost impossible for Canadian merchants to compete upon fair terms with their rivals there.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, leaving out of sight for the moment the question of trade, we are in this unfortunate and humiliating position, that we cannot send a policeman or a soldier into our own territory without that policeman or soldier taking off his uniform and asking leave of the American government to cross American territory. That is the humiliating position in which we are placed in the Yukon Territory by reason of the action of our friends on the other side of the House. More than that, we cannot take a prisoner from Dawson city to a penitentiary in the older portion of Canada, because we would have to take him through American territory, and we would be liable to be called upon to surrender that prisoner, and would be called upon to surrender that prisoner if we attempted to take such action.

Now, Sir, in connection with that country we are placed in a most ridiculous and humiliating position, and we are placed in that position by reason of the action of hon. gentlemen opposite who have forced us to it, or else to incur the enormous expenditure of the building of an all-Canadian road out of the public funds. But further, the action which was taken at that particular time had this effect. As the right hon. the Prime Minister has said, there has been a railway charter to run from the town of Skagway, known as the British Yukon Railway, but now popularly known as the White Pass Railway. It is a fact which is well known to many members of this House, that the promoters of that railway were in the city of Ottawa waiting to learn whether the Mackenzie & Mann Railway Bill would pass or not before they should ask their friends to subscribe a dollar for the purpose of constructing the White Pass Road. They waited in this city until they found out that the Senate had determined to throw out that Bill, and so soon as that action was taken, they went to work and got the money to build the road. And if that Bill had not been thrown out; if the Mackenzie & Mann charter had gone through, then the White Pass Railway could never have been built, because its promoters would never have risked a dollar of investment in that road. What is the result to-day ? By the throwing out of the Mackenzie & Mann charter the construction of the White Pass Railway has been made possible, and the existence of that road makes it an economic impossibility almost to get any money upon a commercial basis for the purpose of getting another railway constructed over Canadian soil. We are therefore in the unfortunate position, that unless and until the trade of that country would justify the government of Canada in making enormous sacrifices for the purpose of getting a railway in there, we shall not have a Canadian railway, and we shall be in the unfortunate and humiliating position of doing everything practically by the leave of our American friends. I am bound to say that so far, our relations with the American government in respect to the right of way and passage across the strip of territory at Skagway, have been of a reasonable and satisfactory character. But there is no member of this House who reflects for a moment who cannot see the difficulty of the position in which the Dominion of Canada is placed, by having access to its own territory only by permission of a foreign power. I have only to say in conclusion on this point that so far as the government are concerned, they regret that they are called upon to ask the committee to pay this sum of money; but they have no reason to doubt that the position they took at the time in connection with this enterprise was correctly taken, and we adhere to the opinion more strongly even than then that the Bill which we placed before parliament at that time was in the public interest and should have been passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the estimated cost of a railway such as was proposed by this contract ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not an engineer's estimate by me or I would be happy to give it to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. OSLER. I do not propose to discuss the question of the constitutionality of this payment, or whether it should be made in the way proposed. But, considering it on ordinary business principles, I thoroughly approve of the payment to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, the contractors, of whatever amount is found to be fairly due to them, they having expended money under a contract that was entered into by them in good faith with a government having a very large majority at their back. I think that any contractors are justified under these circumstances in immediately making a large expenditure of money, and I think that the government and this House should pay them whatever is properly due to them for that expenditure. It may be that the government are not going about the matter in the right way. It may be that the amount settled upon is not the right amount. That, I should gather from what I have heard of this discussion, is quite open to question. It is evident that the amount which the Exchequer Court awarded was an amount that had been arrived at between the government and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann before the accounts were submitted to the Exchequer Court.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, no.

Mr. OSLER. Necessarily that is the only inference that can be drawn, because the amount fixed by the Exchequer Court is practically the precise amount that the government had agreed to before submitting the case. It is quite evident further that there was very little if any investigation into the accounts by the Exchequer Court. There was practically no evidence whatever taken in regard to those accounts. That is quite plain from the fact that the total amount asked from this House in connection with fees and disbursements is only a little over $800. I do not pretend to be able to say from the discussion whether the amount awarded was right or was not right, but I for one am of opinion that the principle of paying what these contractors expended in good faith under such a contract is one that ought to be approved of by the House and carried out. As regards the contract itself which the hon. Minister of the Interior has attempted to defend, I think it was a very vicious one. The statement which the hon. Minister of the Interior makes in reference to Sir Charles Tupper has, so far as I am aware, been heard for the first time in this House to-night. That statement, I venture to say, would not have been made if Sir Charles Tupper had been present, but would have been contradicted by him flatly and emphatically. It is a statement that was never made when that gentleman was in this House. It is quite true, Sir Charles Tupper said at that time that it was a wise thing to build that railway, but the terms of the contract were denounced by Sir Charles Tupper, as they were by every other member on this side of the House, and as they were denounced by every man in the country who looked into them. But let us go further. It is the duty of those who assume the responsibility of government, if they meet with difficulties, to find a way out of those difficulties. But what steps did the government take when the Bill which they introduced was defeated by the Senate? Did they do what men would have done if they were in earnest—at once set to work to carry out the object which they had in view and which they said they approved of? No, they dropped that Bill and they shirked all attempts to re-enact the measure, knowing that their own followers and the country would not for one moment have endorsed the carrying out of another contract. If the condition of affairs is as humiliating to-day as the hon. Minister of the Interior says it is, what is to prevent the government bringing in a Bill for building another railway on somewhat similar terms? I do not suppose it will be denied for one moment that much more favourable terms could be obtained to-day than the terms which were then given.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We could not get as favourable terms to-day.

Mr. OSLER. You could get a contract to-day on terms so much more favourable to the government and the country that there would be no comparison between the two. If that contract at that time was worth the enormous grants of land and privileges given to Mackenzie & Mann, it is worth very much more to-day. The terms of that contract were such as outraged the sense of justice and fairness of this country and the government dropped as quickly as possible all further reference to the Yukon Bill. What have we seen this session? We have seen a contract, less in value to the extent of its being less in scope and volume, but similar in its terms, made with the private firm of Messrs. Treadgold & Barwick—a contract quite as outrageous in its terms as the Yukon contract; and what happened in regard to it? As soon as the governor of the Yukon came down here and remonstrated with the government, and advised them that there would be a revolution in the Yukon if it were carried out, the objectionable terms were cancelled immediately. Why were those terms given? They were given either without any knowledge of what was being given away, or for some purpose, because the moment the outrageous terms of the contract were brought to the attention of the government those terms were withdrawn. I say that if the railway which the action of the Senate prevented the construction of, was as important as some members of the government now assert, the government could now have that railway built on much more

favourable terms than those of the Mackenzie & Mann contract.

They have a Senate which is practically favourable to them now, and they need not fear that it will throw out their Bill. I have not been long enough in the House to make the statement with authority, but I venture to say that, if there ever has been a case, it is extremely rare, when the Senate has thrown out a Bill twice. Why did not the government re-enact the Yukon Railway Bill? Because the Bill was so vicious, because the contract was so inadvisable, and so much against the interests of the country, that they dared not re-enact it. I did not intend to discuss any subject beyond the actual policy and principle of paying this money, and would not have done so had it not been for the defence made by the hon. Minister of the Interior. As regards the payment of money to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, if the amount has been arrived at fairly, and is fairly known to be what was expended, I believe that the government should pay it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) has talked to us about the humiliating condition in which this country finds itself on account of the action of the Senate in rejecting this contract. He does not seem to understand in what a humiliating position he has placed himself and his colleagues by the statement he has just made. He says that the Canadian trade has been lost to that country and that a great many evils have befallen the Yukon on account of the action of the Senate in throwing out this Bill. I asked him, how much it would take to build the railway, and he did not know. What was there to prevent the government from building the railway itself that same year if it had desired?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It would have cost a great deal of money.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They were deterred by the expense. They were willing to place this country in the humiliating position in which he says it is, because they were afraid of spending the money. Well, I have no doubt that it would have been a great deal cheaper for us to have built that road ourselves than to have had it built by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, under the proposed contract. But whether the sum required to build it as a government road be great or small, this government had the responsibility cast upon it of dealing with the matter; and if the facts are as the hon. the Minister of the Interior has stated them, this government has failed in its duty in not having brought down an appropriation for that purpose. These hon. gentlemen are on the horn of a dilemma. Enther we are not to trust the statement of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, or if we do, this government has been recreant in its duty in not having provided for the building of that railway by a public grant and appropriation and in not having done the work itself if necessary. I would like to know how the hon. gentleman is going to get out of the difficulty. The government did not seem to want a railway into the country. I recollect myself that when a company asked for a charter, the government laid down the policy distinctly, in rejecting the measure proposed, which did not call for the expenditure of a dollar of public money, that while they were considering the whole subject they would not give any charter to parties to build a railway, and they had that charter voted down. They adopted that policy because they said they were considering the subject. They took a whole year to consider it. Why did they not come down the next year with a proposition to build a railway if its construction was of so much importance? Why did they allow four years to pass and a condition of things continue to exist such as has been described by the hon. Minister of the Interior to-night? The hon. gentleman, instead of placing in a humiliating position hon. gentlemen on this side, who have no power to deal with the subject, has placed himself and his colleagues in a most humiliating and extradordinary position by the statement he has just made.

I agree with my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) that, so far as this claim is concerned, it ought to be paid. It is the government we are censuring for their conduct in connection with this contract, and we are not objecting to the payment of the claim of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann.

There is another thing I would like to say to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and it is this, that when Sir Charles Tupper was face to face with him in this House in 1898, when this matter was discussed for a month, and when Sir Charles Tupper was face to face with him in the session of 1898, and in the session of 1900, it is most remarkable that the hon. Minister did not take occasion, in any one of these sessions, to make the statement he has seen fit to make to-night about Sir Charles Tupper going to his house. These hon. gentlemen are very sensitive sometimes about statements concerning people who are absent. This matter was discussed, as the hon. gentleman has said, in wearisome detail in 1898, and I heard no such statement from him then as that which he has seen fit to make to-night. He has waited until Sir Charles Tupper was absent, to charge him with dishonour, to cast imputations on him, but he never saw fit to make any such charge when Sir Charles Tupper was present to defend himself.

There is just one more circumstance I would like to mention. The hon. gentleman said that the Conservative party threw out that measure in the Senate. Well, if all rumours be true—and we heard a good many on the subject at the time—there

were a great many Liberal members here, who voted for that measure, under the stress of party discipline, who were as much opposed to it as gentlemen on this side. And if we are to believe what is told us by gentlemen in the Upper Chamber, some of those members exercised influence on the senators to have the measure thrown out, because although they felt compelled to support the government in this House, they felt that the passage of the measure was not in the true interests of the country.

It is not worth while for me at this day to go into a great many of the matters dealt with by the hon. Minister of the Interior, for the purpose of making party capital. So far as I am concerned, I think that these men should be paid, but at the same time I think that the government are to be censured for having entered into this contract in the way they did, and for not having waited until parliament could pass upon this measure before committing the country to the expenditure we are now called on to vote and pay over to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann.

The PRIME MINISTER. I have just a word to say in reply to some observations made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Osler). I do not know how my hon. friends on the other side can entertain the opinion, and repeat it in this House that the account which parliament is called on to pay is one which had been settled between Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann and the Department of Railways. Nothing of the kind has ever taken place, and such an assertion is purely imaginative.

Mr. BELL. Was there a report made to the government or the Railway Department by the officers of the department who investigated the accounts ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Here are the accounts themselves, presented by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and which have been audited again and again by the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals, and audited with great care.

Mr. BELL. What is the amount of the account ?

The PRIME MINISTER. About 302,000.

Mr. BELL. Practically the same amount as the award.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not know what mysterious feature there can be in the fact that the accounts, which were audited by the officers of the Department of Railways and Canals, were found to be accurate, or about as accurate, by the official auditor. The claim was handed in by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to the government. It was audited again and again by the officers of the Railway Department. Items were eliminated, all the profits claimed by Mackenzie & Mann were eliminated, and after it had been audited, by the officers of the department, a judicial audit was ordered by the government. The judicial auditor went through it no doubt with great care, and I am surprised that any doubt should be passed on the auditor, Mr. Justice Burbidge, and that he should be supposed not to have done his work with accuracy.

Mr. BELL. The hon. Minister of the Interior has just stated that the judicial auditor sat upon the reference, and that the reference was the papers audited by the officials of the department.

The PRIME MINISTER. Does my hon. friend find fault with that ?

Mr. BELL. The auditor simply dealt with those figures.

The PRIME MINISTER. If the judicial auditor was satisfied, if he had sufficient evidence in the record to dispense him from calling for other evidence, will my hon. friend insinuate that Mr. Justice Burbidge had not acted properly ?

Mr. BELL. No.

The PRIME MINISTER. My hon. friend says that because Mr. Justice Burbidge did not seek other extraneous evidence, therefore some doubt must be cast on his audit. I do not know what evidence he should have sought. I am content with believing that since Mr. Justice Burbidge has reported that a certain sum was due, he must have found evidence in the record to justify such a conclusion.

Mr. BELL. The right hon. gentleman said, in the course of his speech, that the judge of the Exchequer Court acted simply as an auditor.

The PRIME MINISTER. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. Therefore he dealt with no other documents than those presented here. Was there any interest included in the award ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BELL. If you add a reasonable amount of interest to the $300,000 you will come pretty close to his award.

The PRIME MINISTER. What fault does the hon. gentleman find, then, if Mr. Justice Burbidge finds that the claim presented to him was correct in amount that he should say so ? If he found that the amount claimed was the amount due, what fault does the hon. gentleman find that he should so declare it ? Why, he could not do anything else. And I presume that the character of Mr. Justice Burbidge will satisfy every hon. member that the work was

properly done; and, since he has reported that the claim is correct in amount, every hon. member of this House ought to be satisfied so far as that is concerned. Now, I come to the statement of the leader of the opposition a moment ago. He found fault with the government for refusing to allow the passage of another charter for a railway to communicate with the Yukon. So we did. But why? Because this charter if we had granted it would have been the means of establishing communication with the Yukon through American waters, and we should have no relief, so far as having a national railway is concerned, from the position of having to communicate with the Yukon through American territory. The reason was that we would not again complicate the settlement of the boundary question which we have enough difficulty in settling already. The hon. gentleman says also that we did not bring in a new measure for a railway after this one had been defeated. Sir, there was all the difference in the world between building a railway to that part of the country in 1898 and building it afterwards. When we asked parliament to sanction the contract which we had made with Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann for the building of a railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake, there was no railway between Calgary and Lake Bennett. It is a matter of fact, unfortunately, that the best line of railway to communicate with the Yukon country is by way of Skagway. That is the shortest line. Before 1898, contractors could have been induced to put money into the enterprise, because there was no rival to compete with them. But after a shorter railway to the Yukon has been built, as it was in the summer of 1898, everybody realizes that to build and run a line of railway from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake would involve a very much larger expense. My hon. friend said that the terms we offered to Mackenzie & Mann were extravagant. On the contrary, I venture to say we might offer the same terms to-day, and there is not a firm of contractors who would accept them and build the road. In 1898, we were told on the floor of this House that we were giving to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann an enormous area of gold-bearing territory. The fact is that over that whole space of country not a single discovery of gold has been made ever since, outside of Klondyke Creek, except that last winter there was a discovery on Stewart river. But in the parts where we gave Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann the option to locate their claims, not a single discovery has been made. And I venture to repeat what I have just said, that no firm of contractors would to-day accept the contract on the same terms as those given Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. Had the contract gone through at that time they would have had a monopoly, whereas now they would have to compete with the American railway which has a monopoly. These are the reasons which have prevented us up to this time from asking parliament to sanction the building of that railway. I venture to say that we may have to propose a project of that kind at a future time. We cannot remain very long as we are, dependent as we are upon the good-will of the American people to give us access to our own country. The position is not only humiliating, but, as stated by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, it is dangerous and dangerous in the extreme. Why, last year, we were told that there was a conspiracy about Skagway on the part of some American desperadoes to 'rush' the country and take possession of it. There was such a conspiracy. It did not amount to much, I am glad to say. But, with the character of the population there we do not know when attempts may be made to 'rush' the country and take possession of it. And we are absolutely helpless. If we are to send men to that section, as was stated by the Minister of the Interior, we have to send them as civilians, they cannot go through as a military force. We have almost to smuggle them into the country. This is a most alarming position, and one which we must ask parliament to remedy. And when that proposal comes before parliament, then parliament will realize what an egregious mistake they made in 1898.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. leader of the opposition was exercised by two things. The first was that I should put myself in such a humiliating position as to say that the country is suffering from the lack of a railway, and yet that the government should not bring down a Bill to construct that railway. I venture to say to my hon. friend that if he should have the good fortune to sit upon this side of the House, he will find that there will be a great many things that would be of service to the country and for the want of which the country might be said to be suffering, and yet he will not be able to bring down an appropriation to parliament to furnish them. That is the position we are in with respect to many things in the Dominion of Canada. We know that the Dominion of Canada is suffering to a very considerable extent by reason of the fact that there is not an all-Canadian railway to the Yukon district. Yet, we are not prepared to take the responsibility of recommending to parliament a sufficient appropriation for the construction of that railway. That is a very plain and reasonable and intelligible position, and I am quite unable to agree with my hon. friend that, in any respect whatever, the statement of that position places me or any member of this government in a humiliating position. My hon. friend is further exercised by the fact, as he believes it to be, that I would not have made the statement with regard to Sir Charles Tupper calling upon me or saying

what he did to me upon this matter, if Sir Charles Tupper had been here. I did not hear what my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) said, being unfortunately, unable to hear him very well when he addresses the House, but an hon. friend beside me tells me that the hon. member for West Toronto took the same view as his leader upon this subject. My hon. friends are forgetful in this debate of many circumstances, and they are particularly forgetful of the debate which took place on this very question. Members of the House will remember what I said to Sir Charles Tupper who then led the opposition, when he made his famous somersault upon this question and, at the dictation of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Maclean), allowed himself to be compelled to swallow his own words and to do what was directly contrary to his own judgment, because the hon. member for East York and those who were with him thought they could gain a small party advantage over this government by that course. It is not necessary that I should have Sir Charles Tupper here to refer to a fact which he has admitted himself. If the hon. leader of the opposition will take 'Hansard' of 1898, and refer to the report of my remarks when the subject of this Yukon Railway Bill was under debate, he will find in the first place, that I called attention to the fact that Sir Charles Tupper had taken this somersault on this question and I said he had done it not in accordance with his own judgment, but because he had been dragooned into taking it by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. Then I went on to quote an interview with Sir Charles Tupper himself in the 'Mail and Empire' newspaper, and hon. gentlemen will find it on page 572 of the 'Hansard' of 1898. I said:

> The authenticity of this interview is vouched for by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Maclean), the gentleman who, in the Conservative party, fills the role of private detective and regulator of the party leader.

I do not know whether he fills that position in regard to my hon. friend who leads the opposition at present.

> It appears that Sir Charles Tupper was asked by the correspondent of the 'Mail and Empire' to state his views regarding the arrangements the government had made. This is what he said:
>
> He stated that the route chosen is the best that could have been selected. 'When I was in the west,' he said, 'I made inquiries, and I reached the conclusion that Canada ought at the earliest possible moment to have communication with the Yukon. I impressed it upon the British Columbia government that it should co-operate with the Dominion government to secure the construction of a link between the Stikine river and Teslin lake. At Winnipeg I declared that the undertaking was a necessity, and when I returned to Ottawa I went immediately to Mr. Sifton. I impressed upon him the absolute necessity of opening up the route to secure Canadian trade.

Hon. Mr. SIFTON.

Mr. MACLEAN. There is an imputation throughout this debate that the Senate of Canada did a wrong thing in throwing out that Bill. Sir, if the Senate of Canada ever justified its existence it did so in throwing out that Bill. Hon. gentlemen have an idea and they are always formulating it, that because they control the majority of this chamber therefore what they say ought to go in parliament. But the parliament of Canada is made up of this chamber associated with the other chamber, having equal authority, and associated with it also is the Governor General. What rules in this country is, not a brute majority of one party in this House, but it is ultimately public opinion that rules; and the public opinion of this country on that occasion was voiced by the Senate who threw out that infamous proposition.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Where was public opinion in 1900?

Mr. MACLEAN. Where will public opinion be on the 29th of the present month, in the province of Ontario? But the Minister of the Interior, who has just left his seat, has never got over the soreness he felt because his pet project was thrown out of this parliament and was condemned by public opinion. He could not get public opinion to endorse it to-day, and therefore he cannot bring it in. It still remains a sore point with him that in some way the Conservative party, through its leader, was committed to that proposition, and because he didn't get the support he expected, he could not put it through. The government of this country has come to this, that they cannot bring forward any measure without its being in some way endorsed by the Conservative party before hand. If they want to undertake any great railway project they first try to get the endorsation of the opposition, and then they bring it forward. Now, that has come to an end. The government, or at least certain members of it, have a great proposition in connection with the Georgian Bay ship canal, and in an insidious way a petition was circulated on this side of the House, and they tried to dragoon this side of the House first to give support to the proposition. Now, we are not here to do business in that way. I resent the doctrine that is laid down here to-night, and a great cry is made over it, and we hear a lamentation made before the country that the project fell through because they could not count on the support of the leader of the opposition. All that must end. The government must come forward with their proposition supported by themselves, and they must assume responsibility for it. We hear to-night that their scheme failed because it was not supported by the opposition. Sir, their scheme failed because it was a bad one; their scheme failed because it meant the giving of an enormous

amount of territory to a private company who proposed then and there to exploit the London market with a $16,000,000 or a $20,000,000 proposition ; and if that agreement had been sanctioned and had been exploited on the London market—and it had actually been underwritten—there would have been the greatest Yukon scandal the world had ever heard of. The country would have been disgraced. We never would have got a railway, or if we had, it would have been a railway at the mercy of the Americans, just as hon. gentlemen have said that the present scheme puts us at their mercy. If there was an all-Canadian route independent of American territory, hon. gentlemen never had the courage to bring it forward, because they knew it involved too large an expenditure. I say to-night in face of the whole country that if the Senate of Canada ever gave a reason for its existence, it did on that occasion. There are times when public opinion can only find its expression and its outlet through the Senate, and it did find its outlet there on that particular occasion.

Mr. SPROULE. I consider this question as one of the most important that ever came before this parliament. It is important because it involves a radical departure from the well understood principle of constitutional government, the principle that the executive are responsible to parliament and parliament is responsible to the people. In this particular case the executive incurred a very large and unwise expenditure before parliament was consulted, and within a few days of the meeting of parliament. The reason given for their justification is that of urgency. The contract was entered into nine days before parliament met because, as they said, the case was an extremely urgent one. What has taken place since then to justify the plea of urgency) Have we seen any of those direful results taking place that we were told would take place if this contract was not sanctioned ? Not by any means. We were told that it was necessary to build this railway immediately because we could not get our soldiers in there, and there was danger of an insurrection. Have there been any signs of an insurrection ? Have not the North-west Mounted Police been able to make life and property just as safe there as in any other part of the Dominion ?

There is no evidence to indicate that there is the slightest trouble, but there is evidence to show that peace and harmony prevail there and that the authority of the Canadian parliament has been maintained the same as it has been maintained in all the other provinces of this Dominion. Therefore, I say, that the argument advanced on that ground has no force. In the next place, it was said that we would lose the trade of that country and that the trade would go entirely to the United States. I would remind hon. gentlemen that one of their own friends made a statement inside of the last year in regard to the trade of that country, if my memory is correct, in the city of Toronto before a commercial audience, which was something to the effect that of the trade of the Yukon to-day, about 60 per cent is done by Canadians, that the goods which are supplied to the people of that country are Canadian and English to that extent, and not American. Therefore, so far as that argument is concerned, there is nothing in it. It has not been verified. These predictions have not been verified, these forecasts have not come true and these prophesies have been unfulfilled. The next thing was that the people were crowding in there in such large numbers that they would likely die of hunger and starvation, because provisions could not be got into that country. How many people have died of starvation on account of not being able to get provisions into the country ? We have never heard of any difficulty in that regard. After the charter was thrown out by the Senate, people went about their ordinary avocations just as they had done before. They had plenty of provisions, there was no sign of starvation and they continued in the enjoyment of the luxuries of life. This was one of the strong reasons urged why it was desirable that parliament should pass that Bill. As none of these forebodings or prophesies have been verified, and as none of them are likely to be verified, we are justified in saying that when parliament threw that Bill out at that time parliament did right. But, the government are doing a very improper thing, and for another reason. What is it ? I say that they are violating one of the well understood principles of constitutional government in entering into specific contracts, giving orders to go on with these works, and incurring expenditures which undoubtedly the country will be called upon to pay without parliamentary assent having first been sustained. I do not blame the contractors for asking for an indemnification for what they have lost. The government were instructing, either by implication or direct authority and advice, these contractors to go on and make heavy expenditures and in doing so they knew that parliament would be called upon to indemnify them in the event of the contract not being ratified by parliament. It was not ratified, and we find this condition of things that we have here to-day. Our constitution never contemplated it, it never authorized it, it is contrary to free parliamentary government, and it confers no right upon a minister to do what the hon. Minister of the Interior did at that time. Therefore, these hon. gentlemen are violating a well understood principle of constitutional government, which above all things ought to be sacred, not only in Canada, but in every other colony in the British Empire. But, they are doing more; they are establish-

ing a very bad precedent, a precedent that no doubt will be taken advantage of in the future by designing parties who wish to get claims before the government, by parties who desire to make money and who can find a government weak or servile enough to co-operate with them in entering into a bargain—I will not say that it would be a collusive bargain, but a bargain which they know parliament will not ratify, because, when they see proceedings of this kind taking place, and a precedent of this kind established, they will know that they would be justified in coming before parliament and asking to be indemnified, not only for every dollar they have put into the undertaking, but for the interest on their money, and for the costs which they have paid to the lawyers who have conducted the case for them. Such a precedent is bad on the face of it in Canada or in any part of the British Empire. Yet, we have lived to see the day when the Reform party, the party which above all others have always professed a desire to live up to the well known principles of free constitutional government, will depart from the principles in a most radical way, at the same time establishing a very bad precedent in the country. We are adopting a very bad precedent, a precedent that may work any amount of trouble and injury to the country in the future. To-day, we are asked to go it blind in this matter as to the amount of money to be voted. Hon. gentlemen have said that this question has been submitted to the Exchequer Court, but what information has been given to the House as to the question that was submitted to the Exchequer Court? If it were the sale of a dog, involving a transaction of $2, as much trouble would have been taken to see that the transaction was a fair one as has been taken in regard to this transaction involving $328,000. They submitted the accounts to the Exchequer Court that were received from Mackenzie and Mann, they were looked over by an officer of the Department of Railways and Canals, who was instructed, no doubt, to prepare a report on them which would be submitted to the House, and which would be of such a favourable character as to justify whatever action the government took upon the claim, but they gave no opportunity for the opposition to analyse it in such a way as to determine whether we are justified in voting this amount or not. In looking over the accounts carefully, I came to the conclusion that the government have taken no more interest in this account than they would in a transaction involving an expenditure of $100. They submitted the question to the Exchequer Court, and the judge was to report his judgment, but the court was not asked to determine the legal standing of the parties, or how far this country was liable or responsible for this transaction, how far the country was called upon to indemnify the contractors for the loss they had sustained. That question was not submitted to the Exchequer Court or to any other court in the country. No effort was made to appeal from the decision of that court to a higher tribunal. The government claim that they have taken the ordinary course, but if this had been an ordinary contract, if advertisements had been published and an invitation had been given to contractors to submit tenders, and the contractor who had secured the work had a claim of $200 or $300, or $3,000 for work done under his contract, the government would have submitted the claim to the Exchequer Court, and if an adverse decision had been rendered by the Exchequer Court they would have appealed it to a higher court. Did they do so in this case? No, they accepted the judgment in silence, and they paid no more attention to the matter than if it had been a claim involving $100 or $200. They did not take it to an independent tribunal with the view of determining the legal rights of the contractors who were applying for this large amount of money, or the legal liability of the country to pay it. They simply submitted the claim to this House and asked this House to ratify it. Then, there is something behind all this yet that seems to be of a very important character. When the Bill was before this House, and when it was considered and forced through the House by the majority that the right hon. leader of the government and his friends have at their backs, and it went to the Upper House, and after being carefully looked into, that house decided that the bargain was a very bad one, they decided that the reasons given as a justification for the passing of that Bill were not good, they decided that it was an attempt to exploit the domain of the state unwisely and imprudently, and they decided that a young Napoleon had floated one of his transactions on the country that would not bear the light of day, and the result was that they threw the Bill out. But, now, we are asked to vote the sum of $328,000 to indemnify these contractors. What say have the Senate whether that shall pass or not? They were the portion of this parliament which prevented the Bill from passing; they threw it out.

The Senate has no say as to whether this item shall pass or not, because if they reject it they could only do so by rejecting the whole Supply Bill, which they would not do, and so this procedure on the part of the government has wrested from the Upper Chamber the power to pass judgment upon this matter. I do not blame the company for preferring this claim against the government, but I blame the government for giving them instructions to go on with expenditure under that contract. And although the government have hedged very adroitly upon that question I have no doubt in my mind that they gave instructions to

Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to go on with the work. Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann are too astute to be guilty of the blunder of spending even $100, if they had not a well understood agreement with the government that they would be indemnified if the contract was not ratified by parliament. I oppose this because it is in violation of the well understood principle that no expenditure should be incurred without the assent of parliament. In a matter of extreme urgency the government has power to raise money by Governor's General warrant, but in this case they did not dare resort to that expedient. We are told by the Minister of the Interior that we appealed to the electorate of Canada in 1900 on this question and that as a result we are in opposition. What was the result in the minister's own province? Were it not for the most bare faced corruption he would have come back here with but a single supporter from Manitoba. What was the result in the great province of Ontario that will be called upon to pay the largest share of this? The result was a majority of 16 or 18 members against the government, a clear and distinct condemnation of their action and policy. The Minister of the Interior tells us that he cheerfully accepts the responsibility for this action, and he intimates that the majority behind him will carry him through. Well, majorities have done many improper things in the past, and I have no doubt they will repeat it to-night. It is not the first time that the Minister of the Interior has done an improper thing and trusted to—I was going to say his servile majority—to carry him through. He is called the young Napoleon because he was willing to exploit anything which in the judgment of wise people would be regarded as unconstitutional and improper, and he does that because he depends upon his majority. We know that after the election of 1896 he illegally incurred the expenditure of public money in violation of all constitutional principles. He ordered an inquiry at the cost of the public treasury for which he had no legal authority under heaven. He did it because he depended on his majority, and therefore his statement that he accepts responsibility does not mean that his action was either constitutional or proper. He tells us that in this matter he endeavoured to protect the treasury, when as a matter of fact it is an act of piracy perpetrated upon the treasury. Why, the men who above all others should protect the treasury are the men who are burglarizing the treasury through their contractors in this scheme. There is nothing to show whether these accounts are correct or not. There is nothing except the statement of the contractors who ask that they shall be paid out of the treasury their claim and their costs and everything else.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman make that statement ofter having read the report of the auditor of the department. Does not the hon. gentleman know that the cheques, the accounts and all these documents were carefully looked into by the auditor and passed by him showing the actual outlay of cash made by these people.

Mr. SPROULE. What auditor?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The auditor of the Railway Department.

Mr. SPROULE. Ask my brother if I am a rogue.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPROULE. That is about the principle involved. The Minister of Railways knows as well as I know, that he has not a public servant under him that he cannot get to make an account to suit him.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. That is very complimentary to the service.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me be well understood. I do not mean to say by any means that he would falsify an account, but I say he would go there knowing that the minister desired to have these accounts passed.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He could not know anything of the kind.

Mr. SPROULE. Would he raise the objections he would raise if it was his own money he was handling?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has no right to say that Mr. Shannon knew the minister wanted to have these accounts passed. The minister wanted nothing of the kind. The minister wanted a proper audit made of them. The minister had no communication with Mr. Shannon at all. The instructions went to the Deputy Minister and by him were communicated to Mr. Shannon requiring him to make a careful audit of every one of the items of that account.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, and the auditor knew well that his superior was committed to the payment of them. He knew that his government had made that unwise contract. He knew that his government had given such information to the contractors as justified their spending money with the implied understanding that it would be repaid. His auditor knew that very well. Therefore knowing that the government and his minister had that dilemma confronting them, would he be likely to do otherwise than try to get them out of it in the best way. I say he would not. Had that audi-

tor an opportunity to analyse these accounts ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How could he analyse them ? Could he go to every part of the country and see whether the expenditure alleged to have been made had been made, or whether the materials alleged to have been sold at the market price had been sold at that price or squandered ? How could he go into these questions sitting in his office in the western block ? The country would laugh at such a suggestion. There is not a business man in the country who would say that was a proper audit in any private transaction. He would go through a dozen courts before he would pay such accounts.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Let the hon. member ask the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals whether he believes that Mr. Shannon, who was in the department in his time, and whom he knows very well, is the stripe of man the hon. gentleman represents him to be.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not talking about the stripe of man he is at all. I assume that the work was done in every particular as it would be if the stripe of man was the highest possible in honour and integrity ; but he had not before him the available means of examining into these accounts, sitting there in his office.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He did not sit in his office. He went to the Yukon, the very place where the work was done and where the goods were got. He had all the money and all the time that was necessary to enable him to make a thorough audit.

Mr. SPROULE. How long was he at it ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He was at it long enough to enable him to say that the report made was an accurate report from a close personal inquiry into all the items of the accounts.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister knows how long he was at it; why does he not say how long ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. SPROULE. I have nothing to take back at all, but something more to say. What had that auditor to do ? Place before me a thousand accounts, and I examine them. I see vouchers of payments that were made, and I put one beside the other and I pass them as all right. I do not know whether the accounts were cooked beforehand or whether two prices were paid. I do not know unless I take some means of ascertaining in order to satisfy myself. The hon. Minister of Railways says that the auditor went to the North-west. Yes, he went to the North-west and he examined certain accounts. Where did he examine them ? Did he bring before him the parties who were paid ? I say he was in the dark; and while I have no doubt he attempted to do his duty faithfully, it was utterly impossible for him, with the time at his disposal and in the way he did the work, to safeguard the interest of the country as a man would safeguard his own private pocket. We have endeavoured to protect the government, says the Minister of the Interior. Yes, we have endeavoured to protect the government—how ? By endeavouring to satisfy our friends that they ought to support us. What protection have they given the government ? They allowed the contractors to go on and operate under an unconstitutional contract. How have they endeavoured to protect the government? Only by keeping the majority behind them to vote them out of this dilemma. They have endeavoured to hide their tracks as much as possible, by keeping from the House the information it ought to have. When were these papers laid on the Table ? Only last week. We have not one-tenth of the information to-day that we ought to have. Where is the correspondence that passed between the government and the contractors and the correspondence that passed between the contractors and the parties who furnished the supplies ? Where is the information to show that those supplies were sold at the prices at which they are said to have been sold at ? How do we know that they were sold at those prices, or at lower prices? We have not this information, and in the absence of this information it is impossible for us to do our duty. The Minister of Railways says that we need a railway in that country very badly, and but for the action of the Senate in throwing out that Bill we would have it. I ask the Minister of the Interior and the Minister of Railways why they stood in the breach for four years and refused to allow any other company to build a railway into that country if we need one so badly ? We have had two Bills before the Railway Committee, one of which I remember distinctly. The company asked to be allowed to go on and build the railway without an acre of land or a dollar of subsidy, and they offered to deposit $50,000 as a guarantee that they would begin the work within six months.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Where was that railway ?

Mr. SPROULE. They offered to build into the country from Pyramid harbour and ultimately to extend the railway to British Columbia; but the government refused to accept that deposit and give them a charter; and they have refused not only that company, but other companies as well which have declared their desire and willingness to build a railway there without asking an acre of land or a dollar of subsidy from the government.

Mr. SCOTT. Was that to be an all-Canadian road ?

Mr. SPROULE. At first it was not; but ultimately it was to be. Was the road which was proposed to be built from Telegraph Creek to Teslin Lake to be an all-Canadian road ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Not a bit of it. One end was to be in the United States, and you would have been obliged to make use of the navigation which would put you just as much under the power of the United States as if you went over a railway built in the United States territory; and it would not answer the purpose which the Minister of the Interior declared they had in building that railway. These hon. gentlemen have given no evidence that they want a railway into that country, or they would make an effort to get it. They have had companies knocking at the doors of parliament for permission to build a railway there, but they would not give permission. I have often thought they held it back for the purpose of using as an argument against the Senate the action of the Senate in throwing out that Bill. The Minister of the Interior will have to convince us in a different way that the government desire to have a railway built in that country. He went on to tell us of the wonderful bargain they had made, and the advantages they were to get from it. By that contract they were giving away all the gold land in the country. I heard an Englishman say in the Brunswick hotel at the time that Bill was before the House: 'If Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann make over to me by power of attorney the right to handle that scheme in the British market, I will make a fortune for myself and bring them back $40,000,000 of hard cash.'

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Did you believe it ?

Mr. SPROULE. I did, because I knew the man to stand high in the financial world.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the hon. gentleman think the land was worth $40,000,000 ?

Mr. SPROULE. I can answer the hon. gentleman by telling him that the government would not sell the land for less than $10 an acre. That is the price they asked from the poor miner.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nobody ever asked $10 an acre.

Mr. SPROULE. Why did the government hold the land at $10 an acre and refuse to sell for less ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. They did not.

Mr. SPROULE. They did not offer to sell it at less.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Nobody wants to buy it.

Mr. SPROULE. Why then make such a regulation ? Why not have said that you would sell it at a dollar an acre. I am justified in taking the valuation which the government themselves put on the land, and what does that valuation amount to for the building of the railway. I think it is $37,500,000.

Mr. SCOTT. I will stake my word to this fact that the government could not sell that land in any bulk for fifty cents an acre.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hon. gentleman a miner ? Has he been out there in the mining business ? Or, is he simply a newspaper editor in Regina. What does he know about it ? He knows no more than I do. What does the government know about it ? What does the Minister of the Interior know about it ? Why did the hon. Minister of the Interior recommend to Council the land should be valued at $10 an acre if it was not worth half a dollar an acre ? On what authority did he make that recommendation ? What, the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Scott) says to-day is the strongest condemnation of the Minister of the Interior and the government. They have not offered for sale or sold a single acre of mineral land in that country since that time at less than $10 an acre. I am therefore justified in taking their own valuation as the consideration they were giving that company. What were they charging the poor man for a royalty ? Ten per cent on the gold he took out, no matter how poor he might have been or how unable to pay it. And all they were charging this wealthy company was one per cent royalty. Taking all these things into consideration, we would be doing less than our duty if we did not raise our voices in the strongest protest against this transaction. It is a violation of the principles of constitutional government. It establishes a bad precedent, and for my part I enter my protest against it in the strongest possible language I can use.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am sorry that the right hon. leader of the government is out, because I wished to refer again to a statement I made as to an arrangement having been come to between the Department of Railways and Canals and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann regarding the amount of the latter's claim, which statement my right hon. friend contradicted. I thought I remembered that I had seen in the papers laid on the Table some time ago some correspondence between Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann and the department regarding their claim. It seemed strange that the final claim of these gentlemen should amount to $302,-239.69 and that the amount recommended by the Railway Department is exactly the same. Mr. Shannon of the Railway De-

partment went over the accounts and found that that was the correct sum due them. There is another thing which appears in the correspondence, and of which we have not heard before. These parties were entitled to the money they had expended on the road with interest. That was the understanding. That was the interpretation of the submission as given to us, but when I look into the account, as arranged between the department and Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, I find that they are allowed, in addition to the money they actually expended, nearly $60,000, or fifteen per cent on the amount they expended on the road. We never heard of that before from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals nor have we heard it from the right hon. the First Minister. I remembered seeing in the papers some correspondence between the department and Mackenzie & Mann regarding the amount due the latter. And perhaps I had better read the correspondence so as to put it upon record and in order that there may be no doubt about it in the future :—

TORONTO, July 18, 1899.

Leonard Shannon, Esq.,
Accountant of the Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Re our account and claim for disbursements in connection with the Canadian Yukon railway matter. I beg to advise you that the claim against us of the Alberta Railway Company, amounting to $105,000, as set out and included in our account to you has been settled for the sum of $11,000. Our solicitor's fee and disbursements in connection with defence of suit and settlement of the claimants to $750 more, making a total of $11,750. Will you, therefore, kindly note that this settlement adjusts the whole account as follows :

Amount rendered you.. ..		$493,735 22
Deduct the Alberta Railway Company's claim including Edmonton above.	$105,000 00	
Also 15 per cent on the above..	15,750 00	120,750 00
Total..		$373,035 22

The House will see therefore that in this claim for $493,735 there is included fifteen per cent, because when the $105,000 was deducted there was also deducted fifteen per cent on that amount, or an additional $15,750.

Add—

Settlement with Alberta Railway Company	$11,750 00	
Also 15 per cent on above..	1,762 50	$13,512 50
		$386,547 22

Then there is a further letter :—

New rails and fastenings at Vancouver purchased for the Canadian Yukon contract.

We beg to advise you that we have disposed of these rails and fastenings for the sum of $83,270.43, less cost of checking out and superintending transfer at Vancouver, $150, leaving $83,720.43, which sum we have credited on the account rendered you as follows :

Balance of account advised you in our letter of 18th inst..	$386,547 72
Present credit..	83,720 43
Balance due	$302,827 29

Just the amount the department found was due, just the amount given by Mr. Justice Burbidge in favour of Mackenzie & Mann, and that includes $58,000, or 15 per cent advance upon the claim against the government, besides the interest which was awarded by the Exchequer Court. And I would ask hon. gentlemen to give me reference to the statute under which they referred the question to the Exchequer Court. Nobody seems to be able to answer this. But it is a very important question. We do not want the country to believe that a judgment was rendered by the Exchequer Court to pay this amount to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, because, as I said before, this contract had a saving clause under which the contractors knew they could not oblige the government to carry out the contract unless they had the authority of parliament to enter into it. The contract was with that condition, a condition sine qua non, that it should be approved by parliament. It was submitted to parliament, and, rightly or wrongly, parliament refused to approve it. Therefore, the condition under which these gentlemen entered into the contract never arose, and they had no binding legal claim, as was admitted by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. The only claim they had against the country and against the government, was an equitable claim which they could not enforce in law. That is the reason why I asked whether this was a judgment or whether it was an order, or what it was. It becomes evident now that the only thing that the government did was to refer the question to the judge of the Exchequer Court as a persona designata as to whether the account could be audited in a proper manner and was a proper account to be paid, supposing the government were bound in law to pay it. Moreover, the first thing the government did before submitting this to the judge of the Exchequer Court was to acknowledge its liability that this amount should be paid by the Dominion. Therefore, I object, and I say that the resolution should be amended. This resolution, if I may use the word, bears upon its face a falsehood. For, if there was no judgment, it is not a true representation of the facts to say that there was a judgment of the Exchequer Court. There has simply been a report made by Mr. Burbidge, it may be, by any other person, but not by a court. Therefore, I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this resolution proposed to us bears upon its face a falsehood when it says 'to pay amount of judgment of Exchequer Court to Messrs. Mackenzie

& Mann.' Why, the Committee cannot pass that resolution; the Committee cannot say that there was a judgment when it was admitted on all sides that there was no judgment and that there could be no judgment. I am in the judgment of hon. members who are of the legal profession when I say that no judgment of this kind could be rendered against the government in connection with this contract. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said himself, and nobody can deny it, that these gentlemen have no legal case against the government. At all events, this resolution must be amended so as not to make it appear that there was a judgment. Otherwise, what would happen? When hon. gentlemen opposite go upon the hustings to defend their policy in connection with this item, they will say: We were condemned by the judgment of the Exchequer Court to pay the amount. We had no discretion, for if we had not paid it, execution might be issued against us or other means taken to compel the government of the Dominion to pay the amount. But that is not a valid excuse; and it cannot appear in the resolution that there was a judgment when there was no judgment. If the resolution passes, as I think it will, it will have to be amended so as to read otherwise than as a declaration that there was a judgment of the Exchequer Court, when, by the admission of all the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, there was no judgment either by Judge Burbidge, sitting as a judge, or by the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) is to be congratulated upon making a remarkable discovery at this late period of the debate. He has read the item which goes to show that there was, in point of fact, a recognition of this claim and an acknowledgment that it had to be paid. My hon. friend tries to draw a very large conclusion from very limited premises. There is not a word in this paper that will justify any man of business, any man who has experience in affairs, in making any such statement as he has made. The claim was handed to the government by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, and by the government referred to the Department of Railways and Canals for audit. The department was not asked to say whether the claim ought to be paid or whether any item of it ought to be paid.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But they objected to some items.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. All the department were asked to do was to ascertain whether or not the items which went to show large disbursements for the purposes stated, had been made by Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann in connection with this business. The question was, whether the disbursements which these gentlemen claimed to have made for supplies, for freight, and other proper charges in connection with their preparations for the construction of this railway had, as a matter of fact, been made. Now, how would you go to work to ascertain that, preliminary to a decision as to whether or not you are going to pay it or pay any part of it? Mark you, the government had not declared, it had not come to any decision, as to what would be paid, whether the whole or any portion of the claim. The government simply felt, as several hon. gentlemen on the other side have said they would feel under like circumstances, that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, having been induced by the government to enter into this contract, ought not to be left to pay the loss which has resulted to them from their endeavour to carry it out. Now, the auditor, taking up the claim item by item, examined it. What are these items? They are for material of all kinds, for supplies for wages paid to men, for moneys paid for all the purposes which will occur to the minds of hon. gentlemen as likely to be called for in connection with this undertaking. Now, how would the auditor satisfy himself upon that point? What ought he do to satisfy himself as to the correctness of the items? One thing you will say he ought to do—he ought to go to that portion of the country wherever it was, where the supplies were which had not been used.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What was the finding of the auditor. Tell us. Don't be all night about it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman will pardon me, I will take as much time as I please, and if he does not like the fullness of the answer I give him, he will have to bear it with such patience and serenity as he can command.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman do this—will he, instead of showing at great length what the auditor ought to do, tell what he did do?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is what we want.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I am charmed with the clearness and acuteness displayed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox). It is not often that we have an opportunity of congratulating the hon. gentleman upon the clearness and lucidity with which he puts a point. But, had he been following me, he would not have felt called upon to interrupt me in doing the very thing which, with the clearness and astuteness of his intellect, he sees I ought to do.

Now I was proceeding to say that the auditor went to that country, he went to where these supplies were that had been

purchased for the use of this railway but that were not used on the railway. He makes his inventory, and he compares the inventory which Mackenzie & Mann had given in this bill with the articles themselves on the ground; and he finds that it either corresponds or does not correspond with their inventory, as the case may be. He found that it did not entirely correspond, although it did to a large extent, and where it did not correspond the items were struck out.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister tell us in what respects they did correspond and in what respects they failed to correspond?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will read for the information of the hon. gentleman the statement which the auditor himself has made:

Sir, in accordance with your instructions I have personally made an audit of the account presented by Messrs. Mackenzie, Mann & Co., in connection with the Canadian Yukon Railway, and have the honour to make the following report:

I find that the vouchers submitted for the expenditures of each month, with certain exceptions to be hereafter mentioned, represent the amounts charged in the statement and are correct as to amounts, and that the necessary details have been given to enable a proper audit to be made. In nearly every case each voucher contains not only the receipt of the parties to whom money was paid, but also the retired bank cheque, which in itself is sufficient evidence of the money having been paid out. I found the following errors which I have altered to the correct amount in the statement, namely:

Then he enumerates a number of errors.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount of the errors?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Some are small and some are large. I will read it all to the hon. gentleman, if he would like to hear it:

Voucher No. 46, March, originally charged $816.50, but one account of $61.50 has been withdrawn, making the amount not charged, $755.

Voucher No. 29, June, should be $106.80 instead of $116.30.

Voucher No. 45, June, contains items to the extent of $120.30 which are also included in voucher No. 46. I have, therefore, reduced the amount to $161.25.

Voucher No. 47, June, returned as $138.50, should be $128.50.

Voucher No. 70, July, returned as $11,642.11 should be $11,632.11.

Voucher No. 10 and 11, December, for $100 and $630 respectively, are not yet paid, so these amounts have been transfered to the list of vouchers approved by Mackenzie, Mann & Co., but unpaid.

I also found in the pay lists submitted several sums amounting to $80. Twelve representing overpayments to men, and have accordingly deducted them, but Mr. Lukes representing Messrs. Mackenzie, Mann & Co., informs me that those items should be considered inasmuch as they were caused in all cases by the store account, and other charges against the men being in excess of the amounts earned, and not due to any clerical error.

After making the aforementioned corrections, I find that the actual amount of vouchers paid and pay rolls, including interest at six per centum per annum up to January 1st last, to be the sum of $317,767.65 which together with accounts approved but not yet paid amounting to $26,800.88, makes a total of $344,568.53, and with 15 per cent added by Messrs. Mackenzie, Mann & Co., $51,685.28, and less proceeds of goods sold as per statement of credits, viz., $34,362.09, makes a grand total of $361,891.72. In connection with this I would draw attention to the 15 per cent being calculated upon the sums of interest claimed.

In addition to the above, the statement contains accounts and claims in dispute to the extent of $114,890 which with the 15 per cent added makes a total of $131,893.50.

I also beg to draw attention to the nature of the following vouchers:

He enumerates the vouchers which he thinks ought to be brought to the notice of the department.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume the minister, having gone over these figures, can tell us what was the difference made by the auditor. It was a matter of less than $100, was it not?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman is really making a desperate effort to be sarcastic.

Mr. LENNOX. Not at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS: Yes, he is making a painful effort, but he has not succeeded.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not painful to me, though it may be to my hon. friend. But can he tell us what was the total difference made by the auditor as the result of going over these accounts?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The total amount finally settled upon was $302,239. There appears to have been a claim for $510,422. There appears to have been credits which were afterwards brought in to the extent of $208,182. What the auditor did by this finding was to see that the disbursements which the company proved as having been actually made, amounted to $302,239. The very moment that the auditor came to that conclusion, Mackenzie & Mann, recognizing that the audit was fair and just, withdrew any larger claims they had, and preferred a claim for the amount which the auditor had declared to be proper, a very reasonable and proper course for these gentlemen to take. Now the hon. gentleman draws the inference that there must have been some collusion between the government and Mackenzie & Mann because the judge, when he came to examine into this matter and hear witnesses under oath, came to the conclusion that the amount which the auditor had passed upon was a proper amount to allow with the additional interest, whatever it might be. If the audit was properly made, and if the

disbursements were truly shown, and it was proper to allow interest upon the money actually paid out, and something for services given by these contractors to the work, then the claim would be that allowed by the audit, and so the judge finally decided. This matter passed into the hands of the Department of Justice, and immediately upon the auditor's report being received, the claims, papers, reports and everything else went over to the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice made a recommendation to Council as to what would be a proper mode in which finally to have this matter determined, and Council was advised by the Department of Justice that a reference should be made—not a petition of right, because a petition of right would have to be founded upon a legal basis, but this was regarded as a claim of an equitable nature, rather as an application to the grace and bounty of the Crown than as the preferment of a legal claim founded upon a legally authorized contract.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It was not a judgment at all.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. A reference was made to the judge under the Order in Council.

Mr. CASGRAIN. There cannot be a judgment except there be a suit. There was no suit, there was no petition of right and the hon. gentleman does not say there was. There was really no reference under the law as far as I can see. There was not even an award, and further the right hon. leader of the government said this afternoon that there was simply an audit of these accounts by Mr. Justice Burbidge. There was no judgment, there was no award, there was no decision.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Was there not a finding ?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, there was no finding ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) is quite correct in saying there was no judgment of the court. I am prepared here to admit that the hon. gentleman is absolutely right ; there was no judgment of the court in which that expression can be technically used. There was a reference. No one wants to have the item appear in any other form than according to the fact. This matter was referred to the judge, the judge took evidence under oath, he examined witnesses, he heard what they had to say, and he came to the conclusion that the amount was properly made up, that these disbursements had been actually made and that, under the terms of the reference, $328,000 was the proper amount to pay.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The result of what the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals says is that the reading of this resolution is not correct, and the committee cannot decide that there was a judgment when there was not. The committee cannot say that this amount is the amount of a judgment rendered by the Exchequer Court. I would suggest that these words be substituted : 'To pay the amount due under the report of Mr. Justice Burbidge to Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann.'

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. A rose by any other name would smell as sweet. I do not suppose that we need quarrel over the words. As a matter of fact the Order in Council distinctly states that this matter is to be referred to the Exchequer Court, that the judgment of the Exchequer Court is to be accepted, and the Exchequer Court does not appear to have taken any exception to the form of the reference.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sorry to differ with the hon. gentleman, but I hold in my hand the statute which shows that there can be no judgment of the Exchequer Court because the statute says :

> The head of any department in connection with the administration of which any claim arises may, instead of referring such claim to the court for adjudication thereon, refer the same to one of the official referees for examination and report, both as to the matters of fact involved and as to the amount of damages, if any, sustained.

The statement which is made is that a decision has been rendered by the court in a case which has been regularly instituted by these gentlemen, Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann, against the Crown. This is important to this extent that if this question came up for discussion on the hustings, hon. gentlemen on the other side will get up and say that as this was a judgment of the Exchequer Court we had no discretion in the matter, but we had to pay it. I appeal to hon. gentlemen opposite, whether, in view of the facts which have been stated by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and by the right hon. leader of the government, it is fair to put in this resolution that there has been a judgment of the Exchequer Court. I do not care what the reference, or what the Order in Council said. I am very much surprised to see that such an eminent lawyer as the hon. Minister of Justice should have drafted an Order in Council in the terms which have been mentioned by the hon. Minister of Finance because that would not be according to the law at all. This is a simple reference to Mr. Justice Burbidge and in this matter he is not even acting as a judge of the Exchequer Court but he is merely acting as a persona designata.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to the question of the words, we do not attach any importance to them. I do not think the great public of Canada will see as clearly as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Casgrain) does the distinction between a judgment of Mr. Justice Burbidge in the Exchequer Court and the report which Mr. Justice Burbidge

has made in this matter. The fact has not been disputed that the duty of the court was simply to pass the accounts, and I think the great public will not see the distinction between a judgment of Mr. Justice Burbidge and a report of Mr. Justice Burbidge, but, that the public will see that this is the opinion of Mr. Justice Burbidge whether you call it a judgment, or a report, or a finding.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am sure that if the hon. Minister of Finance and myself were on the hustings discussing this question, he would be astute enough to take the position that this was a judgment of the Exchequer Court. I would not have very much to say because I would not be able to deny that, if this were a judgment of the Exchequer Court the government are bound by it.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. But, as the Order in Council distinctly declares that the liability is admitted, I would not put myself at the mercy of the hon. gentleman by making any such statement.

Mr. LENNOX. I think we are getting into greater difficulty by reason of the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). He tells us that by the Order in Council it was referred to Judge Burbidge of the court of Exchequer to give judgment. If it is the case that no judgment has been given we are not in a position to treat of the matter at all, but I think we may take the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals as putting the matter in a fairly clear light, and keeping that in mind, I think the hon. Minister of Finance does not give the great public credit for the astuteness which it really possesses. I think the public will see a very broad distinction at once between a judgment of the Exchequer Court, as it has been pointed out by my hon. friend here (Mr. Casgrain), and the case as put by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. What I understand is that there had been an audit by the Department of Railways and Canals for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of the items, that they did go into the matter and did ascertain the correctness of the items and that for the purpose of verifying that further—if I understand the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals correctly, and I hope the hon. minister will not say that I am sarcastic in any degree——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You are not now.

Mr. LENNOX. I am improving all the time. For the purpose of verifying that and for greater assurance and for the purpose of justifying the government in any action they might subsequently have to take they referred the matter to Judge Burbidge, as a persona designata. It might have been referred to any other well qualified person. He could corroborate by a report the amount arrived at by the audit that had been previously made. This is not a judgment and the public will apprehend that point if they get an opportunity of being seized of the facts and therefore it is important that what is suggested by my hon. friend on this side of the House (Mr. Casgrain) should be complied with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I will bring the trouble to an amicable end by proposing that the item be changed to read :

To pay the amount reported by the judge of the Exchequer Court on a reference made of the claim of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann to recoup them, &c.

Mr. CASGRAIN. That is satisfactory.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Knowing that it will be a great relief to my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) I will tell him that $10 an acre for land in the Yukon, except it may be choice land, is too much. The hon. Minister of the Interior tells me that in the Department of the Interior they have valued this land at a dollar an acre and that they find some trouble in disposing of it at that.

Mr. SPROULE. But mining lands are worth $10 an acre, and it was mining lands that Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann were to select.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of the Interior stated that the amount paid to Mackenzie & Mann was solely the cash they expended. I believed that at the time, but I find now that the amount awarded to Mackenzie & Mann includes $58,000 for remuneration besides interest.

The PRIME MINISTER. No.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I beg your pardon, there is 15 per cent allowed for remuneration.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Only 12½ per cent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The amount claimed is $302,000, and if you add 15 per cent to that and costs, it comes to the award of the Exchequer Court.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 12½ per cent is all that is allowed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The judgment is for $58,000 for remuneration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there a judgment ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The award or recommendation or whatever you want to call it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. 12½ per cent is allowed.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. A few days ago the minister promised to bring down the amount expended on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway since he went into office, the quantity of miles of rail laid and the number of miles still unfinished. He promised that information before he would go on with the estimates.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have here a statement showing the amount chargeable in connection with the Canadian canals, statement of expenditure of construction, cost of enlargement and total estimated cost to the 1st of May, 1902. I have also a statement here of the renals paid on the different canals. The deputy minister does not seem to have made a note of the other question. The information can be obtained, I suppose. I will hand these documents to the hon. member for Lanark.

Item, as amended, agreed to.

Rideau canal, $1,200.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I call the attention of the minister to the report of his officer on the condition of the Poonamalie bridge, and I would ask the minister to insert an item in the estimates to put that bridge into proper shape. The government engineer reports :

I can see no appearance of the bridge being damaged or shifted by high water as stated in the petition because it appears to be fairly in line throughout. It is of course in very bad repair, and in my opinion most dangerous for vehicles to pass. In fact, Mr. Snider said nothing to me about damage being done to the bridge but admitted that it was simply worn out by old age, and that their council had to renew it ; but that as the holding up of the water by the canal bank at Poonamalie lock necessitated an increased length of bridge, which is in my opinion true, they were for that reason praying the government to assist them to do so.

The engineer states the amount they were entitled to. Therefore I hope the minister will see his way to put a sum in the estimates to carry out the recommendation of the engineer as to the claims of the municipal council of the township of Elmsley.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is hardly a recommendation of the engineer. The difficulty we have had in making any allowance in respect to that work is this, that it does not appear that the bridge required to be renewed, because of our having raised the level of the water at that point ; but it does appear that the bridge requires to be renewed because it is worn out and decayed from old age. It is too late to put an item in the estimates this year, but I would be disposed to consider the matter for a future estimate.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Is the minister not going to contribute to the additional length of the bridge rendered necessary by the raising of the water level ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If there is any substantial increase in the length of the bridge by reason of our having raised the level of the water I think that would be a fair ground for a claim; but I do not know that the length has been increased to any appreciable extent.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. All the council ask the hon. minister is that that portion of the work they have to do by reason of the raising of the water above the normal level of the dam shall be contributed to by the government. The amount which they say will be required to complete it is $1,000. The hon. minister's engineer says $900, and he says that a fair amount to contribute would be one-third of the cost, that is, $300. It is not worth arguing about.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I cannot put it in the estimates this year, but I am willing to consider it for next year.

Trent canal—Rebuilding dam at Peterborough, $9,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I thought that was a new dam, which we built not long ago ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It is not finished yet. This is to finish it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Last year we had an appropriation of $12,000 which, with this vote will bring the total cost to $21,000.

Prince Edward Island—To increase accommodation at Charlottetown, $30,000.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether any estimates have been prepared as to what the 31½ miles which he is constructing will cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The engineer has not got the estimate here. He has it at the office.

Mr. BARKER. Was the estimate prepared as a whole or in sections of 10 miles?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. As a whole.

Mr. BARKER. When was that done ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He got it inside of last week.

Mr. BARKER. Then, no estimate was made before the contract was let ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Not up here at Ottawa.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that the minister let the contract for these 31½ miles without knowing what the works would cost ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had the calculation showing what it would cost, but he had not the engineer's estimate.

Mr. BARKER. I understand, from the discussion which took place on the 6th of May, that the contractor had a contract two years ago for 11½ miles, that that contract was let by tender, that since then recently the minister has let a contract for 31½ miles additional at the same rates ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. For the same class of work.

Mr. BARKER. How did the minister know whether these rates were reasonable or not ? How could he tell that the price per yard for earth cutting or rock blasting or anything else was reasonable without having an estimate ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. He had the tenders for 11½ miles—for earth, rock and all the other items.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman suppose that the earthwork at one point of the railway must necessarily cost the same as the earthwork at another point. At one point it may cost 27 cents or 30 cents and at another 15 cents. How can he tell whether the price was reasonable for the 31½ miles unless he had an estimate ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I had a total estimate.

Mr. BARKER. That is a most extraordinary way to make a contract.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It was a most peculiar contract. The first time I asked the Minister of Railways whether this work was let by tender, he said yes. I understood then that the whole work was let by tender from Charlottetown to Murray Harbour. On April 9th the question was asked in the Senate by Mr. Ferguson, whether the work had been let by tender, and the answer was that it had, but in the neighbourhood where the work is being done, it was believed that only one portion, 11½ miles, had been let by tender, and on the 1st May the Hon. Mr. Ferguson inquired in the Senate :

Whether it is the intention of the government to invite public tenders for the construction of the railway from Charlottetown to Murray harbour other than section 2.

If so, when will the notices for such tenders be issued ?

The Hon. Mr. Scott replied as follows :—

The answer sent me is as follows :—The department invited tenders by public advertisement for section 2 covering 11½ miles from Mutch's Point towards Murray Harbour and the contract was awarded accordingly to a responsible contractor, at prices which the engineers pronounced reasonable. The next section was continued at the prices for the work as settled under the first tenders, by Order in Council. The contract has been sent for execution by the contractor.

In reply to my question as to whether any work had been done before the Order in Council was passed, the hon. Minister of Railways said no, that the Order in Council was passed before the contractors had begun to do the work on the other sections of the road. But what are the facts ? Here is what Mr. Ferguson said in the Senate :

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—That is most extraordinary, in the face of the replies that were given across the floor of the House on the authority of the chief engineer of railways, that no work was being done on any section but No. 2, when now it appears that by an Order in Council the work was prosecuted on other sections of the road on the same terms as No. 2.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman is right except as far as the date is concerned. After my hon. friend made the statement that work was going on, I called the attention of the Minister of Railways to it and he denied it, and I spoke to Mr. Schreiber about it. It appears the contractor went on with the approval, perhaps, of the local engineer. Subsequent to the statement made, on a report from the local engineer, confirmed by Mr. Schreiber, a continuation of the work was given beyond the 11½ miles to this contractor at schedule prices contained in the first contract.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—That is all right, but what becomes of the denials given by my hon. friend on the authority of the department, that work was being done by the government ?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Evidently the department did not know the work was going on.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—And it was done by Order in Council ?

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—No, he went on before the Order in Council. The Order in Council was passed, if my memory is correct, after my attention was called to it by my hon. friend.

What becomes then of the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways that the work was, in the first place, let by tender for the first 11½ miles, and then that a contract was given for the other 31 miles, on the schedule prices of the first tender and without inviting any competition. I need not go into the constitutional question, whether the hon. gentleman had the right to do this or not. There are enough sins against the government without charging it with anything more. But the hon. minister did what he had no right to do. By law he is bound to advertise for tenders for the construction of all these works. But the hon. gentleman does not seem to pay much attention to the law in these matters. However he extended the contract, and he told us that no work was done by the contractor until the Order in Council was passed. It appears now, however, that the contractor was doing the work by some one's authority, without the knowledge seemingly of the minister, and without any Order in Council having been passed. According to the hon. minister's colleague in the other House, he seems not to have

known anything about this. The work, it seems, was going on without his knowledge, and it was only authorized by Order in Council when the attention of the minister's colleague in the Upper House was brought to the fact by Senator Ferguson.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman has discovered a mare's nest. Let me tell him that the questions which he has asked and which have been answered, have been truthfully answered. The question he asked me, whether or not the Order in Council authorizing the giving of the second contract to the contractor, on the schedule prices of the first, was made before any work was done, I replied in the affirmative. I still say that it was.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Before the work was commenced ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Before any work was done on the extension. I am confident of that because that Order in Council was passed long enough ago, and I do not think that the contractors could possibly have begun the work before it was passed. Let me make a suggestion to my hon. friend. He has been during last summer with his hon. friend beside him (Mr. Barker) travelling over the Intercolonial Railway. The attention of these two gentleman has been given during the recess almost exclusively to the subject of the Intercolonial Railway. They travelled over the line, listening to all the stories they could hear, and they were convinced that when parliament was called together and when the Public Accounts Committee went into all these transactions, they were going to make a great exposure of wrongdoing. The minister was to be proved guilty of all sorts of transactions next to criminal. The air was blue with the predictions they made. They took a certain amount of comfort out of that. They were buoyed up during the recess by the confident expectation that something was going to happen disastrous to the government. as the result of their labour. Well, I would suggest to them now that they should proceed at once to Prince Edward Island and gather all the reports and information they can regarding the Prince Edward Island Railway, and let them buoy themselves up until next session with the expectation that they are going to prove any quantity of misdeeds. Let them go into the Murray Harbour transaction, sift it to the bottom, and make a great exposure of it. That is something to which they can devote their attention during the recess with great benefit. no doubt, and from their point of view, to the country . But it is rather late now to go into an inquiry of that kind. It is a thing which will keep. If everything is in such a deplorable condition. no doubt they will have abundant opportunity a year hence to make a reputation for themselves even exceeding what they have succeeded in establishing this session.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Did the hon. minister contemplate, when he began building the railway from Mutch's Point, 11½ miles south, to continue it to Murray Harbour ? If so, why did he not, when letting that part of the contract, let also the whole line ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was not intended then to carry it on so soon.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You only intended building 11½ miles then.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. It was very largely in the discretion of the minister on the island then, and he recommended that 11½ miles be taken up.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. As a business proposition, I should think that you would have intended building the whole section.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. There was a very serious question about the route, as to the direction we would continue. And that matter had to be looked into, as the hon. gentleman knows. That was the reason why only 11½ miles were taken.

Mr. HACKETT. I would say with regard to the building of these lines on the island——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which one ?

Mr. HACKETT. Take the whole enterprise. It should not be dealt with as a number of small sections. If the hon. gentleman is going to build fifty miles he should call for tenders for that work. But I can understand why tenders were first called for this 11½ miles from Mutch's Point. It appears the hon. gentleman contemplated building only 11½ miles, but, since then, he has changed his mind and is building 45 or 50 miles, and is giving these parties an opportunity to build through the level section the grading of the railway, the ballasting and track laying, on the basis of a tender for 11½ miles. I think that is very unfair to the contractors in that part of the country that they should not be afforded an opportunity to tender.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But they had an opportunity.

Mr. HACKETT. On the 11½ miles, but not on this.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The small contractor could handle 11½ miles easier than he could 30 or 40 miles.

Mr. HACKETT. They had an opportunity to tender for the work in the most hilly part of the country——

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Which is the most profitable for the contractor.

Mr. HACKETT. We know which is the most profitable. And if the hon. minister will consult his deputy and chief engineer, who built the railway in Prince Edward Island, he will learn how it was built around the hills in every direction, and it has cost the country over $17,000 within the last few years to strighten out those curves. Now, the hon. gentleman is building this railway through the country south of Hillsborough, the hilliest part of Prince Edward Island.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) object to the location of the railway in this section ?

Mr. HACKETT. I am not objecting to the portion of the country the railway traverses. But I am objecting to the hon. minister giving the contract for building 11½ miles through the most hilly part, and then continuing the contract to the contractor for 31½ miles through a level section without giving others an opportunity to tender.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hackett) say that it is easier to build the 31½ miles than to build the 11½ miles ?

Mr. HACKETT. I do.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). On what authority does he make that statement ?

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. On his own.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). I asked the hon. member for West Prince (Mr. Hackett).

Mr. HACKETT. I make the statement on this authority, that, in building the Prince Edward Island Railway, the line was run around the hills, and it has cost this country, as I say, almost $20,000 within the last few years to straighten out the curves. The hon. gentleman will understand that it is more difficult to make a straight line through hills and levelling up the valleys than to build it in a level country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. But it is much more profitable to the contractor. So, the hon. gentleman is not making out a very strong case.

Mr. HACKETT. As the straightening out of these curves has cost the country so much one would suppose that the minister in laying this track for 11½ miles would lay it in a straight line through that section of the country, so that trains could be run without difficulty. If you gave a contract for this 11½ miles for a straight line through the hills levelling up the valleys, then it would be a different matter to get contracts for 31½ miles where you have a level surface.

Mr. HACKETT.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). Starting at Mutch's Point where would the 11½ miles bring you to ?

Mr. HACKETT. About to the ten-mile house.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). About to O'Neils. It does not pass the ten-mile house at all, but passes beyond it. The hon. gentleman does not know the location of the road. Has the hon. gentleman ever been over that road that he says it is a more level road from Mutch's Point to O'Neils than over the other part of the road ?

Mr. BELL. That is the very opposite of what he said.

Mr. HACKETT. Does the hon. gentleman understand that, in going from Mutch's Point to O'Neil's you go over Tea Hill ?

Mr. HUGHES (King's). No, you go east of Tea Hill. Has the hon. gentleman ever been over that road ?

Mr. HACKETT. I have been over it, I can assure the hon. gentleman, and I was down to Vernon river last summer.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). How far did the hon. gentleman go ?

Mr. HACKETT. To Murray harbour. And let me say that I think the hon. gentleman's interruption on this occasion has been quite impertinent.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). Now I make this statement, and I venture to say I shall be borne out by the engineers, that the latter portion of the road is more difficult to build than the former. The hon. gentleman stated that the first of the road was over a more level country.

Mr. BROCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes, King's) is making a worse case for his friends.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). I mean, that the hon. gentleman said it was through a hillier country. But that was not in accordance with the facts. Does the hon. gentleman know the settlements through which the road extends ? They are Vigg, Kinross and Caledonia. And Caledonia, with the exception of de Sable, is the hilliest part of the island.

Mr. BARKER. And the hon. minister says that is where you can do the cheapest work.

Mr. HUGHES (King's). I am making my statement in contradiction of the hon. gentleman from West Prince (Mr. Hackett). He says that the 11½ miles was the hilliest section of the road and that the rest was a very level country, and I must say that that is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. BARKER. There is one thing that is in accordance with the facts—that the minister did find it expedient and proper, when he was constructing only 11½ miles of

road to ask for tenders, and to receive them from four or five different contractors. But now that he is constructing 31½ miles he does not think it is necessary to call for tenders, though the statute under which he exercises his authority requires him to do it.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We can go into that next session, when we have plenty of time.

Mr. HACKETT. I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes), that I was over that section of the country last year. I drove through from Charlottetown to Murray harbour, and I saw the work that was being done as far as Vernon river. I want to assure him that my experience in driving through the country was that the most hilly part of it was between Charlottetown and Vernon river. From Vernon river to Murray harbour I found a more level country that I could drive through easily. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Hughes) cannot make it appear that there are mountains in that part of the country.

Post Office Department—Salaries, to provide for 3 additional second class clerkships, $3,500.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Those are promotions, one from a third to a second class, and the other two are for the outside service whom it was intended to transfer to the inside in connection with a change of work.

Provisional allowance, $180.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for a clerk in the dead letter office at Victoria.

To provide for increases of salary for employees in the inside service not provided for in the main estimates, $2,260.

Mr. MONK. Like many other estimates, this appears extremely vague. Who are those clerks whose salaries are to be increased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In the main estimates provision was made for all whose salaries were not over $800. At that time the officers had not gone through the whole list. This provides for statutory increases for all whose salary are above that should they be recommended for the fiscal year, and the fiscal year is not yet concluded.

Mr. SPROULE. I may as well take occasion of this item to refer to a question asked by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Richardson) with regard to the dismissal of the postmaster at Holstein. I have in my hand a copy of the information given to the hon. minister as to why he was dismissed.

Memorandum for the Post Master General in reference to the removal of the Postmaster at Holstein.

The Postmaster General is informed that complaint was made that the postmaster was conducting a public library in the room where the Post Office was located, and that looking after his duties as librarian conflicted with his duties as postmaster, causing thereby both delay and inconvenience to the public. It was further complained that the postmaster was not exercising proper care over mail matter, and that the public in going to the library had more or less access thereto.

This complaint having been referred to the inspector, he reported on the 11th of March, 1902, that the Postmaster was acting as librarian and also attending the public telephone, that he was also engaged in the grain trade, to which he devoted the greater part of his time, and that he found considerable dissatisfaction at Holstein on account of the public library being kept in the Post Office. In his opinion the Post Office is not a suitable place for such library. He also stated that during the time he was examining the accounts of the office a person called and asked for twelve books, that the person in charge left the Post Office work to look over the library to see if such books were in stock ; that at the same time the telephone was ringing, which also had to be attended to by the same person, causing thereby considerable confusion in the office. The Postmaster himself was absent from the office that day.

The inspector further states his opinion that the office was of sufficient importance to be separated distinct from the public library and telephone business, and that sufficient privacy for those depositing money in the savings bank and seeking money orders, could not exist under existing conditions.

Under the circumstances the Postmaster was removed on the 12th of March, 1902.

Now, I have here a copy of a petition sent to the Postmaster General with reference to that. I may mention the fact that this petition is signed by 151 parties who use the office, and I am told represents about leighty per cent of all those who use the office. It reads as follows :—

We the undersigned who are served by the Holstein Post Office have learned with most profund regret that our present Postmaster, W. T. Petrie, has been notified that the postmastership is about to be changed. We are thoroughly satisfied with the equipment and arrangement of the public library and telephone being in the post office building, and also that the service and accommodation are entirely satisfactory. And your petitioners do humbly pray that you reconsider your decision and leave the office and service in its present form.

The postmaster, writing a letter regarding this question, draws attention to the fact that in Dromore the library is in the post office as at Holstein, and no complaint appears to be raised. In several other post offices the same thing is done. I have personally known Mr. Petrie for many years. He is a most enterprising man in the community, enjoying the respect and good will of almost the entire community. He is a business man of many years standing and has done everything that could be reasonably expected to benefit the place and serve the

public. I do not wonder that it is regretted, as this petition expresses it, that a change should be made in respect to a man who has served the interests of the public so long and so faithfully.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) expects me to make any observations as to the report of the inspector to which he has referred as a justification for the action taken. It is quite clear that the convenience of the public was not being sufficiently regarded in the management of the office. In the course of carrying on the department complaints were made, the matter was referred to the inspector and he made his report. I do not think the department could have done less than change the postmaster under the circumstances.

Mr. SPROULE. The office seekers seem to be satisfied that their interests are being very well served.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know this office, I know the postmaster, and I know personally the service he has given to the community in that place. It is a pretty well known fact that a simple matter of keeping a village library in the post office is a convenience to the public. It is something to which there is no emolument attached, it is a gratuitous service to the public which is very much appreciated, I am sure, in this case. There is one thing in the inspector's report that carries with it great improbability, and it is the statement that somebody comes into that village library and asks for twelve books. It seems to me to be incredible unless it was arranged specially when the inspector was there that something of the kind should be done. Usually only one book is allowed out at a time, or two at the outside. I know how the library is kept and it does not require any one to go out of the office to see whether the books are in their places or not. I know Mr. Petrie is very highly esteemed by the community there and that the petition is, I am credibly informed, signed by 90 per cent of the people who are served by the office, irrespective of political lines altogether. It does seem somewhat strange, with a petition of that character presented, that no further inquiries seem to have been made, but that on this flimsy pretext, the postmaster is simply dismissed in order that a place may be made for a man who has been a very active politician and supporter of the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a matter that I brought to the attention of the Postmaster General some time ago, upon his estimates, in regard to the dismissal of two postmasters, one at Middle Musquodoboit, and the other at Oyster Pond Jeddore. Mr. Kaulbach, who was the postmaster at Middle Musquodoboit has written a letter in reply to certain documents which were brought down by the hon. Postmaster General, and which I sent to him. The letter is as follows :

Middle Musquodoboit, May 10, 1902.

R. L. Borden, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In reply to the affidavits of Jno. A. Shaw and George B. Phalen, that I had previous to the general election, canvassed and tried to induce them to vote for the Conservative candidates I positively assert that the statements of these men are false ; that during the campaign I was from home looking after mining business and that at no time did I take any part other than using the franchise by voting. That the argument which was used to obtain the sympathy of the public here, was that I did not need it ; and that I had plenty of money without it. The petitions sent to William Roche, M.P., signed by both parties showed that I had been an efficient officer and the confidence the public had in me. I considered I had a right to reply to the charge, or an investigation would have been in order neither of which was given me.

I am, yours truly,
ROBERT KAULBACH,

This is simply another of those cases in which the Postmaster General has seen fit to dismiss men without giving them any opportunity whatever to reply to the charges made against them, and has acted upon ex parte statements without giving the officers of his department an opportunity to make a defence. I have a similar letter from Mr. David Mitchell, of Jeddore, who states that as far as political partisanship is concerned, he canvassed no man for or against the government, he was on no committee and had nothing to do with the elections.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Is the statement of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) there ? I do not remember the case. I sent the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) the particulars.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The documents that were handed to me in Mr. Kaulbach's case were two so-called affidavits of a very indefinite character, taken before a justice, not giving any dates or particulars, but making a general charge of political partisanship against Mr. Kaulbach, which he has denied.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In what constituency is that ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is in my own constituency.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Does Mr. Roche represent that too ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, Mr. Roche represents it also.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think there is some communication from him.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Nothing from the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Roche) was brought down by the hon. gentleman.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I may be in error.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I submit to the hon. gentleman is that it does not seem to be a very fair way of dealing with these men to dismiss them without even letting them know anything about the charges against them, and upon ex parte statements of this character, to dismiss them from their positions with a certain imputation upon their character without giving them an opportunity of making their own defence. I have put that forward in this House a good many times without any effect. I think it is absolutely unfair to the officers of the department to dismiss them for alleged political partisanship without giving them an opportunity of making their defence against these charges. I know that notwithstanding the pledge which was given by the right hon. gentleman who leads the government, the practice has been defended from the other side of the House of dismissing these men upon the statement of a member of parliament purporting to speak from actual knowledge. I do not think that the hon. member from Halifax (Mr. Roche) would pretend to have any personal knowledge of the alleged partisanship of these men, because they live a long distance from Halifax, where he resides, and he must, in any statements he has made, have had information given to him by other persons, so that the cases do not even come within those that I have mentioned. There is another difficulty in regard to the Jeddore postmaster, and it is that the people of that community are to be deprived of any opportunity to communicate to the outside world by telegram, because the only person who is capable of taking charge of the telegraph office there is Miss Mitchell, daughter of the postmaster, and it would not be worth her while to devote her attention to that work, as her father has been deprived of the post office. I have had a communication from a strong supporter of the Liberal party living in the vicinity, who has complained to me very bitterly in regard to this matter, and I think the hon. gentleman had better look into that and see whether the public are not likely to be inconvenienced very greatly by the dismissal of this man without any opportunity being given him of saying anything in his own defence.

There is another matter I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. gentleman, and that is that 21 petitions of right were filed three years ago and the fiat asked for, which has not been granted in regard to any of them up to the present time. We have had at least two cases this session where people have been offered fiats and have declined to receive them, and their claims have been submitted to the Exchequer Court, not on the question of legal liability, but on the question of what is fair and right apart from legal liability, and very substantial claims have been voted by this parliament upon the reports made under references of that kind. If the government see fit to grant references with respect to claims where there is no liability; on what ground does the Postmaster General persist in refusing petitions of right to these men who simply ask that claims against the Crown shall be adjudicated on in the Exchequer Court. Under a statute passed this session, the Crown has the right to exact security for costs from all these men, and whatever justification there might have been before—and I think there was none—there certainly is no possible justification now for refusing these men the right to have their claims decided on before a properly constituted tribunal.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. In cases where the claimants have any substantial claims ; claims in good conscience as well as legal claims, I would agree with my hon. friend that a fiat should issue as a matter of course. But you have to look at these cases in order to see whether it is in the interest of right that they should be facilitated in proceedings against the Crown. It is rather late at night to take up the whole subject, but speaking generally what are the facts ? My hon. friend has not perhaps studied all the facts. Permit me to tell him that in the year 1895-96, the government—probably because they expected an early election or for whatever reason—proceeded to disregard the statute which governs the Postmaster General, and right and left they issued contracts for the carrying of mails in contravention of that statute which says that tenders shall be invited for mail service and the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer; but, that in special cases the contract may be renewed. The cases that my hon. friend refers to are renewals of contracts. Now, not in one instance is there a special circumstance so far as appears in the department to warrant entering into these renewal contracts. They were renewed not only without justification under the statute but against the interests of the public. I do not know whether the observations I am about to make apply in detail to each one of the twenty-one cases, but I am sure that an analysis of the facts will show that many of the cases fall within the class I am about to describe. Tenders had been invited in many instances by the late government and after their receipt sometimes opened and the amounts ascertained, and then disregarded, the contracts were let to the old tenderers at prices in some instances enormously in excess of the general average of prices for which the new tenderers were prepared to perform the contracts. In some instances tenders were not even opened and scores and scores of new contracts were let for services which had been advertised and for which there

were tenders by the score in the department. In some instances contracts were let—and I believe one or more of the contracts referred to by my hon. friend—were let to the tenderers at higher prices than their tender. There are instances—and I think there are one or more among the twenty-one cases speaking from memory—where the old contractor put in his tender in the ordinary course for the new contract, and yet the government of the day chose to ignore his tender and let to him the contract at the original contract price, which may have been 50 per cent in excess of the amount of his new tender. These contracts, I submit, are not worth the paper on which they are written. There is no equity in their claims. If the contracts are good in law; if the statute does not mean what it seems to say, then it will be on the barest technicality they could recover. If they choose to disregard the right, and by their understanding with the government of the day or for whatever reason obtained improper contracts from the government, they have no claim upon the government to aid them, because they did not enjoy the full fruits of these improper contracts. Rather, they should be compelled to account for the portion of the excess they received during the currency of these contracts. It is incredible to suppose that in hundreds and hundreds of the simplest service that Canada affords, there were special circumstances that warrant the abandonment of the principle of inviting tenders, and yet that is what took place wholesale, and these cases are of that class. Under the circumstances there is no merit in good conscience in these claims, and the claimants have nothing to claim, but rather they should congratulate themselves that the government proposed to have the contracts treated as null in the first instance, and did not call upon them to make good to the Crown the excess of money which during the time they purported to render service, they received.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The doctrine laid down by the Postmaster General is absolutely subversive of the principle upon which petitions of right have been granted in the past. The Postmaster General in effect says: Because my predecessor was guilty of laxity in the public service, I will annul these contracts whether I have the legal right to do so or not, and I will refuse these men a fiat which will enable them to substantiate their claims in court.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The other party is just as guilty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What other party?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The petitioner is a party to the wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the petitioner is a party to the wrong; if this contract is not worth the paper it is written on, it is perfectly competent for the Crown to go into Court and say that. If the argument of the Postmaster General means anything it means that there was a conspiracy between these men and his predecessor in office to defraud the government. If that can be established in court, then not one of these men can recover. But the Postmaster General sees fit to judge these men behind their backs. He refuses these men the right to urge their claims in court, just as he refused the two postmasters the right to be heard in their own defence before he dismissed them. That is the position which the Postmaster General takes. I would be willing to leave it to the House and to the country as to whether that is a position which can be fairly maintained by any man who is desirous of doing right. If what the Postmaster General says, is true, then the government has nothing to fear because these men cannot substantiate their claims in court. If on the other hand these men are able to prove that what they say is correct, they have a valid claim against the government and they should have the privilege before the court of seeing whether they are right or whether the Postmaster General is right. But that right the Postmaster General denies them. He judges their cases himself and he deprives these men of that which every man in this country is supposed to have: The right to have his claim determined in a court of law by a proper tribunal, and after hearing both sides of the case.

Mr. HACKETT. I desire to bring to the notice of the hon. the Postmaster General a case which I brought before the House last session when he was away in Australia, and the acting Postmaster General could make no reply. It is the case of a man named Kehoe who had the contract for carrying the mails between Tignish and Mail Point. Mr. Kehoe was requested by the inspector of post offices in Prince Edward Island, Mr. Brecken, at the expiration of his term of three years or so, whether he would renew his contract on the same terms, namely, $30 a year. Mr. Kehoe said he would, and signed the bond in my presence, and entered into a new contract in accordance with the request of the inspector. A few days afterwards an order came from Ottawa that the mails were to be delivered to another man, Thomas Nelligan, that Mr. Kehoe was not the contractor. Mr. Nelligan has been carrying the mails for the last two years and has been receiving $50 a year for the same work that Mr. Kehoe did for $30 a year. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General if he has any knowledge of this matter.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I am sorry to say I have no recollection of the transaction. I was not aware that it had been referred to in the House on a former

occasion. If my hon. friend had intimated to me that he was going to bring it up I would have been prepared with a statement of the facts. But even at this late date I will endeavour to obtain such a statement, and if he does not receive it in the House I will send him a communication explaining what the facts are, and I feel certain that he will find it to be a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to say with regard to the post office at Holstein, that if inadvertently an injustice has been done to the late postmaster and also to the public who by petition have expressed their satisfaction with the service and their desire to have the post office conducted by the same man, in view of the fact that no irregularity has been found in the office conducted by him for many years, and that he had no opportunity of hearing the charges made against him or making any defence. I think the Postmaster General should at least make some further inquiry into the matter. This is a case in which a gentleman who has rendered good service to the public for many years has been suspended on short notice without any opportunity to defend himself, and the position given to a very active political partisan.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what my hon. friend would suggest could have been done. It was a question of the proper management of the office, and the course pursued seems to me to have been a reasonable one. Charges were made, the proper officer was instructed to investigate he did investigate, and he ascertained that the public were not receiving fair consideration. The officer was conducting a telegraph or telephone business and a public library and was also engaged in the grain trade, so that the public were not receiving reasonable service. If the public are to be considered, it seems to me that it was a case calling for a change of postmaster. The inspector was at the office and saw for himself what was going on there. The postmaster, or his assistant, or his people were there. A new officer has been appointed, and I suppose the transfer has taken place, so that new rights have arisen. I see by the papers that the report was made early in March last. If so, the new officer has entered on his duties. He has his rights now, and it will be quite impossible to undo what has taken place.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that it is a very common thing to have a telegraph or telephone system conducted in a post office. The emoluments are so very small in these offices that these businesses have to be combined for the convenience of the public. As to the other little matter of keeping the village library there, only five miles away a village library is kept in the post office and no complaint is made, and I do not believe there would have been any complaint in this case if it had not been got up by a few people who were opposed to the postmaster. I know that he is a popular man. I believe that this petition asking that he be continued in the office has been signed by from eighty to ninety per cent of the people served by the office. It certainly seems to have been a case in which there might have been an investigation and opportunity given to comply with requirements of the department with regard to keeping library or telephone office.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There was an investigation and the inspector made a report.

Mr. RICHARDSON. That was the only investigation. He had no opportunity of making a defence.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He had every opportunity.

Mr. MORIN. There was a postmaster in my county who was dismissed last fall. The other day I put a question on the Order paper about the dismissal and the Postmaster General replied that he was dismissed because Mr. Talbot had asked that he should be, as he had taken an active part in the election of 1900. Mr. Talbot was at that time, like myself, busy at home, and he knew nothing about what was going on in my county. All he could say was that some one told him so. Well, the hon. Postmaster General should not listen to what he hears in that way, especially from politicians. He cannot expect to hear anything else, whether it is so or not. I remember very well in 1896 that question came up in the House, though not with regard to my county, and the Prime Minister said that people employed by the government would have the right to vote for whom they pleased and they would not be deprived of talking politics if they wanted to, but he said that a man employed by the government had no right to make speeches nor to publish articles in the newspapers. He said it made no difference whether the parties were Conservatives or Liberals, they would be dismissed. Now, to show you that this promise has not been carried out at all, I know a man perfectly well—he is a friend of mine if he is a Grit, and I do not like to mention his name—who last January spent some eleven days in the county of Beauce. On his return home he and I rode on the train together, and he was telling me how much money he had spent in the county and how many days he had been there. He was also in the company of the Minister of Justice. Some time ago this question was brought up in the House by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Leonard), and the Minister of Justice replied that he knew nothing of it. In this case it would not do to say that he knew nothing of it.

The hon. member for Bellechasse and the hon. Minister of Justice were in the county

of Beauce doing electioneering work. I do not ask that this man be dismissed, but I say it is rather strange to find one man treated in one way and another man treated altogether differently. If a Conservative works, or even if he does not work, but is reported to have been working in an election, he is dismissed. But a Grit is allowed to work right along, right and left in election time, and he is not interfered with. Is that treating citizens of this country on an equality ? I say it is not. Let me draw the attention of the Postmaster General to another case. In 1890, there was a man in my county who got a contract for carrying the mails and he got it by tender. In 1895 that contract was renewed without public tender. In 1896, the present Postmaster General dismissed that man and gave the contract to somebody else. I have no fault to find with that, but what took place in 1897, right in the very town where I live ? I know all about the contract and the man. The contract expired and was given to another man, after public tenders were asked, for $55 a year to carry the mails from the station to the post office. That contract expired some time last fall. The contractor wrote the department asking that his contract be renewed, but he got a reply that it was given to another man without any tender having been called for at all. Why is it that the Postmaster General condemns men and contracts just when it suits him and in any way he likes? If it was not right in 1895 to give a contract without public tender, why was it right to give it without public tender last fall ? If the hon. minister can explain that, I will be very grateful to him.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. With reference to the first point, the dismissal of a postmaster, I think that my hon. friend moved for a return.

Mr. MORIN. Not that I know of.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Some one did, and I think that the declaration of Mr. Talbot was produced upon which this change took place. I think it took place last summer while I was away, but of course I assume the responsibility. I looked up the papers when my hon. friend asked the question and I found that Mr. Talbot did not in any way qualify his statement. but spoke as if he had positive knowledge of the facts. Therefore, although my hon. friend thinks that he had not that knowledge, still Mr. Talbot assumed full responsibility. I remember speaking to him personally on the subject, and he assured me that his statement to the department last summer was perfectly correct; and if he were here, I think he would be prepared to discuss the facts with my hon. friend. With reference to my hon. friend's inquiry as to the contractor in his town, he will understand that I cannot carry all these transactions in my head and remember an incident that occurred five years ago, and which has reference to one out of ten thousand contracts. I will, however, look the matter up and find out all about it.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. minister says that he is sorry Mr. Talbot is not here to defend himself. Will the hon. gentleman give him a chance to defend himself ? Will he tell Mr. Talbot that I spoke from personal knowledge, that I was in the county of Beauce myself, and that I know he was in the county working with the gentleman who gets $800 a year from the government ? The hon. member for Belchasse (Mr. Talbot) and the Minister of Justice and that man were there together. If Mr. Talbot wants to make reports and have everything done right, let him look after his own man who worked with him in the county of Beauce.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have received a communication with regard to withdrawal of the mail service from the village of Bayside in my constituency. It is regarded as a great hardship by the people that the mail service should have been withdrawn. There was some talk of dispensing with it two years ago, and the person who carried the mails offered to do the work for a lower sum in order that the people might not be deprived of the mail service. The service was continued a couple of years, but lately has been withdrawn. There are three or four business places in the village, which do a large business and ship a large quantity of fish. There is no railway to that village or telephone communication, and they had only mail service twice a week. Now, I believe that service is altogether withdrawn. I would like the hon. gentleman to consider the matter and see whether it would not be possible to continue the service to that community.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not see that the office has been closed. I think it is a case of removal of the site.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know. They regard it as a withdrawal. They say that they had a service in the past and that it is now withdrawn. They speak of a more frequent service in some other place.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. My recollection is that the inspector made a report in which there were some recommendations and what is done was the result of his report. There certainly was no intention to disregard in any way the convenience of the people.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a triweekly service to a village five miles away and it is proposed to open an office at another place seven miles from Bayside, where there are only two or three houses. It seems to be largely for the convenience of the people that the post office should remain where it was, if the statements I have in this letter are correct. It seems to me

that it was a mistake to withdraw the service from these people.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We went simply on the inspector's report.

Mr. POPE. I would like to call attention to the change made in the post office at Keith. A post office existed between the two villages of Robinson and Gould, and that has recently been removed. A post office had been established many years at a point supposed to be the most central, marked out in former days, by the joint action of the mayors of the two towns. It is about 12 miles from Robinson to Gould, and the point that had been selected by the community, in which the office has existed many years, is supposed to be the most central and most accommodating to that district. By the change, the office has been removed many miles nearer Gould. To-day there are four farmers and their families living between the location of the present post office and the village of Gould. Naturally those farmers would be served at Gould which is the natural place for them to transact their business. The result has been to compel the people living for many miles in that vicinity to travel all this distance in order to get their mail. To meet these conditions I understand that an open bag of some sort is carried by the mail carrier and a sort of distribution takes place between Robinson and the present location of the post office known as Keith. I know no good reason why this change should be made. There is a large petition, I presume almost a unanimous petition, which was forwarded to the hon. gentleman from that section asking that this change be not made.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When was it made ?

Mr. POPE. Perhaps sixty days ago. Perhaps thirty days ago. I understand that the postmaster who previously handled the mail there was a Conservative, which, I suppose, is no great crime in the estimation of the Postmaster General. The present occupant, I presume, is a Liberal. I do not know. It is sometimes difficult to ascertain in my constituency those who are Conservatives and those who are Liberals. The Postmaster General has been asked on more than one occasion to make changes in my constituency. None of these changes have been favourable to the public. Some of them have been moved back again to the section in which they first were—not to the same parties, I admit. But I am perfectly willing to have the hon. Postmaster General appoint his own friends, provided he serves the public well. But I must say that in my constituency he has been particularly unfortunate in the advice he has received in the past. If he has no better source of advice in the future, I would ask him to come to me—not that I could give him any particular advantage, but I would at least give him the prestige of serving the public well, and I am sure he will estimate it at its proper value such an advantage.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. There is a way by which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) can get the patronage.

Mr. POPE. That would be to expensive to principle. Ambitious as I may be, that would be too expensive, I am sure the hon. gentleman will see that. I feel somewhat interested in the post office at Keith, because it is an inconvenience to a lot of people as the mail has to be carried along this entire route, nine or ten miles until it gets to the post office as now located. I would ask the hon. Postmaster General, in the interest of these people, to open a way office that might possibly be more convenient and very little more expensive to the country. We have been told that this is a growing time, and I trust that the Postmaster General will regard this district as growing with the rest of the country and will hold it entitled to better service than it has ever received. I would ask him to open, somewhere, between the present post office, Keith and Robinson, a way office that can serve the farming community. There is not a village, but a straight road, and farmers located as they usually are in a district of that kind. I am pleased to see the Deputy Postmaster General on the floor. He has always treated me with great courtesy, and I trust that my words to the Postmaster General will strike the pan of his ear somewhat favourably, and that the people of that section will be given the accommodation to which they are entitled.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will promise that the application of my hon. friend (Mr. Pope) will receive careful consideration. The general practice—I do not think it is ever departed from—is to change the location of a post office only on the report of the inspector.

Mr. POPE. I believe that in this instance the Postmaster General is more or less correct. From my information, the inspector did recommend the change. But that does not alter the fact that the present arrangement is an inconvenience to the people. The cost of putting in a way office would be small and it would be a great accommodation to the people. Therefore, I ask it.

Mr. HACKETT. I would ask the Postmaster General to inform me why the change at Alberton has taken place, and Mr. Thomas Keith, who was postmaster for nearly twenty years has been retired and somebody else appointed.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will make a note of it and will let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

Mr. HACKETT. These notes are very well. But we have no difficulty in under-

standing that Mr. Keith was dismissed because he was a Conservative.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will give the information to-morrow.

Mr. HACKETT. That is old to-morrow. However, I shall be pleased if the hon. gentleman will give it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I can give it, I daresay on going into supply, or I can give the hon. gentleman a memorandum as I did before.

Mr. McLENNAN. I am glad to learn that it is the intention of the Postmaster General to transfer the mail carrying service in the county of Inverness from the present carrier to the Inverness and Richmond Railway. As this is an important portion of the county which I represent, I would like to know how it is intended to carry the mails on the trains. Does the hon. Postmaster General intend to have them sorted by mail clerk, and delivered as is ordinarily done, or merely as baggage in the baggage car ? I can tell the hon. gentleman that this is a most important part of the community, that there are three very thriving mining towns springing up in the county of Inverness along this very route. I hope that the delivery will not be made in such a fashion that the change will be regarded by the people as a retrograde step. For the last thirty-five or forty years, the mail has been delivered twice in every twenty-four hours along this route. I am sure that anything short of a delivery by mail clerk from the train would be considered by the community over this long distance, fifty-eight miles, as a step of a retrograde character. I did not have an opportunity within the last week or two to discuss this with the Postmaster General. I did talk it over with the gentleman in charge of the railway mail service, but he was not very clear then as to the manner in which the mail service in this connection was going to be carried out. And I would like to learn what is intended ?

Mr. HACKETT. That reminds me of the fact that the mails going west of Summerside are delayed at Summerside for twenty hours. There is no connection between the steamboat arriving at Summerside and the train going west. I would ask the hon. gentleman in the interest of the public living west of Summerside that close connection should be made between the boat arriving and the trains going west. There are several towns, two of them 70 miles west of Summerside, and I hope that the Postmaster General will see to it that the mails shall not be delayed at Summerside for twenty hours, where you have only to run trains four or five hours to reach the homes of the people and convey the news that they are expecting from all parts of the world. I trust the Postmaster General will consider this matter. At present we have a steamboat running between Pointe de Chêne and Summerside, and when mails go to Charlottetown there is no connection to carry them west. Supposing I left here to-morrow morning, I would reach Summerside on the evening of the next day, and there I will be delayed until the following day. For just 60 miles, there is no connection between the mail and steamboat service.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I will say to my hon. friend from Inverness (Mr. McLennan) that the matter he has brought to my attention is a very important one, and it will receive the careful consideration of the department. I will say to my hon. friend from Prince (Mr. Hackett) that I think the mails are despatched on all trains between Summerside and Charlottetown, and Georgetown and Charlottetown. Probably if there is any interruption it is because of there being no railway communication.

Mr. TALBOT. I deire to know from my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) the name of this Liberal postmaster who, he says, accompanied the Minister of Justice and myself during the last campaign in the county of Beauce.

Mr. MORIN. I did not say that.

To provide for an additional second-class railway mail clerkship, $720.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is for the reappointment of a mail clerk named Gingras. He was dismissed from the service because of supposed irregularities. He was charged with having thrown mail matret off the cars and delayed it in transmission. He was reinstated, and this is to make good the reinstatement.

To provide for the salaries of additional stampers and sorters, letter carriers and clerks, $10,000.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. This is to provide for any increase in the staff during the year at any place in the Dominion where it may be required. Owing to the expanding business, it is found that in different cities we have to make additions that are not anticipated.

To increase the salary of Mr. E. B. Bates, assistant postmaster at Ottawa, from $1,800 to $1,900, notwithtanding anytaing in the Civil Service Act, $100.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Assistant postmasters are paid a salary based upon the revenue of the office. But the Ottawa post office does a great amount of free business on account of the quantity of matter franked from parliament and from the departments, so the revenue of this office does not fairly represent the business done by it. We think that rule ought not to be adhered to in the case of Mr. Bates.

To provide for increases of salary for employees in the outside service, not provided for in the main estimates, $2,500.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the fiscal year closes, the officers, as in the case of the inside service, will go through the staff and report to the deputy and the deputy will report such as are entitled to the increase. If they should all be reported for an increase it would exceed the sum of $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the hon. gentleman able to give the names of the employees who salaries are to be increased ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. When the fiscal year closes then the officers make a report as to who are and who are not entitled to the increase. At present we are assuming they will all be entitled to it. I trust such may be the case. The report is made to me by the deputy. He, I presume, gets his advice from the officers immediately under him. In the inside service there are heads of branches, and I presume that he bases his judgment largely upon the recommendation of those heads of branches. In the outside service, I presume, he would have the report of the postmaster. It is the duty of the postmaster to inform himself of the efficiency of his staff and report. In the case of inspector's offices he would have the report of the inspector ; and in the case of the railway mail clerks, the report of the controller, I suppose. He in turn will get the advice of the local superintendents of the railway mail service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the usual way in which the vote is passed, waiting for a report to be made at a subsequent date ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. That has always been the practice, I am informed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Pass the vote in general form without stating how many persons are entitled to it ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The usual practice has been to provide for everybody and then get reports.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be the practice in the hon. gentleman's department, but it certainly is not the practice in other departments. The minister usually comes down with his estimates and says : I propose to recommend an increase to certain persons whose names are given, and if necessary I will ask the House to appropriate a sum of money for that purpose. I do not see why a different principle should prevail in the Post Office Department, and I do not see any reason why the officers of the hon. gentleman's department cannot make up their report.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. We cannot do that until the years' services has expired.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see that that has anything to do with it.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know about other departments.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, if a method of this kind is not necessary in other departments why is it necessary in the hon. gentleman's department ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. These estimates were prepared before Christmas.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They may have been prepared two years ago, but they are presented to the House now, and we are asked to deal with them now. When the hon. gentleman comes down with his estimates he should be prepared with the report of his officers as to those whom he proposes to recommend for increases. I do not think it is a very good practice to ask parliament to vote a general sum in this way subject to a further recommendation. We can have nothing to say about it at present. We do not know what is going to happen in the future. If the hon. gentleman would name a particular individual we would know from him as to what the report was, and we would know something as to the length of the officer's service. We cannot know that very well when we have an appropriation in this general form.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not know what the practice is in the other departments, but I cannot myself understand how an officer could give a report as to a person entitled to an increase until the year of his service had expired. When, as a result of the year's service you can tell from his efficiency and fidelity whether or not he is deserving of the increase. To-day, no officer can report whether A B of this department would be entitled to an increase in July. There is a month and a half's time yet to expire. He might disqualify himself in the meantime and therefore the report for the whole period can only be made after the lapse of this time. We cannot anticipate how the service will be performed before the end of the fiscal year. This seems to be the common sense system. If there is a different system I think it ought to give way to one like this because we cannot give a certificate until we come to the conclusion that the officer is entitled to promotion.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General an instance in the North-west Territories, where I think there is fair ground for asking for increased postal facilities. The Pasqua branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which runs from Moose Jaw to North Portal on the boundary line, is a part of the Soo railway line, the greater portion of which is in the United States. There is a first class daily train service each way on that line and has been for eight or nine years past, but up to the present time there has never been a mail car put on the trains running on that line of railway. Until within perhaps a couple of years this has not caused

any grievance, because, on the Canadian part of the line, there was not a very large population, but within the past three years, and within the past two years particularly, a very considerable immigration has been coming into that particular district chiefly from the United States, and there are now some eight or nine considerable towns between Moose Jaw and North Portal. The hon. Postmaster General will remember that some time during the past winter an application came into the department from Milestone, asking the privilege of a daily mail from the train each way; that is to say a double daily mail. The application came from the representatives of a very large American Land and Immigration Company which had established offices at the town of Milestone, and this company found that it was put to considerable inconvenience owing to the lack of the facilities which it asked. For instance, a letter posted at Milestone, addressed to the company's general offices in the United States, had to go first west of Moosejaw and then back towards its destination. I think there is good reason for asking now that additional facilities be furnished to the people of these towns by placing a mail car and a regular mail clerk on that branch railway.

Mr. KENDREY. Before that item is passed, I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General a matter in reference to the post office in the town of Peterborough. The Postmaster, I understand, from the 1st of July is to be reduced in salary from $2,000 to $1,750. I also understand the salaries of the assistant postmaster and some of the subordinates are to be increased. The revenue of the post office in Peterborough has increased at the rate of about $1,000 a year, the work has increased with this increase in revenue and I would like to ask the hon. Postmaster General on what principle he makes this reduction in the salary of the postmaster at Peterborough.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Whilst there is no absolute equality in the salaries of postmasters there is an effort as nearly as possible to bring post offices of this character under the same conditions. The postmaster of Peterborough, I have noticed, has a salary which is exceptionally high, as compared with the salaries of postmasters in other offices of the same character. I think that as a rule postmasters in offices of that importance do not receive $2,000 a year. Speaking from memory, I think I would be safe in saying that the postmaster at Owen Sound, which is a town perhaps almost equal in importance to Peterborough, but probably the responsibilities of the office are equally great, the postmaster at Berlin, which is another town of that character and of Brantford do not get as much as the postmaster at Peterborough. I do not think the postmaster at Brantford gets $2,000 a year. In fact, the salary of the present postmaster at Peterborough is exceptionally high as compared with the salaries of postmasters in similar towns. I think there is one other town where the postmaster has a salary equal to that of the postmaster at Peterborough, but perhaps that will have to be looked into. It is not finally decided to carry out that arrangement. Mr. Edwards, of Peterborough, has brought the matter to my attention and has written a very lengthy memorial on the subject. I propose to look into it carefully and to endeavour to prevent any injustice, but you will find that it is a little difficult to defend giving a postmaster $2,000 a year and not much more to half a dozen others. Of course, the postmaster occupies a more responsible position, but at the same time there should be some reasonable relation between the salaries.

Mr. KENDREY. The reason that I bring this matter up is that in the office in Peterborough the work has been increasing from year to year and the hon. Postmaster General knows that the revenue from that office is increasing at the rate of about $1,000 a year. It does seem to me that so far as the postmaster at Peterborough is concerned, the responsibilities of the office are greater than those in many other cities and that it would be unfair to reduce the salary of the postmaster in order to raise the salary of the assistant postmaster and the subordinates on account of the work which has to be done there. It seems to be unreasonable because I can compare Peterborough with Belleville. Our revenue was very large and I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that while the revenue has been increasing the work has been increasing. I understood some time ago that the salary of the postmaster was to remain at $2,000. I do not think that the Postmaster General intends to do anything that is unreasonable, and I hope he will not do an injustice in this case.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the salary of the Belleville postmaster is a good deal less than $1,750.

Mr. KENDREY. I understand that the postmaster of Belleville pays his own subordinates and that in Peterborough the subordinates are paid by the government.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the same principle applies in each case. There is a sum of money set apart to meet the salaries of all the staff, and instead of the postmaster hiring his staff and paying them as formerly, he is limited to a certain amount in regard to his own salary, and the remainder must be apportioned amongst the staff.

Mr. KENDREY. I understand that the postmaster in Peterborough has a salary of $2,000, and the staff are paid by the gov-

ernment, while in Belleville the postmaster has a lump sum and he hires the help in the offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I think the arrangement is precisely the same in the two places. When there is a vacancy in the post office the postmaster reports it to Ottawa and then the department calls upon our friends in the district to recommend a suitable person, and that name is submitted to the postmaster for his approval. No person is forced upon the postmaster, and he can veto the recommendation. The money set apart for the maintenance of each office is divided by the government and a certain amount is fixed for the postmaster and the amount assigned to the members of the staff goes to them.

Mr. KENDREY. Do I understand that the Postmaster General has recommended that the salary of the postmaster of Peterborough shall be reduced from $2,000 a year to $1,750, and that the $250 taken off his salary shall be distributed amongst the employees.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Nothing has been done in that way. The postmaster's salary is one thing and the salaries of the staff another. There may be an increase in the salaries of the staff, and there may be a reduction in the salary of the postmaster.

Mr. KENDREY. Has the postmaster of Peterborough been notified that on the 1st July his salary will be reduced to $1,750 ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. It was in contemplation and he may have been so notified. Mr. E. B. Edwards, of Peterborough, called upon me and asked me to reconsider the matter, and I requested him to put his views in writing. My secretary, I think, told me that a lengthy communication covering a good many pages of foolscap has come from Mr. Edwards, and I have deferred the pleasure of reading it until after prorogation.

Mr. KENDREY. Has the notification been sent to the postmaster ?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Probably he has been notified, but I have told Mr. Edwards that I will reconsider it.

Mr. KENDREY. All right.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I wish to say a few words in defence of the Postmaster General who has evidently been wronged by some of his friends. The hon. gentleman stated a few moments ago that he was endeavouring to regulate the post offices throughout the Dominion on some principle. I am perfectly prepared to accept the hon. gentleman's word, but I would point out to him that so far, the Belleville post office has not been treated by his department on any principle. Before the advent of the Postmaster General to power, Belleville was a city post office and had a postmaster under the Civil Service Act. Envious people, without any grounds whatever tried to get that postmaster removed from his position. Attack after attack was made on him and in fact he almost lost his position on the ground that he had driven a voter to the polls during my last election, but on inquiry it was found that the voter he had driven was a warm supporter of the Liberal party. When it was impossible to secure his removal with the consent of His Excellency, Belleville was reduced to the status of a country post office for the sole purpose, it is said, of getting rid of the postmaster. It is now announced by the Postmaster General that he desires to apply the principle, and desires to act fairly. Every one will be pleased to hear that, because the fact remains that of all the cities in Canada, Belleville is the only one reduced, while other offices with less revenue and greater expenditure are not interfered with. The fact remains that there are men in the States drawing superannuation allowances while others are filling their places at the salaries the gentlemen who were superannuated were willing to work for. I am sure that the Postmaster General must intend to apply the principle to which he has just referred, or otherwise he would not have spoken of it. I would call his attention in all humility to the Belleville post office and ask him to apply precisely the same principle to that office that he has expressed his intention of applying to every other post office in this country. If the hon. gentleman keeps his word he will restore Belleville to the list of city post offices, and see that the country is not burdended by having to pay to some persons superannuation allowances while others are drawing salaries for doing the same work.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. The changes in the Belleville post office were deliberately made on my own judgment without advice from any one else. Belleville was on a city basis, as it is called, and if it had remained on that basis, the expenditure on the staff would to-day probably have attained to $10,000 a year. I do not wish to be held bound by the figures I now mention, because they may be slightly incorrect; but my recollection is that up to the time it was moved from a city basis the salaries had attained to $8,000 or $9,000 a year. The expenses of that office were out of all proportion to the revenue. With the exception of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, I think there was no city office in Canada having so small a revenue as Belleville. Therefore, I removed Belleville from the city basis for the purposes of economy and to prevent an abuse. My hon. friend is wholly in error in suggesting that the public is under anything like as great expense now, even including the superannuations, as it would have been had Belleville been left on the city basis. I think

the reduction in the expense of the office was not less than $4,000. With regard to the question of my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), with reference to an increased mail service on a branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I can only say that the matter will be carefully looked into.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I accept with pleasure the statement made by the hon. Postmaster General, and I presume that if I can show him that there are other cities in this country whose returns are less satisfactory compared with the expenditure than those of Belleville, he will either reduce those offices to a basis of country post offices, or restore Belleville to the list of city offices.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. I do not wish to enter into any controversy with my hon. friend. I said that at the time Belleville was reduced, it made a worse showing than any other city in Canada, except Charlottetown; but the latter, being a seat of government, I felt was entitled to a little different treatment.

Mr. NORTHRUP. It is not a question of controversy with me. I am merely asking the hon. Postmaster General to apply the principle which he himself stated in this House a short time ago it was his intention to apply, not only to Belleville, but to other places; and as he gives certain reasons why Belleville has been reduced, I take for granted that if those reasons are proven to be erroneous, he will do justice, and restore Belleville to the list of city offices. That is all I ask.

Mr. KENDREY. I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General to the fact that the town of Peterborough, though it has only a town post office, has a revenue of $21,000 as against $14,000 of revenue in Belleville.

Militia, $500,000.

Mr. MONK. Has the hon. Minister of Militia given any thought to the claim of Joseph Larose referred to during the present session, to whom he said he thought it would be possible to grant the indemnity voted some years ago?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. Yes, we have undertaken to pay that amount.

Halifax provisional garrison, $315,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I brought to the attention of the hon. minister last session the case of Private Sievert, of Halifax, who fell at the charge of Paardeburg. I have had some inquiry from relatives of the young man, and I wish to ask the hon. minister if he is able to tell me anything with reference to the position of that matter?

The MINISTER OF MILITIA AND DEFENCE. I think it was with reference to the granting of the Victoria Cross. I may say that I brought the matter to the attention of the imperial authorities through His Excellency the Governor General, but have been unable to accomplish the object, so that the matter remains in precisely the same position that it was in before. There seemed to be some difficulty as to the chain of evidence with regard to the alleged action of Private Sievert, which the War Office seemed to consider was necessary, and it was not forthcoming

To provide for engraving, lithographing, printing, &c., to bring out maps of work already done..	$ 9,000 00
To provide for the salary of a geologist to the International Boundary Survey from July 1, 1902, to July 30, 1903....	2,000 00
	$11,000 00

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why was not the general item brought down in the main estimates?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We brought down the usual vote, and Dr. Bell said that in order to keep up with the work we required an additional amount. The mapping of the geological survey has been behind for years, and I have been making strong efforts to try and get out the general geological map. I hope the map will be got out this summer.

Mr. POPE. If it were not so late in the session, the subject of the geological survey would be worthy of discussion. Considering the great resources of this country, the exhibition we have in the building of the geological survey and the limited information which it is possible to get there, is a shame and a disgrace. I take this opportunity of placing myself on record as having voiced my opinion with regard to this subject.

Government of the North-west Territories—Further amount required for schools, clerical assistance, printing, &c., to be paid half yearly in advance, $100,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems extraordinary that a large sum like this was not brought down in the main estimates. Why is it brought down so late?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Some little time ago we had a lengthy discussion in Supply on the necessity of increasing the subsidies to the North-west Territories. We had practically made up our minds to give some increase but had not decided what it should be, and in the light of that discussion, we made up our minds to give $100,000. This $100,000 represents an increase in the subsidies referred to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am inclined to think that the amount previously granted was very meagre, and from the discussion which took place I think this amount might very reasonably be voted.

Mr. SCOTT. Without doubt, Mr. Chairman, this item shows what a difference is made by the point of view. Ordinarily an amount of $100,000 appears very large to me, but in this particular instance the amount does not impress me at all in the same way.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking absolutely and not relatively.

Yukon public buildings---Rents, heating, &c., $25,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the session were not so far advanced and the hour not so late, I would like to say something about the terms of the concession granted by this government, known as the Treadgold concession. The terms were not submitted to this House at the opening of the session as they should have been. Whether or not they were required to be so submitted by any statute or regulation, the interests dealt with were so large that I think the government should have brought the papers down and have had them printed earlier in the session, for the purpose of informing the House as to the nature of that concession. That was not done. We did not get them until a date at which the government, in consequence of representations made to them from the Yukon, had themselves come to the conclusion that the terms on which that concession was granted in the first instance were not such as should be continued. But it does seem to me that that contract must have been entered into by the government in a very hurried way and without much consideration. To illustrate, I might mention the fact that the miners were to be charged at the rate of $1 per inch for the water supply and this was afterwards reduced to 25 cents an inch. I do not know the provisions of the later Order in Council with regard to this. Looking over it to-day, I could not see any provision on the subject at all. Some communications which I have had from the Yukon Territory indicate that the dissatisfaction with the conditions of the contract as at first framed was very strong, and was not confined to those who are opposed to this government, but was widespread and was felt as strongly and deeply among gentlemen who otherwise approved the policy of this government, as among their opponents. It seems to me, so far as I have been able to consider it, to give a monopoly in the Yukon which will be very valuable to the gentlemen who receive it, and will probably—if we may rely upon statements made by the press of the Yukon and by a great many men interested in that country—prove very detrimental to the miners there for a long time to come. In addition to this monopoly, the men who have obtained the concession have rights which are very much more valuable, so far as I can understand the situation, than those which can be obtained by ordinary miners in the district. For example, what is called the necessity of representation or something of that kind was dispensed with in the first concession so far as these men were concerned. I do not know whether or not that still continues. The effect, as I understand it, was that persons who obtained that concession were not obliged to perform the work of development or pay the annual sum which was necessary on the part of other miners. But these are only a few of the circumstances to which my attention has been directed with regard to this concession. I think it would have been better if the government had submitted a proposition of that kind to parliament before entering into the contract. But putting that aside, there can be no doubt that the terms should have been brought down to the House in the early part of the session so that discussion could be held for which opportunity up to the present time has not offered.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I admit that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has some ground for finding fault because the Order in Council was not laid before parliament sooner. But, as my hon. friend knows, I was away, being in ill health, and even when I returned, I was not able to give attention to the House for some days. The papers were prepared as soon as the motion was made for them and they were brought down. I can assure the hon. gentleman that whatever questions may have arisen, whatever difference of opinion there may have been as to the government's action, that action was not taken in haste. The whole subject has given the government a great deal of consideration, and anxious consideration, in order to bring about the best results. A question which has not yet been realized in regard to the development of the mining ground of the Yukon Territory as completely as it will be realized is the question of the water supply. So long as the rich pockets upon the creeks now well known continue to be worked, the effects of the lack of a proper water supply are not likely to be seriously felt. But as soon as these beds begin to be exhausted—and we are getting pretty near to that now—the difficulty about the water supply will press for attention. There is an enormous quantity of gravel of a much lower grade than the miners have been heretofore operating upon which it will be necessary to work if that portion of the country which is producing the largest quantity of gold is to be kept up to its present position. It was the desire of the government to secure the inauguration of some scheme whereby water would be brought in on a large scale, and, to do that we felt that it would be justifiable and proper in the interest of the country that pretty liberal privileges and concessions should be given to those who engaged in that enterprise. If the scheme as originally contemplated had been carried out, the expenditure involved

would have been $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. It was thought that all the water would have to be pumped from the Yukon river. But subsequently the promoters came to the conclusion that water could be got from a stream called Rock creek and brought by gravitation, reducing the cost of operating considerably, though, perhaps not the cost of putting in the plant. Under that arrangement, the corporations were bound to introduce certain quantities of water under certain conditions and supply it to the miners. The dissatisfaction which arose, I think arose owing to the changed conditions as time went on and the matter was further considered. If, when the contract was first entertained, the proposition had been promulgated I do not think there would have been any opposition. But the condition of affairs had changed. Gold in paying quantities was found in some of the abandoned claims though not to the same extent that the newspapers would lead us to believe, and there was a disposition on the part of those who had no mining claims to take these abandoned claims. My own opinion is that the abandoned claims were probably of no great value, but it is hard to tell with certainty. The change was of such a character as to demand consideration. Mr. Ross, the commisssioner of the Yukon, was here on other business, and Mr. Treadgold, representing the promoters, was here and we endeavored to remove the objections. Under the second Order in Council the plan was passed so that, while many of the privileges given to the promoters are surrendered, the obligation on the part of the promoters to deliver water is removed and it is left practically in the shape of a voluntary enterprise. I still have strong hopes that this arrangement will be successfully carried out and that it will result in the production of an enormous amount of gold from places where at present it cannot be produced at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to know whether the concession in this amended form is meeting with any opposition in the Yukon at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think so. Mr. Ross informed me that the delegates who had been sent from Dawson had seen the amended Order in Council, and agreed that it would be perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to the abandoned claims, the information I have would show that in many cases those claims afterwards proved to be very valuable. Another objection that was brought to my attention was that a scheme of this kind was not required in the Yukon at the present time because it could not be properly carried out until the lower levels had been more thoroughly worked. As I understand it the operation of a scheme of that kind would prevent the working of the lower levels. Am I correct in that ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is one other circumstance I would like to mention. There was a memorial of some kind presented to the minister by a number of miners. I saw a copy of that printed in the public press. I would like to know whether the amended Order in Council meets the objections, either wholly or partially, which were made by the miners in this memorial ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. To all intents and purposes I think I can say that it does. I went over the memorial with the delegates, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sugrue. Mr. Wilson was one of the elected members of the Yukon council, and Mr. Sugrue was a newspaper man. I went over the memorial with them, and they agreed that the Order in Council in its amended form substantially met their objections. Possibly some of the abandoned claims may turn out to be very valuable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As it may be necessary to discuss this subject on some other occasion when we have more time, possibly at another session, and as we have not much knowledge of these objections or conditions, perhaps the hon. gentleman would be willing to bring down this memorial and have it laid on the Table of the House and printed.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Any papers whatever which the hon. gentleman suggests.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The only one I have in my mind is this memorial of which we have been speaking. Are there any others ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I gave instructions that all the papers should be brought down. If there are any papers in the department other than those already brought down, I will lay them on the Table of the House at the beginning of next session, or if possible before this session closes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The memorial I speak of is one of recent date, about two weeks ago.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think my hon. friend must have seen something printed which was sent down a good while ago. There has been nothing lately.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not want to detain the committee, but while other business is being proceeded with I will get a copy of what I have and submit it to the Minister of the Interior. I think it will be found it is somewhat later in date than he supposes.

Dominion lands—Chargeable to capital—further amount required for surveys, $100,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you going to do extensive surveys this year ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. This amount was made up by an exact detailed estimate from the surveyor general, giving the locality where each survey party is going, and the exact cost. Each party costs on the average $5,000. We are getting a considerable portion of the work done by contract now. We found it was necessary to do so, because the work done by day costs very much more. There are sections where day work may be preferable, but the surveyor general has to exercise his own judgment about that.

Additional amount required for museum building at Banff, N.W.T., $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are putting up a new building here. As first estimated it was to cost $5,000. Subsequently the superintendent submitted plans to me, and after consideration we decided it would be advisable to make the building larger, and we are making the total cost $8,000. That is not a large sum for a building in a place like Banff Park. It will be of rustic style with a reading room and museum.

Further sum required for boundary surveys, $10,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How are you geting on with the boundary survey ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work that is contemplated during the coming year will involve an expenditure of $41,000, including this $10,000. There is the survey by Mr. J. D. McArthur, of the 49th parallel in the province of British Columbia, and the surveys of J. O'Hara, of the 49th parallel, along the Columbia river in the province of British Columbia. Then, there is the survey of the boundary between Canada and New York State for the purpose of setting some new monuments and of replacing monuments which have been destroyed or moved. Then, there are the expenses of four or five of the officers of the chief astronomer's department who are engaged in determining the longitude in different parts of the country, the time service at Ottawa and the expenses of the men who go out with these different parties to which I have referred. The estimate which was made up by the chief astronomer amounts to $41,000, $31,000 in the main estimates and this additional $10,000 that we are now voting.

Mr. SPROULE. In your survey in British Columbia and the territories, you are carrying on the work jointly with the American surveyors, are you not ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The work is being carried on under an arrangement with the United States government. They have a party and we have a party. They co-operate with each other, they collaborate their work and check it over together.

Mr. KEMP. Are the surveyors engaged upon the New York boundary working in the province of Quebec ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It will have to be in the province of Quebec.

Mr. KEMP. Would that not include the boundary between Canada and the state of Vermont and New Hampshire as well ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not at this moment remember whether the marks have been obliterated so far east as that, but the arrangement is that they shall go over the boundary line and wherever it is necessary re-survey and place the marks where they have been obliterated.

Expenses and salaries connected with the commission appointed to inquire into the half-breed claims in the North-west Territories, $3,000.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The commission will complete their sittings on the 1st of July, and this is to pay the clerks who are winding up the work finally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the commission doing ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. They are adjudicating upon claims for half-breed scrip. This has been going on for the last couple of years. Mr. McKenna. the commissioner, is now in Winnipeg and he expects to get the matter closed up by the 1st of July. He has two or three clerks doing the clerical work there. This is for the purpose of paying them.

Engraving, lithographing, and printing maps of the Dominion and the North-west Territories, $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you getting out a new lot of maps ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We are getting out what I hope and trust will be a first class map of the Dominion of Canada, the only first class map that has ever been got out. The Geographical Department have spent a vast amount of time and taken a great deal of trouble to make it correct. The map will be 8½ feet long by 5 feet wide. It will be engraved on copper, and I think it will be a thoroughly first class production and the best workmanship that it is possible to get out in Canada. There is a firm in Toronto that does engraving on copper and it is capable of doing first class work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a good deal of the country still unsurveyed. I think there is a paper by the late Dr. Dawson, director of the geological survey, which gives a full statement with regard to the unsurveyed country. In respect to further

surveys, while I am not disposed to urge undue expenditures on any of these matters——

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. Without prejudice ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mulock) desires me to discuss that again I will be very glad to do it. If I may be permitted to observe, I think that particular country might be surveyed and very much less of a debt piled up in this country if due regard were had to the public interest in the expenditure of public money by the government of which the hon. gentleman is a member. I would say that as far as is consistent with due regard to economy those portions of the country which are referred to by the late Dr. Dawson should be looked after in the early future. You cannot have an accurate map of the Dominion of Canada without proceeding with these surveys, and while I hope that the hon. gentleman will bring down the best map that we can have at the present time, it will not be a very accurate map as far as these particular portions of the country are concerned.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I apprehend that it will be a great many years before we can bring down a map that will be accurate as to all parts of Canada, but there are a great many portions of the Dominion in regard to which it is now possible to give information which it was not possible to give some few years ago. The method of surveying by photography has rendered it possible to secure a large amount of topographical information at comparatively small expense which a few years ago would have been absolutely impossible. The survey of the Alaskan boundary was carried on by the photographic method which is a development of modern surveying and for which I believe our own surveyor general, Captain Deville, deserves the greatest amount of credit. We have of late years been able to get a large amount of topographical information, which, under the old system, it would have been impossible to get, and it would have cost an enormous sum of money and a tremendous amount of time and work to have got that information. We purpose having an accurate map made, as accurate, as the present information will enable us to make it. There has heretofore been neglect in not getting out a first class map of the Dominion, but I am satisfied that when the members of the House see that map they will be satisfied with it.

Mr. SPROULE. When will the map be issued ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The geographer told me he hoped it would be out inside of a month. It is my intention to send a copy to each member of the House of Commons and of the Senate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. SPROULE. I hope it will not contain any mistakes like those in the Ontario school books, where the High School Geography says that the population of Winnipeg is 28,000, while the common school geography gives it correctly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before we leave the Department of the Interior I may say that I have found the document to which I referred a moment ago. It is dated the 15th of April and would have been received only very recently.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have not received it yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a document signed by a long list of names, and they set out the objections which the miners have to this concession. Of course they are dealing with it in its original form and what I wanted to know from the minister was whether the concession in its amended form met the objections set forth in this memorial.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. If my hon. friend will let me have a copy of it I will have the question answered.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would suggest to the minister that he would bring the memorial down so that we may have it printed. It is perhaps impossible that we can discuss it with any thoroughness this session, but we may want to do so at some other time and it would be convenient to have the document printed.

Additional plant for Printing Bureau, $7,500.

Mr. SPROULE. We were promised information as to the amount of printing that was done for each department outside of the Bureau.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I called the attention of the officials to 'Hansard' containing the hon. gentleman's remark and I have been furnished with the following memo. on the subject :

How much printing was done outside ?

The amounts for the last fiscal year are given in the Auditor General's last report—Part B, pp. 1-6, in the second column. The amounts for engraving and lithography are, however, included. The amounts for printing separately are as follows by departments :

Interior....	$47,327 69
Intercolonial Railway..	61,193 37
Agriculture....	34,241 68
Reports—Legislation..	11,999 53
	$154,762 27

The details of these amounts are given in the Auditor General's last report at the following places :—

Part L, pp. 18, 46.
Part W, pp. 150, 207.
Part D, pp. 88, 19.
Part T, pp. 58, 59, 64, 67, 62.

The number of hands in the Printing Bureau is 446.

I have been informed that all the reports for the present session have been printed at the Bureau and that during the current year the outside work is chiefly binding and press work and mostly in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not quite the information I asked for. If we had sufficient time we could go through the Auditor General's report ourselves.

Department of Marine and Fisheries, $8,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to refer to a statement made in the House by the Minister of Justice while I was absent the other night. In connection with this settlement of the Noble Bros. claim, the Minister of Justice made the following statement :

I have not looked into the matter very fully. According to the report, the whole proceedings were the result of a conspiracy started by this man Elliott. The learned judge finds that the fishery overseer deliberately plotted to bring about the ruin of the Nobles in accordance with threats which he had previously made to outside parties.

I want to say, with reference to that, that I know the Nobles and Mr. Elliott and all the parties concerned, and there is not, in my judgment, one solitary word of truth in that statement.

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. I say so, and I am in a better position to know than the hon. minister or the hon. gentleman who interrupts me. I was here in the department at the very time and heard Mr. Noble declare to the minister that they were not violating the law in any way; and within five minutes of the time that statement was made a telegram was laid down on the Table giving the information that the fishery inspector had seized those boats, because they were fishing illegally. I have this to say with regard to the fishery inspector. I have known him since childhood, I believe him to be an intelligent, respectable truthful and honourable man, who would be above entering into a conspiracy to injure any one carrying on work up there; and I think I know the source from whence that statement comes; and it comes with very bad grace from the parties who gave that information to the hon. Minister of Justice. If he knew the parties and the facts as well as he should, he would never have made the statement he did in the House of Commons against the fishery overseer who was doing what the department instructed him to do, and what any overseer ought to do. He reported the result to the department, and the department handled the case after that. Therefore it was out of his hands. If any injustice was done to the Nobles, it was done by the minister in charge of the department, and not by the overseer; and a statement of this kind in the House of Commons, traducing a respectable man's character, does not come with very good grace from the hon. Minister of Justice, unless he makes sure that the statement is absolutely correct. When the overseer endeavoured to stop that illegal fishing, he was dealing with a crew who had been practically outlaws on the Georgian Bay for years; and he did what he was instructed to do by the minister, and reported the result, after which it was out of his hands. To say that it was a conspiracy is to do a great injustice to the overseer, and it is not waranted by the facts.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—To provide for the salary of Mr. R. E. Tyrwhitt, technical officer in the hydrographic survey, $900.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This was not voted before ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No. This is a young man who was appointed temporarily some years ago. He has proved to be a very good officer, and this is to appoint him permanently.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL. He is a son of an old member of this House, and a very deserving officer.

Amount required to pay balance of contract for steamer to replace 'Newfield,' $93,570.

Mr. SPROULE. What did the steamer cost ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The total cost is $193,570.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where was she purchased ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. At Paisley, Scotland. We advertised for tenders, and the contract was let to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this steamer now in use ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Oh, no. She will not be here for perhaps two months. We shall have to send a crew to bring her over. She will be used on the coasts of Nova Scotia.

To provide for the furnishing, outfitting, disbursements and cost of sending crew to Scotland for steamers under construction in Paisley, $25,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose this sum is arrived at on some estimate of the hon. minister's officers ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes. This is to cover the cost of bringing out both of the new steamers. One is to be launched in a couple of weeks. We expect a cable almost any minute notifying us to send a crew over. I made careful inquiry of the officers of the department, and they say that from past experience this is the most economical and satisfactory way of bringing the boats out.

Further amount required for building and maintenance of fish breeding establishments and lobster hatcheries, $27,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the hatchery in Georgian Bay included in this ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. We have called a conference of the provincial governments to meet the Dominion government here on the 20th instant, when the whole matter of jurisdiction with regard to the fisheries will be considered. If settled satisfactorily, this work will be gone on with, but we will first get all the information possible with regard to the results of the various hatcheries in our own country as well as some of the United States and other places. My intention is out of this vote to establish a hatchery in Ontario, but where it will be established will have to depend somewhat on the report of the officers in the fishery branch as to what is the best locality. In Quebec they want a salmon-trout hatchery. In New Brunswick the experiment at Pictou of the lobster hatchery has been very satisfactory, and we may establish two small hatcheries there. The opinion of the inspector, who is a particularly good man, is that it would be greatly in the interests of the lobster industry if the hatcheries were established.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister was not perfectly frank when he referred to the matter before. He gave me to understand that in the supplementary estimates I would find an item for the purpose of establishing a fish hatchery in Georgian Bay. Now he says that he will await the result of the conference and then decide on the best places to put hatcheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I did not intend to mislead the hon. gentleman. I thought he wanted the name of the particular locality on the bay.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister neither admits that it is to be on the bay at all nor in any particular place in the bay. I referred to the advantages of the locality. I understood him to say that the government had been considering the matter and it was the intention to establish one there and that when the supplementary estimates came down, he hoped hon. gentlemen who were interested in the matter would be satisfied.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. This does include a sufficient amount, according to the estimates given me by the officers, for the establishment of a fish hatchery on Georgian Bay, as well as the others I referred to. As regards the conference, I meant to give the impression to the House that upon the result of it would probably depend whether or not this money would be spent. If the result is that the fisheries revenue and the full control are handed over to the provinces, why, I suppose, the provinces will look after the hatcheries. But if the position is, as I hope it will be, that they will be left to the jurisdiction of the Dominion, either by amicable arrangement or after reference to the courts, then my intention is to spend this money as I have indicated.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. Does the hon. minister mean to pass by Prince Edward Island ? We expected a hatchery.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It was not the intention to pass by Prince Edward Island. I have caused inquiries to be made, but the report has not been yet received to warrant me in saying at the present time that this season we will establish a hatchery there. But if the decision of the conference is satisfactory and the report is satisfactory, that work will be carried out.

Mr. SPROULE. That, I take to mean, that if the fisheries are left within the jurisdiction of the Dominion government, they will establish these hatcheries. But the hon. gentleman does not tell us where these hatcheries are to be or how many. In fact he gives us no information about that question whatever.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I do not know what more information I could give than I have already given. I have stated that this amount was intended for the purpose of establishing hatcheries, one in Ontario, one in Nova Scotia, two in New Brunswick and one in Prince Edward Island. But I shall certainly only spend the money on being satisfied that the localities are suitable for the purpose. And I informed my hon. friend—and that is all I could have said before—that I am taking this vote with the expectation that the officers of the department, after investigation, will submit a report as to the most suitable places in the several provinces.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has there not been time since last year to find all this out ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No vote was taken last year.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why are the legal expenses of arbitration delayed so long?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The matter was brought to my attention a month or two ago by some of the solicitors connected with the matter. I communicated with the Hon. Edward Blake, who was acting for the Dominion government. If my memory serves me well, the arbitrator appointed died and a delay took place. And now we have had a report from Mr. Blake with his opinion with regard to the matter and that has been submitted to the solicitor interested in this case. So, it depends on them what progress is made.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the position of the arbitration itself ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. It is in statu quo. I have sent a copy of the opinion of Mr. Blake to the parties interested, and it is for them to take the next action. I believe another arbitrator has been appointed by Great Britain.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There has been really nothing done.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Except what I have stated.

Excise—Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, &c., further amount required, $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is this further amount required ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. (Hon. M. E. Bernier). Owing to licensing of new establishments, the expenditure for travelling, &c., is increasing. The expenditure for the first eight months of current fiscal year has been at the rate of a little over $57,000 per annum. The vote in the main estimates is now $50,000. The revenue for the past ten months has exceeded that of the same period of the last fiscal year by over $680,000.

Excise — Weights and measures — Further amount required for the purchase of standards of the metric system of weights and measures and to pay the salaries, travelling and other expenses of inspectors, &c., $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is this further amount required ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Last year the department procured five sets of metric weights to be placed in the hands of inspectors of weights and measures at the most important centres, viz : Montreal, Quebec, Hamilton, St. Johns and Winnipeg. The cost of these five sets was $336.20. The department now purposes securing and distributing to the same inspectors five sets of measures of length and capacity at an estimated cost of $2,000. It has become necessary that the department should appoint, or promote, from the service, a chief inspector of weights and measures at an estimated salary of say $2,500. The travelling and other expenses of said chief inspector in connection with the instruction of subordinate officers as respect the metric system and to bring about a more uniform inspection throughout the Dominion, it is estimated will cost $2,000. To provide for a provisional allowance for the inspector to be appointed in the Yukon, $1,800. In the main estimates $1,500 was provided for the salary of an inspector for the Yukon, but no special provision was made for extra cost of living. The salary estimated at $1,500 may be exceeded, as it is difficult to secure a competent man at this salary to undertake the work, more particularly as he would be required to act as inspector of electric light without additional compensation therefor.

The department has expended up to this date the sum of $1,642.57 for model metric sets which have been distributed to universities, colleges, high schools, seminaries and to various boards of trade. There is an item of $500 in the main estimates for a further supply of these sets, but I am of the opinion, from present requests still unfilled, that possibly a further sum of $500 may have to be expended for this purpose. It is believed that the distribution of these metric sets is bringing about a good understanding of the metric system amongst the pupils of our educational institutions and that the money expended thereon is well spent. Each set costs $7.79.

The estimate of the expenditure of this sum of $10,000 is practically as follows :

Five standard sets of length and capacity	$2,000
Salary of chief inspector	2,500
Travelling and other expenses	2.000
Provisional allowance for inspector in Yukon	1,800
Additional model metric sets say	500
Unforeseen expenditure	1,200
	$10,000

Mr. SPROULE. Is it the intention to introduce the metric system generally ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I suppose we shall have to follow the example of England and the United States, and we are preparing to do so by distributing these metric systems throughout the schools of our country. At present the system is optional, but perhaps within a year or two we will have to make it the legal standard for the whole country. So we are affording the means of teaching our inspectors throughout the Dominion how to inspect these measures of weight and length. We have already been requested by some people in the trade to inspect measures of the metric system. We must therefore have a standard of the same nature, and we need at least one, or two, or three of our officers to be competent and ready to inspect these measures. The system being optional now, every merchant or trader can use the metric system if he chooses. We recognise the fact that within a short time we shall have to adopt the metric system. There are already, if I am not mistaken, two or three Bills before the American Congress to adopt this system, bringing it into force gradually.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is a mistake to have two systems of weights and measures in the country. It is not many years ago since we spent over $20,000 to purchase standard weights and measures for general use. I understand the minister to say that this system is an optional one. I think it would be wise for the government to decide whether they intend to introduce it in the future or not.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There are not two systems at present in use, for while one is only permissive, the other is a compulsory and legal one. I am not in a position now to state what I shall do with regard to the adoption of the metric system.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the opinion of the government ?

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I do not think the government has formed any idea with regard to that subject, except that we shall be compelled to follow the example of other nations. If we wish to trade either with England, or France, or Belgium, or the United States, or Germany, we will have to use the same system of weights and measures that those countries use. I appreciate the difficulty we would have if we had in use at the same time the metric system and our present system. To introduce the metric system and make it universal would be a revolutionary measure in that branch of business. We cannot expect our people who have been long accustomed to the old system, readily to adopt the new system. Therefore we are commencing to educate them to the use of the metric system, by distributing the sets of weights and measures throughout the various educational institutions of the country. Last year we purchased fifty sets. I am receiving quite a number of requests for them, even from members of parliament, who wish to distribute them among the schools in their constituencies.

To provide for the inspection of binder twine, $2,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a usual vote ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright) introduced a Bill this session putting binder twine on the list of articles to be brought under inspection, and as the item is a new one there must be a corresponding appropriation to provide for it.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the inspector visit the various institutions where binder twine is made and the establishments of the wholesale importers as well ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think that is the intention, but I would not like to speak definitely in the absence of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. That is the object, however.

Additional for commercial agencies, including expenses in connection with negotiation of treaties, or in extension of commercial relations, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Where are these commercial agents to be appointed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is carrying out the policy announced at the opening of the session, of enlarging the scope of our agencies. I think the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has not yet determined all the places at which these agencies shall be located. There will probably be two additional agents in England and some in the colonies. The locations have not as yet been agreed upon. The item can stand, if the hon. gentleman desires it.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not want it to stand. I think it would be a good plan if you appointed a great many more commercial agents than you have. I understand that some of the business men of Toronto were down here urging that this should be done, and I would ask if the government could give any information upon the subject.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The government fully appreciate the importance of all that had been said on the subject, and in voting this amount the desire is to make a beginning. No doubt this will only be the beginning of a larger scheme and that in later years we will have to vote additional sums. I think, however, this will be sufficient to enable us to make a fairly satisfactory beginning.

Mr. SPROULE. What would be the duties of these agents ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. They will perform the general duties of commercial agents, going out into different sections of the country, interesting the people in our manufactures, and bringing to their notice the many good things that we have to offer. A good deal of work can be done in that way.

Mr. KEMP. What does the negotiation of treaties mean ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is merely the form of the old vote. It really does not mean anything in particular.

Mr. KEMP. Our agents have no right to negotiate treaties.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. No, this does not contemplate any treaty negotiations, but it is the usual form of the vote.

Steam service between Victoria, Vancouver, way ports and Skagway, $12,500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this a new appropriation ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. This is an additional appropriation. The trade in that region has been rather going away from us owing to the lack of efficient steam communication from Vancouver to Skagway. The design is to get a more efficient steam service.

Department of Agriculture—To provide for the promotion of F. C. Chittick to a first-class clerkship at $1,500, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $150.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Sometimes we are told that the whole salary must be put in where there is a promotion, as in this case.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is the difference between what is already voted in the main estimates for the same clerk and the amount which the promotion would entitle him to.

Mr. BELL. Is that not a very large sum at which to start a first class clerk ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Fourteen hundred dollars is the usual amount and he is getting $1,350 already.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I dare say that is all right but I want to understand it. I was told that the salary of a man advanced from a lower class had to be voted in that way. The hon. Minister of Agriculture is not doing it in that way. He has voted the salary of Mr. Chittick and he is providing for his promotion now to a first class clerkship. That means from a second class to a first class clerkship, does it not ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why did we not do it in the other cases ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I do not know why we did not do it in the other cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not criticising this. This seems to be all right.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. A salary of $1,350 as a second-class clerk has already been voted in the main estimates for Mr. Chittick. I wish to promote him to a first-class clerkship and give him $150 extra and therefore I have asked the committee to vote this amount. I think that when the item appears in the Bill it will appear together with the original vote as placed in the main estimates, and the two together will make up the sum which he is to receive. Why this was not done in the other cases I cannot tell.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That seems to be exactly right. That is the way I do it myself. It must be right, of course. That is not the way in which it has been done in the other departments.

To increase the salary of James O'Regan, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $100.

Mr. SPROULE. You seem to give James O'Regan a double increase.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that Mr. O'Regan has been applying for an increase of salary for a number of years. He is a very faithful and diligent officer, and I would be inclined to think that possibly no objection would be made.

Mr. SPROULE. Let it go.

Junior judge—Leeds and Grenville, $2,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the appointment been made, and if not, who is likely to be appointed ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Justice left me a note to say that the appointment is to be made, so that no one has been yet appointed.

Library of parliament, $500.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may say to the Speaker in connection with the Library, that I think it would be desirable to have more copies of the Statutes of Canada. I intended to mention the matter to Mr. Griffin, but I take the opportunity of mentioning it to the Speaker now. There is no reason why there should not be more copies of the Statutes, so that members could have them when they require them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will be glad to bring the matter to the attention of Mr. Griffin.

Mr. SPROULE. How many messengers are there in the Library ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there are four.

Experimental farms, $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is it for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to pay off an accumulation of arrearages.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The operations are not being extended, but there has been a deficit in the past.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. There has been a deficit in the past, and the wages of all the labourers on the farms have had to be increased 25 cents a day.

St. Louis and Osaka exhibitions, $175,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What preparations are being made for these exhibitions ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The preparations are only just beginning. I have had communications with regard to space and the opportunity for exhibiting at both exhibitions. The Osaka exhibition in Japan opens on the 1st of March next, and the St. Louis exhibition on the 1st of May next. The preliminary work in connection with the collection and arrangement of the exhibits is now beginning.

Mr. POPE. Do you intend to send cattle to Japan ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No.

Experimental farms, $22,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is a supplementary vote for the current year, to pay off the accumulation of arrears that has been going on for several years back.

Mr. POPE. How many past years is this supposed to cover ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The accumulation covers about three years.

Mr. POPE. Do I understand that these men have not been paid for three years ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. No, but one year has run into another, and we found this year that we had a very large arrearage to pay in the first two months of the year, which left us with a deficit at the end of the year.

Mr. POPE. This does not appear to me to be a legitimate proceeding. The minister appears to have been paying out money which he had no legitimate right to pay out.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. That has unfortunately occurred more than once in the past. Before I came into office supplementary votes of this kind were called for.

Pan-American exposition, $17,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether there are any more arrearages of this kind in his department ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. I am not aware of any except the other vote similar to this.

Paris exhibition, $2,000.

Mr. POPE. For what purpose is this money utilized ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is to pay off one or two claims for exhibits which were slightly damaged on their return. We have been discussing the validity of the claims, and it was only recently that we found that they were justified.

Quarantine—public health, $60,000.

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is due to the small-pox difficulty along the American frontier.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I oberve that recently a vessel came into Halifax with small-pox on board, and there seemed to be a great deal of difficulty as to who should take charge of the unfortunate man who was suffering from that disease. As far as I can gather, the Department of Agriculture refused to assume any responsibility, and there was a conflict between that department and the local authorities. Will the hon. minister state how that dispute was settled, and what became of the unfortunate man who was suffering from small-pox ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. The vessel to which I suppose the hon. gentleman has referenec was a fishing vessel from Lunenburg which went out to the fishing banks, where one of the crew took the small-pox, and then the vessel sailed to Halifax. The Department of Agriculture does not deal with vessels which sail from one port of Canada ta another, but only with vessels coming from foreign ports. I believe the sufferer was not a passenger but one of the crew, and I understand that he had paid his mariner's fees, and that he was taken charge of by the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I trust that the House will not find fault if I ask for a vote for taking care of this unfortunate man, because I was advised that it was not legally the duty of the department to take charge of him ; but under the circumstances, as there was a conflict between the local and the Dominion authorities, I thought it was only proper that the department should take charge of him as he had paid his mariner's dues, and I gave instructions to have him taken care of.

Quarantine—Compensation for slaughter of hogs and sheep and all other expenses connected therewith, $15,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is this the usual vote ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. This is an addition to the usual vote. The vote asked for this year is $15,000, and this is to clean up the arrearages in the same way as we have been doing in connection with the experimental farms.

Mr. SPROULE. What percentage of the slaughtered animal do you pay for ?

The MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE. When the animal is diseased—I am speaking from memory—we pay one-third ; when only in contact and liable to partake of the disease, we pay one-sixth.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—TIME OF PROROGATION.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When does the hon. minister expect to reach prorogation; to-morrow or the following day ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I suppose the hon. member means to-day or to-morrow—we are now in Wednesday. I hardly think it is possible for us to prorogue to-day, but it will depend somewhat on the progress that is made.

THE CASE OF J. M. HURLEY.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). With the permission of the House, I desire to mention this one matter briefly. When the estimates of the Marine and Fisheries Department were under consideration, the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) stated that he had some information with regard to one of the fish-

eries inspectors taking part in an election. The hon. leader of the opposition also made some remarks, and I gave my promise that I would write to the officer referred to. I wrote inclosing him a copy of the remarks of the hon. member for West Hastings, and have received his reply and also the affidavit of the party who was alleged to have been influenced by this officer to sign the protest against the hon. member. The hon. member for West Hastings has spoken about it once or twice, and if he had been present when the estimates were up I would have been pleased to lay the information before the committee. I believe this should be done, and I think every one will recognize that it is only due to the officer whose conduct has been called in question that his letter should be given. This is the letter :

Belleville, Ont., March 6, 1902.

The Hon. James Sutherland,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Hon. Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter, dated Ottawa, March 3rd, respecting the statements made by Mr. Porter, M.P. for West Hastings, that I took an active part in the recent by-election in that riding, and that I solicited the petitioner to sign the petition against him.

In reply to the first statement, I beg to say that I took no part, directly or indirectly, in the recent election contest in West Hastings, nor did I ask any man to vote or not to vote. I may say further that I did not attend any meeting, either public or private.

With regard to the second statement made by Mr. Porter, I beg to say that I did not solicit the petitioner to sign the petition against him, nor did I ask any one else to sign it nor did any one consult me about signing the petition.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,
J. M. HURLEY,
Fishery Officer.

The following is the affidavit of the party referred to :

In the matter of the West Hastings Dominion by-election.

I, Cornellius Mullins, of the city of Belleville, in the county of Hastings, sailor, make oath and say :—

1. That I am the person whose name is signed to the petition filed herein against the return of Mr. E. Guss Porter, as member for the West riding of Hastings.

2. That I have been advised and believe that certain charges have been made against Mr. J. M. Hurley, Inspector of Fisheries, to the effect that it was by his inducement and representations, I was prevailed upon to sign the said petition.

3. That the said J. M. Hurley did in no wise try, procure or endeavour to procure my signature to the said petition, nor did he have anything to do therewith, nor was the question of election of, or protest against the return of the said candidate ever spoken of by him to me.

And it was not on his inducement or procurement, or by any request on his part that the said petition was so signed by me.

C. MULLINS.

Sworn before me at the city of Belleville, in the county of Hastings, this 6th day of March, A.D. 1902.

E. J. BUTLER
Commissioner, &c., H.C.J.

I am sure hon. members will be pleased to know the state of affairs, and no person, I am sure, will be more ready than the hon. member for West Hastings to accept the facts with regard to the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure that every one will be glad to know that this officer did not take part in election contests. But there is just one observation I would like to make, and that is, that a great many officers of the government have been prepared with evidence equally cogent of their freedom from political partisanship so far as taking part in elections is concerned, but who, nevertheless, have been dismissed without being given an opportunity of making their defence before an impartial or indeed any tribunal.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.20 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 14, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the chair at Eleven o'clock.

BILLS WITHDRAWN—RAILWAY SUBSIDIES.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved that Orders No. 30, Bill (No. 28) respecting Telegraph and Telephone Companies—Mr. Fitzpatrick ; No. 31, Bill (No. 120) to amend the Dominion Lands Act—Mr. Sifton ; No. 36, Bill (No. 104) to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways—Mr. Blair ; and No. 37, Bill (No. 146) for the settlement of railway labour disputes—Mr. Mulock, be discharged.

He said : I may say in reference to these two Bills, to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways and for the settlement of railway disputes, that they will be taken up again next session. The government, in introducing these Bills, did not intend to follow them up at the present session, but rather to give notice to the public, so that their features might be carefully considered, and perchance be ready to deal with them at the next session.

I may also take advantage of this opportunity to give an answer to numerous applications which have been made for assistance in railway construction. The government has determined not to ask parliament this year for any appropriations for that object. At the same time, we are not unmindful of the fact that railway development is

more than ever a pressing necessity. This is specially true of railway construction in those fertile lands of the North-west Territories in the valley of the North Saskatchewan river, towards which immigrants and settlers are now rapidly and numerously flocking. It is due to those people that they should be assured that their wants in that respect are engrossing the attention of the government, and it is hoped that next session assistance will be given to the construction of a railway by as rapid stages as possible from some point in the western boundary of Manitoba, through the Saskatchewan valley towards Edmonton.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the Bill respecting Dominion lands ? I thought that some measure of that kind had already been passed.

The PRIME MINISTER. It did pass, but the amendments of the Senate have been such as to make the Bill nugatory. Therefore, we do not intend to proceed with it this session.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that Orders No. 30, respecting telegraph and telephone companies, No. 36, to amend and consolidate the law respecting railways, and No. 37, for the settlement of railway labour disputes, will be presented and pressed next session ?

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we were promised the second reading of the Railway Commission Bill, but I suppose the time has not been found available for that purpose.

The PRIME MINISTER. That is it.

Motion agreed to.

YUKON TERRITORY REPRESENTATION.

House proceeded to the consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 134) respecting representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons.—The Minister of the Interior.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the amendments ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). The amendments are not of an important character. There is an amendment to section 22, which is purely clerical, by which the words 'two candidates where two members are to be elected' are struck out. It does not alter the meaning of the Bill, and it is a better way of expressing it.

Section 23 in the Bill as passed reads as follows :

If at the time fixed for receiving nominations there remain more than two candidates in nomination where two members are to be elected, or one candidate where one member is to be elected at the election then pending, the said officer shall grant a poll, &c.

This section has been amended so as to read :

If at the time fixed for receiving nominations there remain more than one candidate, the returning officer shall grant a poll, &c.

The draughtsman in drafting the Bill provided for a case in which there was more than one candidate, but it is unnecessary, as the Bill provides at the present time for only one member, so that this amendment is quite in accord with the rest of the Bill. Section 28 is amended by the Senate in accordance with a suggestion made by the Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick). The hon. Minister of Justice suggested that it might be possible that the chief justice or the senior judge might be away from the territory when an election was to be held, and that it would be better to provide that the senior judge who should happen to be there should act. I see no objection to the amendment, and I move that it be concurred in.

Amendments read the second time, and agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS—AID TO RAILWAYS.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the right hon. premier. He said that the government did not intend to bring down any subsidies for railroads this session, but I understood him to say that at no time was it more desirable that assistance should be given to railroads in particular parts of the country, and he intimated that in the opinion of the government there should be some assistance given to certain railroads next session.

The PRIME MINISTER. To one railway.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the right hon. gentleman supplemented the opinion of the government by Order in Council in that direction, or does he intend to do so between now and next session ? He is pledging the government to introduce a Bill next session for the purpose of giving assistance to that particular road.

The PRIME MINISTER. There has been no order passed, and no order shall be passed either.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. In the budget speech I stated that we proposed to extend the time for the free admission of

machinery for the manufacture of beet root sugar, and I gave notice of the following motion:

Resolved, That it is expedient that the provisions of chapter 22 of the Acts of 1901, respecting the free admission of machinery and structural iron and steel for use in the construction of factories for the manufacture of sugar from beet root, be extended until the 1st day of April, 1903.

I now beg to move that this resolution be agreed to.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister extended the time for more than one year it would be proper for him to do so. He will undoubtedly have to extend the time next year if he desires the advantage to apply to those who are building or contemplating building beet sugar factories.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have had no representations made to me that a further extension would be necessary. If the matter comes up again it will be considered on its merits, but I do not think that it is wise at this moment to extend the time further in view of the resolution, notice of which has been given.

Mr. SPROULE. I doubt if the companies will be able to get in their machinery within the time fixed in the resolution.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Has the Minister of Finance power to remit that duty without a resolution ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That may be debatable, but the more of these things we do by resolution of the House and the fewer of them we do by executive act the better. It is always better to have these things fixed in the tariff and then the public at large understand them and not a particular individual. The next motion is this. The Minister of Militia has made a contract for the manufacture of the Ross rifle in Canada, and one of the conditions of the agreement was that the company should have the right to import the machinery and parts of their rifles free of duty. Instead of leaving that to be expressed in the contract only as applied to that particular company, it was thought better that, for the same reason I gave a moment ago, it should be set forth in the tariff, so that if it should happen that any other company should at any time make arrangements with us of a similar character, this item would stand in the tariff free to all. Practically it only applies at present to the Ross Rifle Company, because that is the only company with whom the government have this contract, but instead of leaving it to be expressed in the contract itself, we thought it better to put these items on the free list as applying to all persons with whom similar arrangements might be made.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman mean the parts of the rifle which are to be taken over by the Dominion government, or the rifles manufactured ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The aim of the government was to have these rifles manufactured in Canada, but it was remembered that the machinery would have to be imported, and there is practically no harm in admitting that free. If we made them pay duty we would have to put up the price. As respects the other part of the resolution, certain parts of the rifles, it is claimed, cannot be conveniently made in Canada, and these parts may be imported. That is the substance of the resolution.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But this rifle company manufactures rifles not only for the government but for sale. They have a contract for the manufacture of a certain portion of them for the government. What I want to know is whether the parts of the rifle which are imported into the country and not used by the government, come in free to be sold ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Not under this regulation. It only applies to work they do for the government. The machinery, of course, which makes the rifle for the government of Canada may also make a rifle for somebody else. To that extent the machinery would apply to all. I think the clause (a) makes it clear that it is only for the manufacture of rifles for the government of Canada.

Mr. MONK. How does the minister think it possible to prevent the manufacture of rifles generally for the public ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not want to do that.

Mr. MONK. Will it be possible to limit it to the manufacture of rifles for the use of the government ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We do not propose to limit the factory to the manufacture of rifles for the use of the government. They may do it for anybody in the world ; but they cannot have these admissions free of duty except for the use of the government.

Mr. MONK. How will you guard against such a thing happening ? If they choose to import the material in the rough for the rifles which they will sell to the public at large, how can you prevent it ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. That is to be left to the inspection and regulation of the Customs Department. The same question my hon. friend puts might arise in connection with some other items where the article is admitted at one rate of duty for the purpose of being manufactured, and at a different rate of duty when it enters into general consumption. It is a form of legislation that has been in our tariff for a long time, and practically it works out very well.

Mr. SPROULE. I am inclined to think they should bring in their raw material free in any event. But where the government give a consideration that is not extended to any other factory, for the purpose of supplying the government's need, there would of necessity require to be some arrangement whereby the company would not take advantage of that clause and apply it to the general public. How would the government regulate it so that they could not use the same parts of a rifle for general manufacture ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I admit that it requires very careful observation by the Customs Department. We have the same question arising in other branches of business, but in practice I understand the department manages it very well. I think it is regrettable that we have to have these distinctions in the tariff, but experience has shown that the Customs Department can watch them and guard against any abuse.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I would much rather see the whole rifle manufactured in Canada. Under the resolution which the minister proposes they can simply assemble the different parts of the rifle when they come into the country. I think that a provision ought to be made so that the whole of these parts except, perhaps the forgings, or something of that kind, in the rough, might be obtained from other countries ; but the whole material that enters into the rifle ought to be manufactured in the country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. My hon. friend is mistaken. In the first place the arrangement made between the Commissioner of Customs and the manufacturer sets forth just what pieces are required. Practically the whole gun is made in Canada. There are a few small pieces, easily designated, in regard to which it is very simple to know just how many of them are used, and would be entitled to come in free. Supposing they manufactured 10,000 rifles for the government, the customs would know that only 10,000 of these articles, or sets of articles, used in those rifles would be entitled to come in free. I do not think there will be any difficulty in working it out. I was on the committee examining the matter, and we found it was only a few small articles that we have not yet perfected in this country, that will have to be imported from foreign countries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is perfectly correct in what he stated with regard to the effect of this resolution. He said, as I understood him, that it is quite competent for the manufacturers to merely assemble everything, importing all the materials from abroad.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If there was not a contract, it might be possible; but the contract specifies what is to be done.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The contract has nothing to do with this resolution. My hon. friend from Lanark was not dealing with any contract, but with what is before the House; and he is absolutely correct in his statement as to the effect of this resolution.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Theoretically, yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The English language could not be plainer :

> All materials or parts in the rough, unfinished and finished, screws, nuts, bands and springs, to be used in rifles to be manufactured at any such factory for the government of Canada.

You could not get a more comprehensive statement than that by employing any language. Of course, it is to be done under regulations made by the Minister of Customs, which may afford some safeguard; but apart from that, it is certainly open to the very grave objection which the hon. member for Lanark has suggested.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend has perhaps not observed the distinction drawn in subsection 'b' between the rough materials and the finished materials. If he reads it again, he will see that while they are at liberty to import rough and unfinished materials generally, the finished articles which they import are limited to screws, nuts, bands and springs. Then there is the general proviso that the Minister of Customs must make the regulations.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The whole of what the hon. minister states depends on the punctuation marks, which are not generally taken into consideration by the courts. There might be a very strong argument made to prove that it means exactly what the hon. member for Lanark says. These punctuation marks, though regarded as important by many people, have practically no effect in determining the meaning of language in a court of law.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I do not think the meaning depends on the punctuation. I think the language itself is very clear. Before the resolution is disposed of, I wish to ask the attention of the committee to another item which is not included in it, but about which I do not imagine there will be any difference. There is a provision in the tariff for the admission free of duty of certain machinery for mining operations and for blast furnaces and operations of that character. Under this provision we have allowed coke-making machinery to come in free of duty. There is certain machinery which is used in common for the manufacture of coke and the manufacture of charcoal, and the department has held that the provision might reasonably include machinery for the manufacture of charcoal. About the only difference

is that coke is made from coal, while charcoal is made from wood. The department has so interpreted the provision; but the Minister of Customs has called my attention to the matter, and he thinks it advisable that there should be a clear definition in the tariff in accordance with what has been the interpretation of the department. I propose, therefore, to add to the item as clause 'c' 'charcoal-making machinery.'

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Will it have an ex poste facto effect?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Customs Department having hitherto interpreted in this way, I suppose in that respect it has an ex poste facto effect. But the Minister of Customs desires that it should be made a matter of tariff instead of a matter of departmental regulation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no objection to that so long as there is no discrimination.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. None whatever.

Amendment agreed to, and resolution as amended agreed to.

Resolution reported, read the first time and the second time and agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897. He said: this is simply a transcript of the resolution which we have already agreed to.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Bill finally passes, we shall expect the government, by means of customs regulations which are referred to in the Bill, to use proper safeguards so that the danger pointed out by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) shall not be realised.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I entirely concur in the suggestion of my hon. friend. The Customs Department must be instructed to look carefully into the matter.

Mr. MONK. Why does this change date from the 17th March?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. All tariff changes date from the date of the budget.

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

SUPPLY—THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION.

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

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring briefly to the attention of the House the matter which I mentioned in a very superficial way to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior last evening. Some considerable interest is taken, especially in the western part of the country, with regard to the concession known as the Treadgold Concession, and a good many communications have been sent to members of parliament from the Yukon concerning certain features of the arrangement between the government and Mr. Treadgold and his associates. The matter was to have been brought up in parliament by certain gentlemen on this side, but about the time when they were instructed on this matter, it was announced in the public press that the government had rescinded the Orders in Council, which had created so much excitement, and revoked a great many of the features of the concession which were regarded as objectionable. I do not propose to discuss at present, as it is too late in the session, certain constitutional features beyond saying that as it seems to me, though I have not carefully examined the question, there is a great deal of doubt as to whether the terms of this concession did not exceed the powers which could fairly be regarded as vested in the Governor General in Council. I also would have suggested to the House that a concession of this kind, covering so wide a range, involving such enormous interests, might properly have been submitted to parliament in the first instance, and should not have been passed by Order in Council, even if the Governor in Council possessed the technical right to pass it under the authority of the statutes. I also would have taken the ground that assuming that the powers possessed by the Governor in Council were legitimately exercised in this instance, it was a matter upon which parliament should have been informed at the very commencement of the session, so that the House might have had occasion to fully consider the terms of this concession, which are of such great interest to the people of the Yukon. Apart from that all I have to say at present is that I have not been able—nor indeed do I profess to possess the knowledge which would so enable me—to clearly distinguish between the effect of the concession in the terms first granted and its effect in the terms granted by the subsequent Order in Council. And I do not know to what extent the excitement which prevailed among all classes in the Yukon, by reason of the terms of the first concession, has been allayed by the fact that the concession has been rescinded as well as the Order in Council granting it, and a concession in some what different terms granted the same gentleman. What I desire to do at present is this. I brought to the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior last evening the fact that a memorial with regard to this matter had, as I understood, been sub-

mitted to my hon. friend, and I was anxious to know to what extent the objections raised in that memorial, which demanded the repeal of the concession, had been met by the terms of the new Order in Council and the new concession. It appeared that either through some difficulty in the mail service or on account of the pressing engagements of my hon. friend during the closing days of the session, this memorial had not been brought to his attention, and I believe he saw it for the first time when I handed to him what purported to be a copy of it, taken from a Dawson newspaper which had been sent me. I do not suppose that the hon. minister has been able to take this matter up to any extent in the meantime, as it was three o'clock this morning when I brought it to his attention, but upon consideration I think that it may be well to read the memorial to the House in order that hon. members may be acquainted with its terms and that it may be useful to them perhaps, if there should be any occasion at a subsequent date to discuss the terms of the new concession. I think that possibly the House will pardon me for taking up its time in the few minutes necessary for the purpose of reading this document, and I trust that my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior, will not think I am bringing this matter to his attention without notice, because I have really had no opportunity of giving him notice except that which I gave him this morning, when I told him I thought I would briefly discuss the matter in the House and desired that he should be present. The memorial is signed by a large number of gentlemen who purport to be the holders of very large claims in the Yukon. It was published in all the papers at Dawson, I believe about the 16th of this month. The newspapers I received were dated the 16th, and contained a copy of this memorial. It is in the following words:

The preamble to the Order in Council of June 12, 1901, gives as a reason for the privileges granted the following :—'The mining now carried on in the Klondike district because of the inadequate supply of water, is necessarily confined to the washing of the richest gravel only, comparatively small in area, thus leaving large tracts of gold bearing gravels unworked.'

It is true that there are large quantities of ground unworked for want of a sufficient quantity of water ; at the same time the men at present in the district are gradually absorbing this land and applying capital and machinery to the purpose. Among these are operators who are identified with the country since its discovery and have grown up with it.

The statement that the richest gravel only is worked at present is not correct ; it is partly and only partly true. The hydraulic system has already been introduced by private enterprise. For example : Mr. Alexander McDonald has employed it on the Bonanza creek, Mr. Johannsen on Hunker, and others have followed their example and have placed hydraulic machinery upon the ground for use during the coming season. The operators above mentioned work not the richest ground only, but all the gravel on their claim, leaving nothing undisposed of. In the natural course of affairs, if miners are allowed to proceed as they have been doing hitherto and without interference, other capitalists will undoubtedly proceed on the same lines, and by this means without any cost to the country, without any special concessions, without favouritism and without injury to any other interests, the whole of the gold bearing gravel will be operated up to a certain height, which height will be determined by the cost of raising the water from the creek level up to the hill side gravels and by the values of the hill side gravels encountered.

The grantees under the Orders in Council are only required to give a 300 ft. elevation; the miners who are already using hydraulic apparatus are raising water themselves to a height of 300 ft. at a less cost than Mr. Treadgold and his associates are authorized to charge.

It is possible, though not probable, that paying dirt might be found at a height at which a private operator under ordinary circumstances and with a small amount of capital, would find unprofitable work. In such a case it would be justifiable to grant special advantages to a largely capitalized company, which by operating on a wider scale and employing more expensive machinery, would lift the water to the highest levels at a cost sufficiently small to allow them a fair profit.

This, however, is a contingency for the future and a plan that can only be adopted fairly and with profit to the district after the creeks which are now being worked have been exhausted. Under present conditions the creeks are worked continuously, but, should a large company with an extensive volume of water operate the higher levels, there would be a discharge into the creek beds of so much dirt or debris as to effectually put an end to operations in them. For economical mining it is absolutely essential that the creek claims should be worked out before hydraulic operations on a large scale are commenced on the hill sides. The miners who work on the creeks carry on their business at present with a fair profit, having only to handle the dirt naturally belonging to the creek, but a discharge of debris from the hill side would so add to the expense of their operations as to take away their profit and drive them out of business. In our opinion it will be from 10 to 20 years, if then, before the district has been so far worked as to call for any such wholesale grant of lands as is included in the Treadgold concessions or justify its adoption.

Injurious Effects of the Concession.

The above incontrovertible facts and considerations establish clearly, we believe, the following propositions :

That no capital has been kept out of the country by the want of such a scheme ; that the needs of the country, in so far as the application of hydraulic machinery to mining operations is concerned, are being amply met as they arise by private enterprise and will continue so to be for many years to come ; that the concession secures nothing that the miners are not already providing for themselves ; that it saves nothing in the cost of the water to those who require it, and that if taken advantage of to carry out the purpose indicated in the preamble of Orders in Council, it will have a disastrous

effect upon the operations at present going forward in the creek beds.

We now propose to consider another important feature of the arrangement. It is provided by the Orders in Council that all abandoned claims on Bear, Bonanza and Hunker creeks and their tributaries—this includes Eldorado—shall be deemed to be vested in Mr. Treadgold and his associates, on and after the first day of January, 1902.

It might be supposed by a person ignorant of mining that a claim which has been abandoned is by that very fact proven to be inferior and non-productive, or at least not sufficiently productive to pay for being worked by the private individual. This, however, is very far from the truth. It is the universal experience in mining countries that claims may be prospected three or four times and abandoned and may yet turn out to be rich and profitable. The value of the gift made to Mr. Treadgold and his associates is incalculable, but we believe it is no exaggeration to say that it runs up into millions of dollars.

The effect of a blanket concession like this is to close up the district and withdraw it from relocation. When it is remembered that the district included in the grant comprises the greater part of the gold bearing area which has been exploited in the vicinity of Dawson city and that it contains almost all the roads and improvements that have been made by the government in the mining territory, it will be seen how important the consequence of this measure will be.

The prosperity of the district, the diffusion of comfort among all classes, the continued influx of population and the attraction of further capital for development—all depend upon the abandoned claims being left open to be further prospected by private individual miners and relocated.

The closing of the district will be injurious to the interests of the wage-earner. At present the mining area is thickly populated with individual wage-earning operators. These men are not occupied continually, being usually idle part of the year. During the idle period they are accustomed to prospect and try to find something for themselves.

It is not alone those who are for the time being idle who engage in prospecting, but there is another class of wage-earners even more useful. These are men who are ambitious to better their condition. They work first, in order to earn a small reserve, and spend weeks, sometimes months, searching for the precious and valuable metals. More often than not they fail and have to begin again. It is in this way that the resources of the district are exploited. Such is the universal practice throughout the world.

The capitalists who have been engaged in developing the country depend upon the two classes of labourers above mentioned for their supply of workmen. By closing the district to further prospecting, both the capitalists and wage-earners above spoken of will gradually disappear.

There is no longer any incentive for the individual wage-earner to stay, as he is prevented from looking about for claims for himself, and, as explained above, he cannot obtain continuous employment the year round.

The capitalist must go because he will be compelled to import labour for a short period of the year at higher wages and consequently the cost of production will be increased. Banks of gravel that would be worked with wages on the present scale could not be profitably operated on a higher scale. Further, the ground now owned by individual miners will be worked out in many cases in from three to five years, and the operators will then be compelled to seek further locations, not from the government or under public regulations open to all the world, but from a private firm, whose interests is strictly financial, and whose only object will be to get every dollar they can out of the property they control.

The machinery belonging to miners and mining companies now in the country represents millions of dollars ; this would be rendered idle and consequently valueless, since the owners would be at the mercy of a universal landlord and must either submit to his terms or leave the country.

It may be asked why they could not remove their machinery outside the Treadgold concession and commence operations anew. The answer is that the concession covers nearly all the roads and improvements made in the district by the government ; consequently in moving to a location outside the concession new roads would have to be built to reach the objective points, and no individual could stand the expense. It would in fact be cheaper to bring in machinery for a new district from the outside up the natural water-ways of the country than to attempt to move it from its present position across intervening mountains and valleys to other places.

Minor Details.

The ordinary miner has to prospect, mark out and enter upon his claim. The grantees under the Order in Council are saved all that trouble since it is provided that all mining locations now or hereafter abandoned on the various creeks included in the grant, are to be deemed to be vested in them without entry.

The ordinary miner has to pay $15 per claim per annum rental and to do work to the extent of $200 on each claim (called 'representation' —see Order in Council, June 12, 1901, sec. 18, sub-sec. 5). Mr. Treadgold and his friends are relieved of these expenditures—sec. 13, sub-sec. 4 and 5.

The grantees are to expend during the present year at least $250,000, and this is presumed to be some kind of return for the enormous grant made them.

It is stated that 1,310 abandoned claims became vested in them January 1, and March 1, of the present year. In the hands of private miners, these would have entailed an outlay as above of $215 each, at least, or in all $281,650 per annum, some portion of which would go to the government, while the government will get none of the $250,000 required to be expended by the concessionaires.

In any event we consider the expenditure required of the grantees trivial in comparison to the extent of the gift made to them.

We are confident, from our experiences in this and other mining countries, that every abandoned claim in the district will be taken up within two years, at least, if the district is left open to individual prospectors, and that most of them will be taken up within one year.

The grantees are required to deliver within the district during the summer of 1905 a flow of 3,000 cubic feet of 18,600 gallons of water per minute at such an elevation as to afford

a pressure at an effective head of not less than 300 feet, and this at a charge of 25 cents per miner's inch per hour. One private operator in the district himself raises 1,500 gallons per minute for his own use to a height of 300 feet at a less cost than 25 cents. There are others doing the same thing quite as cheaply, and additional new machinery has been placed on the ground for the same purpose by still other parties.

Generally.

It is our firm conviction that if the arrangement is not repealed and the Orders in Council rescinded, they will put an end to individual enterprise in the Yukon, will paralize every branch of industry there, will cause the people at present in the country to get out of it as quickly as they can work out existing holdings, will hand the country over bodily to a gigantic monopoly whose interest it will be to carry on their operations with Chinese or Japanese labour, and will in fact complete the ruin of the Yukon Territory, not at a distant day, but within the next four or five years.

Dated at Dawson, this 15th day of April, 1902.

Signatures :—

G. Geo. Johannson, for Johannson & Black (30 claims) ; James Henderson, manager for McDonald Bonanza, Ltd., (16 claims); Geo. T. Coffey, manager Anglo-Klondike Mining Co., Ltd., (40 claims) ; Albert Trabold, (46 claims) ; L. Paillaid, manager Syndicate Lyonnais, (10 claims) ; Charles Af. Dunn, manager for Stanley & Worden, (12 claims) ; McKay, Nelson & Dalgarn, (13 claims) ; Gervais & Simard, (10 claims) ; Thomson & Granger, Patterson & McAskill, Faull & Cordt, Southier Bros., McKnight, Chilo & Bagley, White, Sheets & Co.; Fyfe & Danson ; Alexander & Rhisdan ; Higgins & Whyte ; Johnson & Lee ; Brazeau Brothers ; Nordstrom Brothers ; Yeager & Co.; Badger & Co.; Henderson & Tauge ; Fax & Co.; Miller & Curtis ; Clark, Stafford & Williams ; Disher & Christianson ; Weeks & Co.; Bourke Bros. ; August Ryberg ; Frank Agnew; H. McGuinness, Isaac Watier; James Burnfield; F. Hicks; Ef A. Wendt ; Martin Murray; Patrick King; Simon Fraser; J. S. Cameron; H. E. Boucher; Joseph View; T. Potter; C. Andrews; James Butler; John A. Moe; J. P. Simonds; John Erickson; C. J. Putrow; James Hall; H. C. Belcher; Charles J. Anderson; P. H. McCormick; F. C. Johnson; C. W. Sankey; J. B. Shattuck; Carl Blomquist; C. M. Van Cleave; James Munroe; R. G. Wilson; James Cosgrove; Lee Sholson; Ben Jones; John Macauiay; A. W. McLeod; A. F. Stander; Charles Reid; Noe Dufault; A. Binett; Joseph Duleau; George Harvey; H. Y. Crockett; R. J. Oliver; John Mellon; K. L. Smith; H. C. Ash; S. D. Hartman; R. Gilmore; Kenneth Sinclair; John Kerns; Louis Renand; A. H. Anderson; E. McWilliams; Frank McCandless; John Knoll ; Albert Dalton; B. A. Burton; J. F. Brown; J. McIntyre; Louis E. Miller; John L. Eby; Chas. Olsen; Henry Aviser; Robert Casilty; J. McGrath.

I thought it was desirable to bring this to the attention of the House, in order that hon. members may be made familiar with the claims of the miners regarding this concession, and also in the hope that the Minister of the Interior may be able to give some statement to the House as to whether the indictment which has been preferred against these gentlemen interested in that country has been met in any way by the changes which have been made by the recent Order in Council. The hon. gentleman will notice that the statements with regard to the effect of the former concession are very strong, and they are supported, apparently, by a great many people who have large interests in that country. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries seems to be amused by this indictment. Is there any particular cause of merriment ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes it is rather amusing to me.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what way ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If the hon. gentleman wants an explanation, I will say that the communication seems to be from a young lawyer who is a very active partisan, and who could not possibly know much about the conditions existing. I would be very doubtful as to the accuracy of his statements. When I was myself acting in the department, applications came in from people with interests in that country, setting forth the necessity for improvements being made for furnishing water. From the language in which the representations are made, I cannot understand them, it looks very much as if the people making them had no knowledge of the country or of the business. It seems to me a purely partisan or political statement. That is the way it strikes me. So far as I am concerned, the only object I had in view was doing the very best for the development of that country. Of course mistakes may be made. I am satisfied that one of the great needs for getting out the wealth of that country is a supply of water. If my hon. friend and I both live to be here another year, I think we will find that representations will be made by those interested, not by people who have no interests in the country at all, asking the government to take similar action to that we have already taken. I have myself had applications from people in that country, pointing out the great urgency of the government taking some action to provide water, so that the ground can be worked.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that there is any particular cause for amusement in what the hon. gentleman has stated. I understand the hon. gentleman to assert that these gentlemen who purport to have signed the petition have no substantial holdings in that country.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The author of the communication is, if I am not mistaken, a young man——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is Mr. Shannon. The hon. gentleman is amused because Mr. Shannon has apparently been em-

ployed by these gentlemen to draw up, under their instructions, a communication to the Minister of the Interior. Well, cannot my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries free himself from partisan feelings with regard to a matter of this kind long enough to realize that a solicitor, whether he is a Liberal or Conservative, usually acts in these matters under the instructions of his clients, to carry out their views.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If he was retained by these people I would look upon the matter as very serious but I doubt it very much.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, my hon. friend sees fit to cast a doubt upon the professsional integrity of this gentleman.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then I do not know what he does mean. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman is very clear as to what he does mean.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Then we are even in that respect. I have been listening attentively to the hon. gentleman, and I do not think he is very clear himself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am endeavouring to point out to the House the objections to this concession made by people having interests in the Yukon, and this seems to touch my hon. friend very closely, for some reason or other. Possibly there may be some reasons which I do not understand on account of which he takes so deep an interest in this communication. I thought it my duty, because the Minister of the Interior said this communication had not reached him, to bring this matter to his attention. So far as the language of this communication is concerned, I cannot see anything amusing in it. If the facts are as stated, it seems to have been a very improper thing on the part of the government to have passed such a concession, and I should feel disposed to think the hon. gentleman would agree in that conclusion. Of course I do not vouch for these statements. I have not been in the Yukon, I have not cross-examined these gentlemen, I do not personally know about the technical matters of this kind which are dealt with in this memorial. Possibly the hon. gentleman himself is not as completely acquainted with these matters as gentlemen who reside on the spot, and have some personal knowledge of them. It may be he is in a position to dispute everything that is said in this memorial, from his personal knowledge, and to say that it is absolutely false, unfounded and incorrect. But if these gentlemen are to be believed, there was a very serious condition of affairs arising from the concession first made. I was disposed to submit this matter to the Minister of the Interior in a fair spirit. I had only one object in doing it, to know whether, with the very limited time at his disposal since I brought this memorial to his attention, he would be able to tell me whether these objections have been met by the new Order in Council, and whether in so far as they have not been met by the new Order in Council, he, with his special knowledge of that district, attaches any particular importance to them. I do not know that there is anything in the course which I have adopted as a member of this House which should excite the merriment of any hon. gentleman, particularly of a member of the government who are responsible for the concession which has been made, and which has been the subject of such strong condemnation in this memorial, and which, as we know without any doubt, has occasioned the most intense excitement and indignation in the Yukon among a very large portion of people. Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize the fact that this memorial is new to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and I should not blame him in any way if he tells me that he has not had time to take it into consideration since I brought it to his attention this morning. But I would like to know whether he has examined it for a few moments, and if so, what he has to say with regard to the statements which are made in this memorial, and to what extent the objections raised by the miners have been met by the terms of the new concession.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. When my hon. friend called my attention to this document this morning I was under the impression that it was the same document, or a copy of a document, which had been received by me some weeks ago. But when he mentioned the date it was supposed to bear, I think the 15th of April, I was satisfied that I had not seen it, and it had not been brought to my attention. I caused inquiry to be made this morning in the department, and I find that no document has been received, either by my own secretary, in my own private mail, or in the department. So as a matter of fact, the document which purports to be addressed to me and to be for the purpose of bringing certain objections to my attention, has not been forwarded in such a way as to lead any person to suppose that that was the bona fide intention of the person who got up the document. If it had been the bona fide intention of the person who got up the document, surely he would have sent it to me or to the department, instead of circulating it through the newspapers, and leaving it to be brought to my attention by any person who might happen to see it. I do not even now know whether the signature of the lawyer who is supposed to have it in charge is genuine ; I do not know whether the signatures of the persons who purport to have signed it are genuine. There is nothing in it to show that such a

petition had ever been prepared or signed. The fact that it is printed in a newspaper is not, unfortunately, evidence of the authenticity of the signature.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not even there?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. As far as that phase of it is concerned, we will have to leave that for the proper evidence to be presented to be dealt with when it comes in.

Mr. BORDEN Halifax). When I brought this matter to the hon. gentleman's attention, I supposed that he had received a copy of it in the usual way.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am not finding fault with my hon. friend, because even if I had not received a copy my hon. friend would be quite right in bringing it to my notice. But all I can say is, that it has not reached my officers as yet. It will be quite evident, however, that the gentlemen who have taken part in preparing this document have not taken the most expeditious way of arriving at a proper consideration of the circumstances which they allege he desires of bringing to my attention in good faith for the purpose of having the grievances removed. I can only say that I hope the document will be sent in, and that the gentleman who has charge of it will enable me to have proper evidence of the authenticity of the representations which have been made. However, this is beside the question of the merits of the statements which are made. I had an opportunity this morning of hurriedly looking over a copy of the document with which the hon. leader of the opposition furnished me this morning, and while from my hurried consideration of it I would not be disposed to make an unqualified and positive statement, yet, my impression is that by the changes which we made in this Order in Council, when the document was recast, with the consent of the parties, substantially every objection that has been raised was met; that is to say, every objection that is of a character that can in the nature of things be met. The objection that a water scheme of this kind is not necessary now and that the creek claims should be worked out first before anything of that kind is undertaken is something that could not be met, and I intimated to my hon. friend last night that I did not at all agree with the proposition which was set out in that portion of the document, and I do not agree with it now. After having discussed this matter with different persons from the Yukon in whose judgment I have confidence, more especially with Mr. Ross, the commissioner of the district, and with others, I see no seriousness in this objection, and I have not thought it necessary to consider that as a serious difficulty in connection with the matter. But, so far as the real objections are concerned, I think I can safely say that all of these objections have been removed in the charter as it stands at the present time. The changes which were made were made with the consent of the parties after a full discussion with the commissioner of the district and two delegates who were sent down by the people of the Yukon district to represent them in the discussion. One of these delegates was Mr. Wilson, who is one of the elected members of the Yukon council, and who, therefore, apart from his capacity as a delegate, may fairly, I think be considered to be a man qualified in every way to act in a representative capacity. Mr. Wilson, I believe, himself, is also a miner and therefore in a practical way as well as representing others he was well qualified to discuss the whole matter. There was another delegate named Mr. Sugrue. The changes that were made were after full discussion with these gentlemen, and with Mr. Ross, the commissioner of the district. And these gentlemen, Mr. Wilson and Mr. Sugrue, the representative delegates who were sent down from the Yukon, expressed themselves as being satisfied with the position of the government, so that, I think I may say that every reasonable objection has been met. When the gentlemen who were sent here as the representatives of the public meeting which was called to discuss the question in Dawson City, and who were well acquainted with the whole of the circumstances of the case expressed themselves as satisfied with the changes that were made, I think I may safely say that everything has been done that could be done to make the charter satisfactory to the people there.

Perhaps it would have been more satisfactory to the House if at an earlier period of the session, when we were not in a hurry with the proceedings necessarily pressing upon our minds at the close of parliament, a fuller discussion of this whole matter could have taken place. I have only to say that I should welcome the subject if it is brought up by my hon. friend or by any other member of the House, at some future time, because the whole subject is one in regard to which I will welcome full and complete discussion. There are many difficulties connected with the operation of affairs in the Yukon district which do not present themselves upon the surface, and one of the difficulties is that, as in most mining countries, there is a population which has a certain interest which is of a temporary character and the immediate interest of that portion of the population is not necessarily the permanent interest of the mining country or the permanent interest of the whole country. We have been endeavouring, in dealing with this subject, to serve the permanent interest, not only of the district, but of the Dominion of Canada, by attempting to provide means whereby the vast quantities of

low grade gravels which cannot at present be worked at all shall be made productive and profitable not only to the country at large by reason of the fact of the trade of the country being stimulated by the business being carried on, but profitable directly to the treasury of the country in that the production shall pay a royalty to the treasury. We have been attempting to formulate plans whereby that result might be brought about. We have in the course of the operation found that in regard to certain phases of the question there were popular objections which, while in my judgment not of a character which rendered the scheme unworkable, yet, by reason of the fact that in a country of that kind, unless the people are satisfied with such an arrangement it is practically impossible to carry it out, we felt that it would be desirable if possible to get all parties together and make an arrangement which would be of an harmonious character, and as far as possible remove all the objections that had been raised on the part of certain classes of the people there. I think that has been successfully done. As I said to my hon. friend, I cannot say in the most unqualified way, on such a cursory hearing of the objections, which are mentioned in this document, that everything that has been mentioned there has been removed, but I think every objection which is of a substantial character and which can be removed has been removed, and I think the evidence of that fact is that the changes have given full satisfaction to the delegates who were here from Dawson City urging the objections which were considered at the public meetings which were held in the Yukon district for the purpose of discussing the matter. I have nothing to say in regard to the bona fides of the document except that I think the hon. leader of the opposition will agree with me that if the gentleman promoting it wanted a fair consideration of the representations, a businesslike forwarding of the document to my office for consideration would have been the proper course rather than publishing it in a newspaper and having it brought to my attention in an indirect way. I may say, however, that I will give it the most careful consideration, and beyond that at the present time it is impossible for me to go.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). I am very glad that the Minister of the Interior has intimated that next session a full opportunity will be afforded to discuss this question, and to place it in its true light before the country. The minister has stated in a very general way, and without in the least particularizing in what respects the Order in Council of the 23rd April last has bettered the condition of the two former Orders in Council—he has stated, that all objections practically are now removed. From what little attention I have given the matter, and from some information which I have been in receipt of, I believe that the hon. gentleman's impression in that direction is to a large extent in error, and that when particulars are discussed and when the matter is more elaborately presented, it will be found that the order of the 23rd of April is a very slight, if any, improvement upon the two preceding Orders in Council. I might mention the matter of abandoned claims, which as all interested in the matter know, has been the chief cause of complaint. With regard to these abandoned claims I am entirely unable to say that the latter order in any respects betters the position of the free miners of that district. It is said that some 4,000 of these abandoned claims are in a position to be absorbed by these concessionaires. I would draw the attention of the minister to the fact that the first Order in Council vests these abandoned claims on the 1st of January of this year in these concessionaries, and that the last Order contains no clause divesting them of these claims. The effect of that would on its face appear to be that a large number of these claims of very great value have become vested in these three gentlemen named in the original charter, and that they are in a position to-day legally to claim these properties as their own. Further, both Orders in Council free these concessionaires from the matter of representation, that is, as the leader of the opposition has explained: the payment of a fee of $15 annually, and the doing of work of the value of $200 a year upon the claims. The matter of monopoly is by no means amended by the last Order in Council. These gentlemen are granted as full a monopoly under it as they were by the former Order in Council. That monopoly as a fact amounts to a tax upon the free miners of that district, and as we all known the Yukon Act expressly prohibits the imposition of any tax by Order in Council upon the people of that territory. The free miners if they carry on hydraulic mining are compelled by the terms of this concession to purchase water from the concessionaires and that in effect amounts to a tax upon their business.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ALCORN. It has been stated, and I believe correctly, that the terms fixed by these Orders in Council—even by the amended order—at 25 cents a miner's inch would upon an ordinary claim during an ordinary season amount to something like $18,000 of fees which these concessionaires would be in a position to collect from the free miners of that district. That, as hon. gentlemen will see, would be almost a prohibitive tax, and the effect of it would be that they would be compelled to abandon their claims, and under the clause with regard to abandoned claims, these concessionaires would thus become seized of the whole of these claims in that district. I do not intend to further pursue the particulars, especially in

view of the fact that the minister has not seen fit to go into the particulars at all.

What we complain of more particularly is that the government in this as in other matters, have taken the course of proceeding by Order in Council instead of by Act passed by this parliament. I think it will be admitted—in fact last night the right hon. Prime Minister admitted it with regard to the Yukon Railway claim then under discussion—that that course is entirely indefensible. The right hon. gentleman frankly admitted that Mackenzie & Mann had no legal claim upon this government, and for the reason that the government had seen fit to proceed by Order in Council instead of by legislation. Many instances of this will occur to hon. gentlemen—there is the Clergue steel rail contract, the Yukon Railway, the present concession and others; all of which we on this side of the House believe should have been presented by the minister in charge by statement from his place in the House before any Order in Council was passed, before any contract was signed, and before a Bill was introduced. What we complain of is that the members of the administration, being as a matter of course perfectly aware of the law upon this subject, of their rights in that respect, and of the practice and procedure obtaining in England and by which they are bound here ; we complain that they disregard these precedents and pursue a course which we regard as wholly improper and irregular, and which the Prime Minister last evening admitted to be so. While the government are well seized of the state of the law in that respect, others may not be so well informed, and I think the country should be placed in a position to judge of the acts of the members of the present administration in this respect. For that reason possibly the House will bear with me for a very few moments while I state some of the points in that respect by way of precedent laid down by Mr. Alpheus Todd in his 'Parliamentary Government in England,' a work of very high authority and character. At page 450 Todd says :

> The ancient prerogative of the Crown in legislating by Orders in Council has been subjected to the control of parliament, and is now mainly exercised as a deputed and not as a prerogative power. The Crown still retains the right to regulate various details of administration by its own prerogative authority, but it is an admitted principle that the sovereign has no right, by a mere Order in Council, either to sanction a departure from the requirements of an existing law, or to interfere with the established rights or privileges of any class of persons within the realm. It is competent to the Crown to declare and enforce, by proclamation, the execution of any existing law, but it is not within the power of the Crown, either to add to, alter, or dispense with any law of the land.

At page 461 he says :

> A large proportion of what may be called the details of legislation rests upon the authority of Orders in Council, some of which are issued by Her Majesty in virtue of her prerogative, while others derive their force from the provisions of Acts of parliament. It is competent to a court of justice to inquire into the validity—or accuracy, in the statement of alleged facts—of an Order in Council, duly passed and gazetted.
>
> As examples of the variety and importance of the subjects to which this form of quasi-legislation is applicable, it may be stated that Orders in Council or royal proclamations which are usually issued in pursuance of the same, are promulgated for the assembling, prorogation and dissolution of parliament——

And for various other purposes which are mentioned, but not for matters such as the one in question, in which the public property of the country is attempted to be disposed of.

> As a general rule, all Orders in Council restricting trade, unless issued under the authority of an Act of parliament, or justified by reference to cases coming within the prerogative of war—and all orders suspending the operation of any statute—would require an Act of indemnity.

We say that the matter in question is strictly a matter dealing with trade and in restraint of trade in connection with abandoned claims, and our contention is that this amounts to a tax on the miners of the Yukon district. On page 464 the author says:

> In the working of constitutional government, experience has proved that certain subordinate powers of legislation must be intrusted to almost every leading department of state. So long as these powers are exercised with the knowledge of parliament and in direct subjection to its control——

I wish here to point out that parliament prorogued last year on the 23rd of May, and that the original Order in Council is dated the 12th of June, from which it is apparent that in a matter with the elaborate detail incident to this transaction, the government must have been in treaty with the applicants during the time parliament was sitting; yet not one syllable of the matter was communicated to parliament. The whole transaction was conceived in the dark and in secret, and parliament heard nothing whatever of it until a return was brought down this session in answer to a motion by the hon. leader of the opposition. Therefore I say the transaction cannot be said to come within the definition contained in the text, that:

> So long as these powers are exercised with the knowledge of parliament and in direct subjection to its control, they can be more advantageously discharged by responsible ministers than if it were obligatory that they should emanate from parliament itself. For all such regulations are framed by a responsible minister for the sanction of the Crown, and no premature interference therein ought to be attempted by either House. Minutes of council, departmental regulations, and other authoritative directions emanating from the heads of the principal executive departments, must needs be

frequently issued in regard to particular matters of administration, which require to be determined by competent authority, but it is essential that all acts of quasi-legislative authority which may be performed by any department of state, shall be within the limits defined and prescribed by parliamentary enactment; and also that, whenever either the expenditure of public money, or other great public interests, are concerned in the matters thus disposed of, an opportunity should be afforded to parliament of expressing its opinion upon the same, before the government proceed to take action thereon.

This government have seen fit entirely to reverse this order of procedure. Instead of communicating the matter to parliament through the mouth of the minister having charge of the transaction, and informing parliament of their intention to enter into this arrangement, and then obtaining the authority of parliament to carry it out by Order in Council or by an Act, the first we hear of it is, after the matter has become an entirely completed transaction. On page 470 it is stated:

> The constitutional control of parliament over the exercise of legislative powers by ministers of state, executive departments, and other public bodies, being admitted. It is evident that there is an undeniable advantage in the practice itself.
>
> Thus, by the Contagious Disorders of Animals Act of 1848, the Privy Council were empowered to make orders and regulations to carry out the intent of the Act, the same to be laid before both Houses of parliament within a specified time.
>
> It is customary to provide that Orders in Council, departmental regulations, representations, rules of court, or tables of fees, framed and issued under the authority of particular Acts of parliament, shall be laid before both Houses within twenty, thirty, or forty days (as the case may be), after the making thereof—or after the re-assembling of parliament, should they have been issued during a recess—(it is usually added), before they become operative and binding * * * * *
>
> If within that time either House address Her Majesty to withhold her consent from any scheme, or any part thereof, the Crown can only assent to so much of the same as may not have been objected to.

Showing the complete control which the representatives of the people in parliament assembled should have, and in England have, over matters of this kind, and which control is entirely withdrawn from parliament in this country by the practice adopted by the present administration. Surely, if that practice is adhered to, we are returning to the days of irresponsible government. The rights and privileges of parliament are infringed upon in a greater degree than perhaps could be done by any other course which the administration could pursue. If the practice is right, there is nothing whatever to prevent the government dealing with any part of the property of the country in the same manner, secretly, in the dark, and without communication even to the House, much less to the country. In a note, the learned author then gives an instance which occurred in the year 1871:

> On June 30, 1871, an address was moved to the Queen, in the House of Lords, that for certain reasons therein stated Her Majesty would withhold her assent from the proposed scheme of the Endowed School Commissioners for the management of Emmanuel Hospital Charity School, heretofore governed by the corporation of the city of London. The motion was opposed by ministers, but agreed to on division. Immediately afterwards another address was moved praying that the royal assent might also be withheld from the schemes relating to St. Margaret's Hospital and the Greycoat Hospital, Westminister. No reason was assigned for the request in the motion; but the mover stated that these schemes were open to the same objections that had been urged against the first mentioned scheme. Notwithstanding the opposition of ministers, this motion was agreed to. On July 3, Her Majesty's answer was reported, 'That she would withhold her assent from the several schemes objected to in these addresses.'

On page 482, referring to the rights of ministers to legislate in a quasi manner within certain prescribed limits, and in regard to certain prescribed subjects, it is said:

> But admitting its obvious advantages, it is liable to serious abuse. It has been well observed that there 'is no modern innovation which needs to be watched with more jealousy than the practice of delegating the authority of parliament (even in small and local matters) with no better check than the chance that some unusually vigilant legislator may move an address to reject the scheme of law before it has had time to mature into an indefeasible enactment. The whole scope and genius of our legislative system is to afford by the forms of parliament every possible security that no law shall be made which has not been deliberately and repeatedly affirmed in all its details, and it would be alien to the essence of free government to substitute for this a system in which the relations of the Crown and parliament should be reversed, and statutes should be octroyés by the government, and nothing but a bare veto left to the Lords and Commons.

From the authorities I have quoted, Mr. Speaker, it is abundantly plain that the course pursued by the administration with regard to this and kindred matters is entirely contrary to the constitutional rule, and is not justified by any precedent on which hon. gentlemen could rely. That is very well shown by the very frank manner in which the right hon. premier last night, when the Yukon railway vote was under consideration, admitted that it was not to be defended on any legal or constitutional ground. As I have said, I am glad to know that on a future occasion we shall have an opportunity of discussing this matter in detail; but I content myself at present with presenting these few observations on the constitutional view of the matter.

REDHEAD, N.S., BOAT HARBOUR.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I would like to ask the attention of the House while

I refer to a matter which has received perhaps more importance than either the amount of money involved or anything else justified, except by reason of the manner in which the hon. leader of the opposition brought it before the House. I would ask to be permitted to quote a statement made by the hon. gentleman a short time ago, not for the purpose of commenting on it or continuing the discussion, but merely to follow it up by certain official reports relating to the matter. On the 11th of March the hon. gentleman brought to the notice of the House certain representations made to him concerning some public works in the county of Shelburne, and I take the following quotation from what he has said. It will to be found on page 1032 of the unrevised 'Hansard':

Take the expenditure for the purpose of cutting a canal between a lake at Black Point in the county of Shelburne or Queen's—I do not know which—and tidal water. The information given me by a gentleman, who has personal knowledge, is that the project was to cut a canal between tide-water and the lake for the purpose of affording shelter to fishermen. The project had been reported on years ago adversely by the engineer in charge, Mr. Dodwell. This is the information given, not by Mr. Dodwell, but by this gentleman to whom I refer.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. There is no Black Point in our books. Is there any other name by which the place is known?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The harbour at Black Point near Lockeport. It seems that afterwards a gentleman by the name of Locke, a civil engineer, who was placed in charge of a portion of the south shore, reported favourably on the construction of this canal. Mr. Dodwell has said it was no use undertaking the work because the bottom of the lake was higher than tide-water, and the construction of the work could not possibly result in any advantage to the fishermen; but under Mr. Locke's report, the canal was cut at considerable expense, and it was found that the bottom of the lake was above tide-water, so that the water simply ran out of the lake, and the expenditure was absolutely thrown away. This is worse than waste of public money, and the Minister of Public Works should inform the House whether or not the statement I have made is correct.

There was a difficulty in meeting this statement for the reason that the place indicated by the hon. gentleman contains no such work as that to which he alluded. There is no such work at Black Point, and it was difficult to find out the work he referred to. But we have discovered a work which perhaps corresponds with the description he gave, and which he may have had in his mind. I shall simply read a report from the assistant engineer, Mr. Thomas J. Locke, addressed to Mr. Lafleur, acting chief engineer of the Public Works at Ottawa:

At Redhead, Shelburne county, we expended about twenty-one hundred dollars to convert a pond on inside of beach into a boat harbour in the spring of 1900, and built cribwork protection walls to low water about 300 feet in length. On November 10th, 1897, Mr. Dodwell reported on examination of this place. The work is substantial and the boat harbour is now and has been used as a shelter successfully. The class of boats used are skiff boats about 18 foot keel. The channel, from low water to pond is twenty feet wide and at low tide the boats seek its mouth as shelter, and as the tide rises, go into the pond at about approximated half tide. For additional details, please see my annual report for fiscal years 1899-1900.

THOS. J. LOCKE,
Asst. Engineer.

That is a recent report. I wish now to present a report made by Mr. Locke on this work, not recently, not since this session opened, not since this matter was the subject of controversy, but at the time the work was done, two years ago. This is an extract from the report of Mr. Locke, the assistant engineer, for the year 1899-1900:

(Extract from my Annual Report, 1899-1900.)

Redhead is situate about two miles east of Roseway and 12 miles south-west of Shelburne town. It is a fishing station of some considerable importance. There are from 40 to 50 three-handed boats at present fishing from this point, and in olden times when a safe harbour was afforded the fishermen, a much larger number was engaged at this place. At the site of our work is a shingle beach about half a mile in length and separating a small lake from the sea-coast. Through this beach there was at one time a channel or inlet by means of which in stormy weather, the owners of the boats were able to seek shelter and protection for their property through this channel into the lake. In 1840 or thereabouts the provincial government, upon representations being made to them that this channel was gradually being filled up, deemed it advisable to advance the interests of the fishermen by protecting the west side of this channel with a groin of stone-filled cribwork from the lake to within 40 feet of L.W.O.S.T. This work, however, was not suitable for the purpose, and within 15 years the channel was entirely closed, so that the fishermen had no shelter whatever provided for them. Examinations and surveys of this place showed it to be necessary in order to have a permanent haven that the channel should be reopened and cribwork protecting walls built for the entire length on both sides. Accordingly the sum of $2,000 was appropriated for this work, and during the last fiscal year it was undertaken and completed at a total cost of $2,097.87. The work done consisted of the excavation of a channel 20 feet wide, and from four to eight feet deep for a total length of 306 feet to L.W.O.S.T. Protecting walls were built along the sides of this channel, consisting of stone-filled cribwork, 10 feet wide on top and at an average height of from eight to eight and one-half feet. The length of the western wall was 316 feet, while that of the eastern side was but 266 feet. Besides this, we constructed a retaining cribwork wall along the face of the beach, 220 feet in length, six feet wide and three feet high, so as to more fully protect the beach and keep the violent storms of the ensuing two or three years from washing portions of the beach into the lake, thus preventing the destruction of the outlet of the main work. I may mention that the estimated cost of this work was $2,360, and although we

constructed more work than was at first estimated to be necessary, yet the total cost was slightly under $2,100. The credit for this apparent saving is due to no engineering skill, but to the earnest and honest manner in which every labourer engaged in the work performed his duties. Too often, in employing labour upon government works, are the employees inclined to shirk responsibility, thinking in their ignorance that the money to the credit of the work is inexhaustible, but in this case each and every man knew that the building of the work meant a great deal to himself personally, and in consequence we received more than just recompense for the wages paid to labourers. The work is strong and substantial, and I have much pleasure in informing you that this work is satisfactory in every respect.

I certify the above to be a correct copy taken from my annual report, 1899-1900.

THOS. J. LOCKE,
Asst. Engineer.

This is the work which my hon. friend describes as utterly useless. I have not got the date of this report, but the engineer certifies that it is a copy of the report sent by him to the department for the fiscal year ending 30th of June, 1900.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the name ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Redhead. There can be no doubt that that is the place that my hon. friend refers to, because there is no such place elsewhere on that shore. But one other point—the hon. gentleman says that the work was wastefully carried on. I have shown by the report of the engineer that it was exceptionally well managed and that it was a work of great benefit to the people of that section. My hon. friend stated that Mr. Dodwell, the engineer in charge had previously reported against the work. I have now Mr. Dodwell's report made in 1897, addressed to the chief engineer of public works. That report is as follows :

November 10, 1897.

L. Coste, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.,
Ottawa.

Sir,—In accordance with instructions, contained in your letter, No. 2866, of August 6th 1897, I made a survey and examination early in September, at Red Head, Shelburne county, and I now beg to submit the inclosed plan and the following report :

Red Head is a small promontory or head-land on the west side of the mouth of Shelburne harbour, 12 miles due south of the county town. The settlement on and near the head comprises some two or three hundred people dependent for a living almost exclusively upon fishing.

A fresh water pond, of ten or twelve acres in extent, separated from the ocean by shingle beaches, through which was a narrow channel, used many years ago to afford a safe and convenient harbour for the fishing fleet, but it gradually filled up, owing to the drift of the gravel, until it was with difficulty that a boat could be forced through even at high water. Some few years before confederation, therefore, an attempt was made to re-open the channel and a grant of $100 was made by the provincial government. With this sum together with labour and materials furnished by the inhabitants, a piece of crib and pile work about 200 feet long was built on the south side of the channel. The north side of the channel being unprotected, it soon filled up and the work gradually became buried in gravel.

At the present time, and for some years past, the fishermen of the neighbourhood, on the approach of a storm, and also for winter quarters, are obliged, in order to save their boats from destruction, to haul them up on the beach, and often, before this can be done they are dashed on the shore and injured or broken to pieces.

To enable the fishermen to carry on their operations under somewhat more favourable conditions, it is desirable that the boat channel be permanently re-opened.

This can probably be accomplished by the construction of the two-winged walls of crib-work, and the digging of the channel between them, as shown on the accompanying plan, which would give a protected channel having about six feet of water at H.W.O.S.T. (spring tides rise 7 feet, neaps 5½ feet). That would probably remain open for some years and prove a great boon to the inhabitants.

I estimate the cost of this proposed work at $2,360.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) C. E. W. DODWELL,
Resident Engineer.

So, every statement that my hon. friend was induced to present to this House with regard to this work is shown to have been unjust, unwarranted and unfounded. This work was necessary; it was useful; it was not reported against by Mr. Dodwell, but was favourably reported on by him. Mr. Dodwell reported that the fair cost of the work would be $2,360, and, under the administration of Mr. Locke, who carried it out, the work was performed for $2,097.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). So far as the present report of Mr. Locke is concerned, it was apparently made by telegram, and I presume a telegram was sent him. I suppose that it will be produced.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, no doubt, will produce it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the hon. gentleman will look closely at the wording of the report he will see that it carries out practically the information given to me :

The channel from low water to pond is twenty feet wide, and at low tide the boats seek its mouth as shelter, and as the tide rises go into the pond at about approximate half tide.

Indicating that the boats cannot use this pond at all at low water, nor until it rises to half tide. Then, further :

This work has never been useless, although at time of commencement the pond had a deposit of mud from five to eight feet deep which has mostly scoured out.

Now, if boats can only enter at half tide and that with from five to eight feet of mud scoured out from the bottom of the lake, what would be the condition when it

was first opened ? I shall send this document to the gentlemen who gave that information—for the information came to me from more than one source, including some who are political friends of hon. gentlemen opposite—and I shall ask these gentlemen what they have to say with regard to this report. But one of the first things I would expect them to say is that it is a practical admission of the truth of the statement they gave to me. With respect to Mr. Dodwell's report, I informed the hon. gentleman when I brought this matter up that the information I had about the report did not come from Mr. Dodwell himself.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I read what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I also said, which the hon. gentleman has not read :

> Of course, I have no personal knowledge, but the information given me comes from an entirely unprejudiced source — from political friends of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Finance, in whose constituency —I refer to the Minister of Finance—a good deal of this expenditure has been made.

And so, not having personal knowledge of these matters, I asked for information. I shall be glad if the circumstances are not as reported to me. I can only add, and I think the hon. Minister of Finance knows it from other sources than myself, that with regard to many of the expenditures on the South Shore, there has been, and I think are at present a great many rumours at least, and a good deal of dissatisfaction. Therefore, with these rumours current and with dissatisfaction existing, it is only right that these matters should be discussed in parliament in order that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works as well, may put themselves right in regard to them. As to this particular item, I do not think that the report of Mr. Locke shows that the suggestions are unfounded. I do not so regard it at present. But, as I said, I will send it to the gentlemen who gave me the information and will ask them what they think of it, and I will deal with the matter, if necessary, in a succeeding session.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I dissent from the statement that there are rumours of the uselessness of these expenditures or dissatisfaction or any trouble with regard to any of the works to which the hon. gentleman has referred. He has specified this particular work, and this is the one under discussion, and I want to say that I have no doubt that every dollar expended along that shore under the direction of Thomas J. Locke has been expended honestly, intelligently and economically and in such a manner as to meet best the requirements of the people. The hon. gentleman says that if the work is what it is to-day, it must have been much worse before the bed of the lake was deepened. But his informant was not writing of the work as it was at first, but as it is to-day. The hon. gentleman finds fault because boats can only enter at half tide. But is that any reason why the fishermen should not be permitted to get their boats in at all ? The essence of the hon. gentleman's charge was 'this is worse than waste of public money.' I venture to say that there never was a case in which there has been more complete vindication of the work of an engineer in preparing a useful public work. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Dodwell had reported unfavourably, but that another engineer had gone in and done a useless piece of work there. That was the strongest point in what the hon. gentleman said, and it is shown that his statement was quite unfounded, because Mr. Dodwell recommended the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Dodwell made no other report, I suppose. I take it that the hon. gentleman means that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I have no knowledge of any other report. Will the hon. gentleman say that he did make another ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not said that he did. But I have said that I have certain information regarding it. That is all I said about it, and all I brought to the attention of the House both with regard to Mr. Dodwell's report and other matters. So far as the credibility of my information is concerned, and certainly as to the good faith of my informants, I believe in it still, and I do not think the report differs practically from the information given to me.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Let me say that Mr. Dodwell made no other report than the one here presented. I investigated this matter since yesterday, and there is no other report from the resident engineer. Let me add that this kind of work at Red Head, not Black Point, but Red Head is not the only work of the same character that has been done in several places in the county of Gaspé. It is not a costly work. You make a channel and a couple of jettes, and without a large expenditure of money you have a harbour very useful for fishermen. That is the kind of work that has been done at this point. But that is not the only one, very far from it.

PASPEBIAC AS AN OCEAN PORT.

Mr. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure). As the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce were adopted en bloc, I was deprived of the opportunity of making some remarks with reference to the needs of my county, and I would like to take this opportunity, probably the last one I shall have, of doing so.

At one o'clock House took recess.

House resumed at Three o'clock.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Speaker, previous to the House rising at one o'clock I asked the privilege of speaking on this motion before you left the Chair, and I do so for the reason that no opportunity has been afforded me during the present session of referring to the subsidy which is paid by this government for a line of steamers between Dalhousie and Gaspé basin. At a previous sitting of the House in committee it was agreed to vote the estimates for these steamship subsidies en bloc, and I was promised an opportunity before prorogation of referring to some of them. I am glad the Minister of Trade and Commerce is now in his seat, and I will particularly draw his attention to item 202: 'Steam communication during the season of 1902, from the opening to the closing of navigation between Gaspé basin and Dalhousie, $12,500.' The county of Bonaventure which I represent is situated on this route, half way, as it were, between Dalhousie, New Brunswick, and Gaspé basin, in the county of Gaspé. A line of steamers is at present subsidized by this government running practically from the 1st of May until the 15th or 20th of November. The conditions prevailing in that section of the province of Quebec are such that an effort, I believe, should be made by this government to extend the present system of communication as much as possible, in view of the fact that the county of Gaspé is altogether deprived of railway communication of any kind, and that a portion of Bonaventure is also in that position. The North American Transportation Company has had a contract on this line for a number of years past. That contract expired at the close of navigation last year, and if I am correctly informed, the company have been allowed to run for one year more on the understanding that when tenders are called for a five years contract beginning from next session, more improved methods will be applied, and that an attempt will be made on the part of the government to meet the legitimate wishes of the people inhabiting that coast. The steamer 'Admiral' which is at present on the service, has certainly given satisfaction in the past. She is good enough as far as she goes. But, Mr. Speaker, when you take into consideration the fact that the steamer 'Admiral' was formerly the property of General Grant, and navigated American waters as far back as 1861, you will probably admit that in 1902 the time has arrived when a more modern vessel should be placed upon that route. The 'Admiral' is a paddle steamer. Now people want an iron screw steamer able to begin earlier in the spring and to continue later in the fall and winter. At the present moment the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé have, roughly speaking, merely eight months of navigation, although navigation is possible for ten, eleven, and in some seasons twelve months in the year.

A number of petitions have been received by the Minister of Trade and Commerce on this subject. Some of them asked that the service to Dalhousie be discontinued because it is a parallel line with the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway from New Carlisle for nearly a distance of 100 miles. The views expressed by those petitioners have led me to believe that the present service might be continued, but that it might also be vastly improved. If communication is desired with the province of New Brunswick via Dalhousie, we should see to it that the facilities of the eastern end of the line are extended. I would beg leave to urge that if the present line to Dalhousie is to be continued, the line from New Carlisle, the terminus of the railway, should be kept up as long as possible during the fall and winter, starting as early as possible in the spring. At this moment there are people in the county of Bonaventure who have to drive thirty miles to reach the first railroad station. There are people in the county of Gaspé who have to drive 80, 90, and in some cases 100 miles before they can reach the nearest railway station on the Atlantic and Lake Superior, and then go over 100 miles to reach the Intercolonial Railway at Metapedia. Their arguments have been set forth in the resolution which I beg most respectfully to read, and which I believe contains the essence of what is now asked for. It is to the following effect:

That an improvement in the steamer service between the Baie de Chaleur and Gaspé is absolutely necessary.

That in 1899 the Department of Trade and Commerce called for tenders for said service, to terminate not earlier than the 31st day of December.

That notwithstanding said condition on the part of the department, the steamer 'Admiral' has invariably discontinued the said service in the month of November.

That a paddle boat is not adapted for fall and early winter navigation. That the interests of the coast suffer great injury by the steamer service being cut off at a season when navigation is perfectly feasible and safe.

That small sailing vessels of about 100 tons load and sail from Gaspé during the month of December for Europe and South America. That the harbour of Gaspé was closed to navigation this year on the 18th January. That it is a matter of vital importance for the prosperity and welfare of this coast that the steamer subsidized to run between Gaspé Basin and a railway terminus should be a screw steamer.

I believe that when we call the attention of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to this important matter, taking into consideration the fact that these people are deprived of railway communication, he will see, during the year, that no contract is entered into with the North American Transportation Company, or any other company, until it is stipulated that navigation

shall be maintained on the Baie de Chaleur as long as it is possible to do so; that a screw steamer is provided so as to be able to go into the bays when there is a formation of two, or three, or four inches of ice, and that this service shall be maintained from the terminus of the railway at New Carlisle or Pasbebiac. The North American Transportation Company have, so far as I have been able to ascertain, given a fairly satisfactory service in the past, and if all things should be equal, I think they should be given the preference, provided they will undertake to put on a modern steamer and that they will undertake to run from the terminus of the railway until the close of navigation.

I am sorry that I cannot allow my opportunity to escape without dwelling upon another matter in connection with the navigation of the Baie de Chaleur, which is of more national interest than that to which I have just directed attention. The House will remember that a couple of days ago we adopted a Bill providing, as far as we could see into the future, for the extension of the railway service in the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé. That Bill met with the approval of my hon. colleague from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux), it met with my own approval, it was discussed at a meeting of the Railway Committee, and we thought that a fair compromise had been arrived at, and that all the conditions had been taken into consideration, but I learn that at the Railway Committee of the Senate the bondholders of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company succeeded in having this Bill thrown out, so that now the eastern portions of the county of Bonaventure and the county of Gaspé are again condemned for I do not know how long to be deprived of railway facilities. In view of this fact, I appeal to the government, to, between now and the coming session, view this matter in the light that it should be viewed, and see whether the people of these counties are not entitled to generous treatment at their hands. These counties are amongst the oldest settled portions of the province of Quebec. For many long years they have contributed their share to the building up of the magnificent railway system of the Dominion, they have contributed their share to the construction of the trans-continental lines, to the construction of the canals and the improvement of our harbours; in a word, they have paid their proportion to make Canada what it is to-day. Yet, owing to unfortunate circumstances, they have been deprived of the boon and the benefits which have been extended to every nook and corner of this Dominion, barring merely the grants for harbours, rivers and ocean service. In view of the action which the Senate has taken, I beg most respectfully to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to the consideration of a few facts which I will submit to him. He stated, in the course of the debate on the Intercolonial Railway, that the Intercolonial Railway is not yet a complete system, and that the time cannot be far removed when the Intercolonial Railway shall be extended westward to the lakes. We heard, during last session and during this session also, the transportation question discussed in all its phases. As far as the western portion of this country is concerned, I need not say one word in reference to that part of the question, but I would beg most respectfully to urge upon the attention of the government the importance of what may be called the eastern phase of the transportation question. When, after the 25th of November, the last steamer leaves the port of Montreal for Europe, the St. Lawrence being closed to navigation, in what position is this country placed? It means that this route is closed for five or six months in the year. The first American seaport is Portland, and the others are Boston or New York, far removed. There is St. John, which has to be reached through American territory. To reach a seaport in our own country, on a purely Canadian line, you have to travel 740 miles on the Intercolonial Railway to St. John, you have to go 839 miles to reach the port of Halifax, or you have to go 989 miles to reach Sydney or Louisbourg. It is not a matter of surprise that the Intercolonial Railway, being handicapped in this fashion for five months in the year, being deprived of a seaport except at the expense of travelling an enormous distance, is working under a disadvantage, but I think the time has come for the government to take this question into consideration, as it is doing now, and try to solve it. I hope that it will consider whether the time has not come when the Baie de Chaleur, one of the most magnificent bodies of water that we have on this continent, situated midway between the St. Lawrence, the maritime provinces and the Atlantic seaboard should not be utilized with the view of establishing a steamer route to Europe. I am in possession, at this moment, of evidence submitted to me by the most competent officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and by men who have navigated the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Baie de Chaleur, which goes to demonstrate that the Baie de Chaleur is navigable for at least ten months, if not eleven months, in the year for ordinary steamers and for twelve months in the year for steamers specially constructed for that purpose. In view of the fact that the Senate has thrown out this Bill which would extend this railway along the Bonaventure coast, I would submit whether it would not be wise on the part of this government and of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to see whether it is not possible, when the trains reach Metapedia, instead of sending them across the province of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, to find a seaport, whether it would not be possible to use the pre-

sent line of the Atlantic and Lake Superior down to Paspebiac and there find a seaport which could accommodate the largest vessels on the ocean and a seaport which is open for practically eleven months in the year. I do not ask the government to go into any reckless expenditures. I do not ask the government to increase the cost of the Intercolonial Railway to this country, but I ask the management of the Intercolonial Railway and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals to consider if the port of Paspebiac, which is now connected with this system of railways, could not be utilized instead of hauling the whole of our western and general trade to the seaboard through the maritime provinces. I have not a word to say against the city of St. John, or the city of Halifax, or the port of Sydney, or Louisburg. I would like to direct the attention of this parliament for a very few minutes to the fact that what I have called the eastern phase of the transportation question is not a new question. As far back as 1875 a committee of this House was appointed :

To inquire as to the best and most direct route for the conveyance of mails and passengers, between the Dominion of Canada and Europe ; the possibility of navigating the Gulf of St. Lawrence, during the winter months ; and of finding on the shores of the Dominion a harbour accessible both in winter and summer, to be the terminus of such shortest route.

The advantages of Louisbourg, the advantages of Sydney, the advantages of St. John, the advantages of Halifax are all well known, but the advantages offered by the port of Paspebiac are not so well known, and I shall read a portion of the report which refers to Paspebiac, a port which is now accessible to us and which practically forms part of our system of railways, and a port which is nearer to Montreal than any winter ocean port we have on Canadian territory.

That Paspebiac harbour, situated on the north side of Baie de Chaleur, offers all the advantages of a first-class harbour, and is, as the evidence shows, open and approachable from the Gulf of St. Lawrence at all seasons of the year.

In examining into the merits and demerits of Paspebiac harbour your committee deemed it advisable to elicit all the information possible regarding the navigation of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

It appears from the evidence given by Colonel Farijana, based upon careful hydrographical examinations, that the southern and western portions of the gulf are perfectly navigable at all seasons of the year.

It has been shown your committee that the Arctic ice which is carried into the gulf through the Strait of Belle Isle, strikes the N.E. of Anticosti with a velocity of current of half a mile per hour ; that the ice from the river St. Lawrence is born upon the southern shore of the same island with a force of current of two miles per hour ; and that the stronger current from the river forces the Arctic ice towards the western shore of Newfoundland, thus, leaving, as we have stated, the southern and western portions of the gulf safe for navigation.

It has further been shown your committee that the tidal current entering the gulf between Cape Breton and Cape Bay, is divided by the Magdalen group, and that the wave which passes southward of the Magdalen islands, holds in check any ice which may appear north of the islands, thus keeping free from accumulations of ice that portion of the gulf lying north of Cape Breton and south of the Magdalen islands, and as far north as Cape Gaspé.

That report was made by the committee as far back as 1875, and in 1876 another committee was appointed to determine if the river and Gulf of St. Lawrence could be made navigable during the winter season. There are persons in the city of Quebec who contend that the River St. Lawrence can be made navigable for twelve months in the year. I am not now dealing with that question. I am not asking this government, when it calls for tenders for the fast line to stipulate that the boats shall be built in such a way as to overcome the difficulties of ice, difficulties which are overcome now by the ordinary ferry boats plying between Lévis and Quebec. My point is, that if you do not utilize the River St. Lawrence between the 25th of November, and the month of May; if for five months in the year Canada is to be a frozen desert, so to speak, debarred from communication with the outside world except through American harbours; then I say that the time has come to consider the phase of the question which I present in connection with the transportation problem. The committee of 1876 also came to the conclusion, that the Gulf of St. Lawrence is perfectly navigable for the whole winter and that the port of Paspebiac was opened and easy of access. I may be told that four years ago an attempt was made by the steamer 'Gaspesia' to engage in winter navigation, and that the attempt failed. Let me present evidence which will show the nature of the venture made by the steamer 'Gaspesia.' I have here the statement of Captain Wakeham, commander of the government steamer 'La Canadienne,' a gentleman who has lived on the coast of Gaspé for nearly forty years, and who is more competent than perhaps any other to speak on this question. Here is what he says with reference to the 'Gaspesia' conditions generally in winter in that portion of Canada :

But very little ice enters the Bay Chaleur from the gulf. Northerly and westerly winds prevail during the winter, and the gulf ice is carried past the mouth of the bay, and does not drift into it to any great extent. With prolonged easterly wind, some ice would enter the bay ; but owing to the overlapping of Point Macquereau by Miscou Point, the Bay Chaleur is never closely packed with ice.

'Gaspesia' was an old vessel, not at all fitted for winter navigation in the gulf. She arrived off New Carlisle at a very unfortunate season. There was no wharf provision whatever for her. She was forced to anchor a considerable distance off shore in the running ice. The sea-

son was an unusually severe one ; the thermometer was at 20° below zero, and lower, nearly all the time she was in the bay.

On making for sea, the captain of the 'Gaspesia' took an unfortunate course, and one which he was advised to avoid by every one having the slightest knowledge of the ice conditions in the gulf. As a consequence he was caught in the pack which is always found to the westward of the Magdalen islands from the end of January to the end of March. Soon after getting into the pack, the 'Gaspesia' lost her rudder, which was not strengthened or protected against ice, and the vessel simply drifted about until she was relieved. Had she not lost her rudder I believe that, poor vessel even as she was, she would have worked out of the pack, got round it to the north, and made her way to sea without much difficulty.

On her second trip, the 'Gaspesia' reached Paspebiac during the last week in January. She left there again on the 3rd February. She had no difficulty in reaching Paspebiac from sea, and was not bothered with ice when going out of the Baie Chaleur and working down along the Gaspé shore. She afterwards got caught in the ice to the westward of the Magdalen islands. It is the opinion of all conversant with the matter that had she on leaving Paspebiac steamed direct for the east point of Anticosti, and from thence outwards towards Cape Ray, she should have got out of the gulf without difficulty.

But, had I not further evidence at my command, I would not ask the government to test the possibility of utilizing the Baie de Chaleur for navigation during the winter months. I have here evidence which convinces me that the navigation of the Baie de Chaleur is perfectly feasible after navigation has been abandoned on the St. Lawrence, and that it presents none of those risks from shoals and other natural obstacles which the navigation of the St. Lawrence is exposed to. Captain Wakeham speaks of the conditions at the present time, and of the conditions which have existed for thirty years to his knowledge. I know from letters which I have received that the Baie de Chaleur has been free from ice this winter, and that no ice has been seen at all in the port of Paspebiac. Captain Wakeham reports regarding the navigation of the Baie de Chaleur during the months of December and January :

There can be no question as to the navigability of the above waters in December. No ice whatever will be met with anywhere. The weather in December will generally be more moderate, that is, freer from storms than it is in October and the early part of November. For many years (over one hundred) small sailing vessels have cleared from the ports of Paspebiac and Gaspé in December with fish cargoes for the Mediterranean, South America and Jersey. These vessels usually make a quick and safe run out of the gulf. Their sailings have at times been made as late as Christmas week. The prevailing winds will be from west to northwesterly. On her first voyage the 'Gaspesia' reached Paspebiac on the 19th December, and left a week later. She saw no ice either coming or going.

We generally have a cold spell about the 1st January, when ice will make in sheltered coves, and in the inner parts of the harbours ; but this sort of ice will not bother an iron screw steamer. No ice will be found adrift in the gulf or Bay Chaleur, or along the shores of Bonaventure and Gaspé counties during the month of January.

I have frequently inquired of residents on the Bryon and others of the Magdalen islands as to the earliest dates at which drift ice begins to be seen about the islands. In very severe winters, that is rather when the winter has set in early, the first ice is seen off the Bryon island about the end of January. This ice is not at that date heavy, and there has been no rafting so that an ordinary ocean steamer would have no difficulty with it, as it is only when ice is in large heavy pans or fields and rafted that there is difficulty and risk in getting through it.

In a mild season, or when the winter has been late in setting in, ice will not be met with anywhere in the gulf before February.

In this connection I would particularly refer you to the evidence of Mr. Bourke, keeper of the Bird Rock Light, as given in 'La Presse' on the 25th November, 1901, in which this gentleman, who resides on the Magdalen islands, has navigated the gulf for over thirty years, and has for some time been keeper of the light on the Bird Rocks, and was also many springs at the ice as a sealing captain, and who has thus had exceptional advantages to judge of the matter, speaking of the question of winter navigation says :

'The greatest difficulties exist in March and April ; that there is no ice in the gulf until the 15th February.'

You have therefore a magnificent port on this bay, which is open to navigation without any difficulty at all for two and a half months after navigation is closed on the St. Lawrence. You have the Intercolonial leaving Montreal and reaching Metapedia, a distance of 439 miles. You have a branch of the Atlantic and Lake Superior, running down to Paspebiac 100 miles. You have therefore a port accessible, practically over your own lines of railway, which is open to navigation half the winter without any difficulty at all. I humbly submit that when this transportation question is taken up, the government should consider whether it will not utilize this port as long as it can be utilized, without crossing the whole of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to secure an ocean port.

Allow me now to give the table of distances between Paspebiac, to Liverpool as compared with other ports. I will give the southern route, that is by Cape Race, because the northern route via Belle Isle is somewhat difficult at that season of the year :

From Liverpool to		Paspebiac	2,480
"	"	Halifax	2,450
"	"	North Sydney	2,282
"	"	St. John, N.B.	2,700
"	"	Louisbourg	2,274
"	"	Portland	2,766
"	"	Boston	2,837
"	"	New York	3,034

If we take into consideration the advantage of having the shortest route to Europe over our own system of railway, through our

own territory, we have here a route which can be maintained easily without any additional expense by the use of our present railway system. You can leave Montreal for Paspebiac and reach there by the shortest route to Europe. Here is a fact which cannot be contradicted. Here are the figures taken from the official statement of distances, prepared by Captain Smith, let me read this to show the advantages of the route I am advocating.

	Miles.
From Montreal to Liverpool via Pasbebiac by Cape Race	3,034
From Montreal to Liverpool via Belle Isle	2,876
From Montreal to Liverpool via Louisbourg	3,255
From Montreal to Liverpool via North Sydney	3,271
From Montreal to Liverpool via Halifax by the Intercolonial Railway	3,287
From Montreal to Liverpool via St. John by the Intercolonial Railway	3,440
From Montreal to Liverpool via St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway	3,181
From Montreal to Liverpool via Portland by the Grand Trunk Railway	3,059
From Montreal to Liverpool via Boston by the Central Vermont	3,141
From Montreal to Liverpool via New York by the Central Vermont	3,484

Here are the advantages in favour of Paspebiac over the other combined railway and ocean routes :

	Miles.
Over Halifax via Cape Race	253
Over Halifax via Belle Isle	411
Over St. John by the Intercolonial Railway via Cape Race	406
Over St. John by the Intercolonial Railway via Belle Isle	564
Over St. John by the Canadian Pacific short line	147
Over St. John by the Canadian Pacific Railway via Belle Isle	305
Over Portland by the Grand Trunk Railway via Cape Race	25
Over Portland by Belle Isle	183
Over Boston via Cape Race	107
Over Boston by Belle Isle	265
Over New York by Cape Race	450
Over New York by Belle Isle	608

I respectfully submit that, in view of these statements, it is the duty of the government not to undertake to solve the fast line question or make any change concerning the eastern phase of the transportation question before fully weighing these facts, which I have the honour of submitting, and which are confirmed in every respect by the reports of the two select committees of this House appointed to investigate the matter. This is not an attempt on my part to raise a cry against the ports of St. John or Halifax, but it is well known that these ports, by our present system of communication over Canadian territory and our government road, cannot compete with the short lines to Portland and to St. John through the state of Maine.

There is another portion of the evidence I would like to submit before resuming my seat, and this is evidence which has been forwarded me through the courtesy of the senior member for Cape Breton.

We all know that during the last five years the steamer Bruce has kept up a line of communication from Cape Breton to Newfoundland during the whole winter. I inquired from Captain Delaney, the commander of that steamer, what are the conditions in the gulf of St. Lawrence and the Baie de Chaleur, to see if it was possible for a steamer to reach Paspebiac during December and January without meeting any ice. Here is his answer :

> I have been making tri-weekly trips between Port-aux-Basques, Newfoundland, and North Sydney for the last five winters, and I have not seen any ice before the latter part of February and the beginning of March, during that period, which would lead me to believe that ships could run to Paspebiac up to the end of January.

We have been told that North Sydney is the closest port to Europe and that Louisbourg is a great competitor for that honour, but if we take into consideration the combined rail and water route you will see that Paspebiac can beat both of them. You can reach it from Montreal after covering 539 miles of rail, and you cannot reach North Sydney without going over 989 miles of rail. I consider that we should utilize our water communication as much as possible when available in preference to our railways, in order to reduce the rates of freight and exploit most effectively our natural advantages. In order to reach Cape Sydney or Louisbourg, you have to cover 400 miles more of rail than to reach Paspebiac. Our attempt to make Halifax a national port has practically failed because the bulk of our exports go to St. John, and we all know that to reach St. John they have to go, not only over the Intercolonial Railway, but through American territory by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Between this and next session, the government may be in a position to submit a well defined scheme on this most vital question, and I would urge them to take into consideration this fact that the Baie de Chaleur is free from obstacles, that it is situated nearer the great centres of population of this country than any other portion of our waters after the closing of the St. Lawrence, and let me say that if the St. Lawrence could be utilized after the 25th of November, I would not ask that we should convey our passengers and freights to the Baie de Chaleur.

But, the St. Lawrence being closed, why cannot we use this beautiful expanse of water as long as it can be utilized and then if any difficulties arise because of ice, there is no reason why the Intercolonial Railway trains should be switched off on the Atlantic and Lake Superior to Paspebiac ; they can go on to Halifax or St. John. I have submitted these facts for the consideration of

hon. members of this House and for the consideration of the government. I have done so in the interest of the people I represent, who, I believe, have been the victims of another injustice added to the long series of injustices inflicted upon them during the last fifteen or twenty years. But beyond fulfilling my duty to my own county and to the neighbouring county of Gaspé, in which I take a great deal of interest, and which is so worthily represented in this House by my learned colleague (Mr. Lemieux), I have come to the conclusion that the Baie de Chaleur not only offers advantages for prolonged local traffic but is the natural outlet of the great national highway to Europe. Paspebiac is, beyond doubt, as the facts demonstrate, on the shortest route to Europe. I believe that for the solution of the eastern phase of the great question of transportation we should go back to the Baie de Chaleur, which has been so neglected by all governments, and the we shall find in it the solution of our winter port and difficulties. We may find there what Jacques Cartier found when he first came to this country, for it was in the Baie de Chaleur that Jacques Cartier first discovered this beautiful land; we may find there the solution of the problem before us as he found the solution of the great enterprise he had undertaken.

Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I shall not add anything to the very able argument presented by my hon. friend from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) with regard to this question. I wish only to say a few words with regard to winter navigation along the shores of Gaspé and our railway communications. I share his views as to the possibilities of Paspebiac becoming the terminus of a fast line between Canada and Europe. But I beg to differ with him as to the best harbour in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure. I believe that Paspebiac is a fine harbour, with excellent facilities and splendid possibilities. But it has been recognized beyond the shadow of a doubt that the best harbour on the coast is in the county of Gaspé, and it is called Gaspé Basin. Indeed, my hon. friend has made a very able argument and I must congratulate him. He began by speaking of the steamer service which has existed for twenty or twenty-five years between Dalhousie in New Brunswick, and Gaspé Basin. Last winter, I know, there was a certain agitation in our respective counties with a view to improve that service. I may say at once, that the old 'Admiral,' has been a faithful servant of the coast of Gaspé. But, at the same time I must admit she is too old to continue the service. As my hon. friend says, the line needs some improvement. I hear that the directors of the North American Transportation Company intend crossing the ocean this summer and getting a fine iron-built screw steamer, which is expected to begin semi-weekly trips by the beginning of next October.

Last winter I was assailed with petitions and resolutions asking for all-winter navigation in the Bay of Gaspé and the Baie des Chaleurs. Whilst I am a believer in winter navigation in some degree, I do not share the optimism of my hon. friend as to continuous winter navigation in the Baie des Chaleurs or the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Though some reports may have been made by captains and commanders to the effect that navigation could be carried on the whole year around, yet I have often conversed with some good old sea captains and navigators of my county, men who have spent their lives in navigating the waters of the Baie des Chaleurs and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Most of them speaking as honest men and experienced sailors, agreed in saying that while navigation was possible in the months of December and January, yet, during February and March it was almost impracticable. I say it again, I have the testimony of old sailors born and bred on the coast, men who have navigated these waters all their lives, who have been officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department, who have made a special study of the tides and currents, the winds and the movements of the ice in the Baie de Chaleur and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and they tell me that all-winter navigation is not feasible. Against such testimony, it is not sufficient to offer statistics and reports. So I would not advocate before this House a project based upon the idea of navigating those waters during the whole winter. As I said a minute ago, I have consulted some authorities on this subject, and I have summed up their opinions on the movement of ice in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the following lines: The temperature on the coast of Gaspé is milder than the rest of the province of Quebec. Fresh water will freeze at 30 degrees above zero. Salt water will not freeze above zero. During the severest winter the temperature will not go below zero except for eight or ten days. Therefore there is practically no ice in the salt water. The ice found in these waters is fresh water ice, which is formed in and is carried down by the St. Lawrence and other rivers emptying into the gulf. When this ice strikes Anticosti island it is met by a branch of the Arctic current, and is deflected towards the south. This deviation of the current, helped by the northern and western winds, which generally prevail in that region, causes the ice to accumulate in the straits of Northumberland and adjacent waters. The prevailing western winds cause the sea generally to be free of ice along the coast of the county of Gaspé. There is not much of that ice before the 1st or 15th of February; and although the month of March is very mild, the ice remains until it is washed away in

April. The sea is free of ice in December and January, and navigation along the coast is possible until the 1st of February, and can be resumed on the 15th of April at the latest. Last winter the temperature was exceptionally mild, and there was no ice in the gulf; there being no ice a steamer could have run between Dalhousie and Gaspé. In conclusion, during the winter months, navigation is feasible between the 1st or 15th of April, at the latest, until the 1st of February in the following year. Perhaps it would be possible for vessels to resist the ice from the 1st of February to the 15th of April, but such vessels should be built as the 'Stanley, which, until lately was running between Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, but such vessels are very costly.

Now, Sir, there was, last winter an agitation in my county in favour of a winter steam service. But last winter was an exceptionally mild one, there was no ice, and the same circumstances might not exist another year. We can have, as my hon. friend from Bonaventure has said, a steamer service between the 1st or 15th of April, until the 1st of February, or at least the 15th of January. As I stated it a moment ago, the 'Admiral' is an old steamer, and although she has rendered very good service to the coast, a change is needed. My hon. friend and myself, have urged upon the government to induce the North American Transportation Company to put an iron screw steamer on the route, and I am glad to learn that by the 1st of October next, this new steamer will be ready to start, thereby rendering certain navigation during ten months, an event which the people along the coast will hail with satisfaction.

I might also mention another scheme that has been discussed in the county in connection with this question. Some people wanted a steamer service between the terminus of the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway at New Carlisle, and Gaspé Basin, instead of between Dalhousie and Gaspé Basin. I have objected strenuously to such a change, and my reason for doing so is obvious. The county of Gaspé and a part of the county of Bonaventure get their freight from Toronto, Montreal and Quebec. Now take a barrel of flour coming from Toronto, Montreal or Quebec; it would be placed, say on board the cars of the Intercolonial Railway at Lévis, would have to pay freight to the Intercolonial Railway, then to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway, and it would have also to pay tribute to the steamer running between New Carlisle and Gaspé Basin. You can readily understand, Mr. Speaker, to what would amount our freight rates if such conditions existed, and I was justified in objecting to such a change. I am pleased to state that the Department of Trade and Commerce did not yield to the suggestions evidently made by the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. Now, Sir, if as I expect, we have a good iron screw steamer put on the route next October, the coast of Gaspé will be satisfied provided the terminus is not changed.

As regards our railway communication, I fully agree with my hon. friend that the action of the Railway Committee of the Senate this morning was most deplorable. I regret to state that after our Bill had received the support of the Prime Minister, of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and of the Minister of Justice, and the unanimous assent of this House, the leader of the government in the Senate, the hon. the Secretary of State, saw fit to throw in his lot with those who for a quarter of a century have opposed the legitimate aspirations of the counties of Bonaventure and Gaspé. I cannot understand how the leader of the government in the Senate found his way to vote against a Bill which had been to some extent, drafted by some of his colleagues. Yes, Sir, my hon. friend from Bonaventure and myself submitted the amendments agreed to by the interested parties, to the Minister of Justice, and to the Minister of Railways and Canals; the amendments to the Bill were in fact drafted by them. How does it happen that the leader of the government in the Senate found his way to vote against that Bill? Sir, I repeat that the Bill as amended, after having been sanctioned by the Minister of Justice, by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the Prime Minister himself, should have been, to say the least, given fair play by the Secretary of State. As I have already stated in this House, my hon. friend from Bonaventure and myself opposed the Bill as at first introduced, because we found in it no protection for the interests of the people we represent. But when these amendments had been accepted by the Prime Minister and his colleagues in this House, it was the duty of the Secretary of State to support the Bill and not nullify our common efforts as he did by his vote. I regret his action, and I desire to say that next year we shall make another attempt to get justice, not only from the government side but from the other side of the House as well.

THE MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE (Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright). I have listened with much interest, and I have no doubt the House has also listened with much interest, to the remarks of the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil). It is apparent from the remarks of his colleague from Gaspé (Mr. Lemieux) that this is a question which has two sides to it, and I may be pardoned if I decline to express an opinion when two gentlemen having far superior opportunities of understanding the situation than I can boast of, have hitherto failed to agree. With respect, however, to the matters more particularly belonging to my own department, I will just say that I have carefully considered the request made by my hon. friend from

Bonaventure and Gaspé, and the government will endeavour to supply as good a service as they possibly can obtain for the benefit of the inhabitants of those two counties. I believe that up to date the steamer 'Admiral,' which has been engaged for a good many years, has rendered a very efficient service. But I am aware that there are difficulties connected with the employment of paddlewheel steamers, and it may be necessary to substitute another. I am in correspondence with the company on that subject at present, and I hope to be able to meet the views of my hon. friends.

SMALL-POX ON SCHOONER 'JEANIE MYRTLE'—FISHERY AWARD—COASTING TRADE.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). Mr. Speaker, I take advantage of this opportunity to bring to the notice of the government a matter of very vital importance to every citizen of this Dominion, especially those residing near the sea engaged in shipping, but more particularly the sick seamen whose life as a rule is a hard one, when away from home and friends, and stricken down with dread disease. It will be remembered the Halifax newspapers on the 5th inst., reported the La Have schooner, 'Jeanie Myrtle,' Creaser, master, having entered the port of Hailfax from sea the day previous, with a sick seaman on board, and reported the same to the customs a hour after the port physician visited the ship, and when viewing the patient, at a glance pronounced it small-pox. The doctor was doubtful as to the case coming under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, but, as a precautionary measure ordered the yellow flag to be hoisted, and required the crew to remain by the vessel. When reaching the shore he wired the facts to the Minister of Agriculture, and asked for instructions, receiving as an answer, that the case was one for the local authorities, and as a result, the port physician acting under orders from here—Ottawa—refused to take any action beyond the precautions I have described.

The city authorities were next interviewed, and the chairman of the Board of Health of Halifax was asked about it, when the following episode, as reported, ensued :—

'What are you doing about the small-pox schooner?'

'We have nothing to do with it.'

'Who has ?'

'I don't know, but not Halifax. The Ottawa telegram says "local authorities," but Dr. Gilp'n on behalf of province, says "it's a county charge".'

'Are you going to allow the schooner to remain there a menace to the health of the community ?'

'The people on board have been told to stay there, and in the morning we will order the schooner to sea.'

'Where will she go ?'

'To LaHave, where she belongs, I suppose. When ordered from Canso she should have gone straight home, and not put in here at all. Why should Halifax be saddled with the schooner that lies anchored over there near the Dartmouth shore ?'

'How can you order the vessel out of the harbour if you have no jurisdiction in the case?' the 'Herald' asked.

But at this stage the conversation with Dr. Chisholm ended, for the genial chairman of the board of health declined to continue it.

A telegram was sent to me also the same day, which reads as follows :—

Halifax, N.S., May 5, 1902.

Schooner 'Jeanie Myrtle,' Creaser, master, Ritcey's Cove, here with case of small-pox. Authorities refuse allow man land here. Has paid sick mariners' dues. Bad weather may detain vessel here days, with no attendance for man. See Minister Agriculture, ask him instruct Dominion physician to act.

BLACK, BROAD & CO.

This telegram was acted upon by me in the most energetic manner, by my calling first on the Minister of Agriculture, who informed me that he had a telegram from Halifax also, but was powerless to act at it was clearly provincial, and had answered in that way. I next applied to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and had the satisfaction of his telling me, after some slight inquiry and conference with his friends, that he would wire the officer of customs for the port of Halifax to attend to the matter, though in reality it was no part of the requirements of his department, but that his action was purely from a motive of sympathy, under the peculiar circumstances of the case. I would say here, that both the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Marine acted promptly in the matter, and I have no cause for complaint as respects either of them in that connection.

But I do say, and here state, that there is something radically wrong in this connection, that the Dominion, provincial and civic health authorities—all three should decline to act in this case, or care for this sick seaman, as a duty on their part. The very fact of the Dominion government receiving a sick mariner's fee, should in justice entitle a sick mariner having contagious disease to admission into the nearest contagious hospital that offered, and there cared for, with the best attendance possible, come from whence the patient may, within the province or from without. The expression of the chairman of the Halifax Board of Health, in the cold-hearted words, as referred to, 'In the morning we will send the vessel to sea,' if correct as reported, and I have no reason to doubt it, was very uncalled for, but in justice to him would say, that he must have given such utterance in an unguarded moment.

What is the object in exacting the sick mariner's due, I would ask, if it is not to give the sick seamen that comfort, and medical aid necessary to lead to his speedy recovery, and in the dread disease of small-

pox I contend the greatest effort should be exercised in the care of such patients, that they be kept isolated to prevent a spread, which can only be accomplished successfully in a regularly established contagious hospital, with a proper staff of attendants, that the patients may receive all necessary medical aid, care and attention.

I claim in all sincerity that the federal government should take this matter promptly in hand, and make such arrangements and regulations as to settle this difficulty for ever, and have it clearly understood in future, that all sick seamen with contagious disease are to be received into the nearest contagious hospital and cared for at the expense of the federal government. This is most essential, and I sincerely hope the right hon. the First Minister will see that prompt action is taken with the view of better attention being given to this class of seamen.

Whilst I am on my feet I would ask the indulgence of the House to bring to its notice the subject of the fishery bounty. I may say that I greatly regretted my absence from the House (which was unavoidable owing to my having a cold) when the hon. member for Hamilton called attention to the statement of Premier Peters in the legislature of Prince Edward Island that 'there was no need of levying additional taxes to meet the prospective expenditure, because he was certain the Dominion government would pay over to the island government $1,000,000 as the island's share of the Halifax fishery awards.' It is also currently reported that approaches have been made by New Brunswick with the same object in view. The right hon. leader in reply stated that 'there was no ground for apprehension of this sort.' But I did not approve of his utterance that 'It would make no difference whether this fund was administered by the Dominion or provincial authorities for the benefit of the fishermen.' I take serious exception to this, and in my mind it would make a very great deal of difference, were there to be no apportionment of this fund to the respective provinces, they to dispose of the fund as they thought proper, as the other province, Nova Scotia not excepted, would have the same view as to the appropriation as the island province expressed, and the matter of bounty for the encouragement of the fishermen would be a thing of the past. These governments have proved themselves in the past to be by no means, in the sense of the term parsimonious and would, were this money given them, spend it in an improvident manner, and the poor fishermen would in a short time have nothing in the way of bounty whatever.

The question of the division of the fishery award, and the payment even of apportionments to the respective provinces, should not be entertained by this government for one moment, as the Dominion government is the most suitable body to be the trustee of such a fund, and not the provinces, as they would use the money to pay their provincial current expenses, and the bounty would be lost for ever. I here, in the most emphatic manner, protest against any attempt being made to take this fund out of the hands of the Dominion government, they being the most suitable trustees, or custodians of the fund, where we can feel assured it is safe from any attempt to have it utilized for any other purpose than that for which it was intended, viz., bounty for fishermen, it having been paid for the sacrifices the fishermen underwent, when the maritime fishing grounds were used by the United States fishermen in common with Canadian fishermen. The fishermen of the maritime provinces have a hard struggle at present to move along successfully even with the benefit of the bounty, as they have to compete with the bounty fed French fish of St. Pierre which means about $2 of a bonus on every quintal of French fish exported outside of France, Canada being excluded in the sale of fish to any French dependency, Guadoloupe and Martinique included, by reason of their prohibitory tariff. The French have the trade of these islands practically to themselves, and at the same time come into competition with us, with their bounty fed fish in the other markets of the world, the British West Indies included.

There is another matter of very great importance that I desire the First Minister to take cognizance of, and that is the coastwise trade of the West India Islands, enjoyed by British shipping from time immemorial, but now greatly interfered with by the embargo set up by the United States since their acquirement of the island of Porto Rico, and the monopoly of that market, which up to a recent date was largely the market for Nova Scotia fish, in fact the very best of all the West India group. Of course I am aware that we cannot now control this matter, but it might have been managed satisfactorily to us had active measures been taken by this government, and I strongly advised to have the imperial government informed of our interest and trade with this island, and to induce Great Britain to demand an undertaking from the United States government that they would not be allowed to plant their flag on that island—Porto Rico—inhabited by a law-abiding and peaceful people, unless they consented to allow the same privileges for trading with them, in common with the United States, that we previously enjoyed. I tried to impress this government with the importance of the Porto Rico trade to Nova Scotia, and pointed out how essential it was in our interest to have them take prompt action to this end, but without avail. What is the condition of matters now? Simply that we are handicapped by the United States in that market, and in addition prevented doing a coastwise trade; that is in carrying fish to that island and having a return cargo of their products to any port in the United States which we had

hitherto enjoyed, whilst the United States is allowed all the coasting trade she desires with the British West India Islands without interruption.

Jamaica trade with Great Britain should be thought of also at the Coronation convention, in order that the bounty-fed beet root sugar of Germany, France and other countries should not be admitted into Great Britain to the exclusion of Jamaica cane-grown sugar, unless a bonus, or preference is given to Jamaica. I refer to this particularly, as our Nova Scotia trade with Jamaica is little at present, owing to their poverty stricken condition, brought about by England's free trade policy under which, in sugar, she can not compete with the bounty-fed product.

I mention this now, in the hope that the right hon. First Minister will make a note of it, and bring it forcibly to the notice of the Coronation convention meeting next month in London. Effective measures are demanded in the interest of Canadian trade, and the trade of the British Empire, I feel assured will co-equally be benefited by it.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES (Hon. James Sutherland). Mr. Speaker, two of the questions brought to the attention of the House by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kaulbach) have already been discussed, one of them at a very early hour this morning. In regard to the last question I would say that it is one, perhaps, more requiring the attention of the imperial authorities than of this parliament. I hope that the ministers who will attend the conference in London will give the suggestion which he has made their attention. In regard to the case of small-pox on the fishing craft I would say that when it was brought to my attention by the hon. gentleman and by other hon. members of the House and also by a message from the authorities in Halifax I was advised by the department that it was a provincial or local matter and that it was outside of our jurisdiction. However, as there seemed to be some doubt as to the question of jurisdiction, in my own mind, at least, and as we had a report stating that the unfortunate sailor was very ill on a fishing craft lying out in the harbour, I made every possible effort to see that he was taken care of and I requested the use of the contagious diseases hospital there on the island. I also instructed the officer of the department at Halifax to see that every provision was made to take care of this unfortunate man.

In regard to the fisheries award I suppose that my hon. friend and that all of us will have to abide by the decision that may be given by the courts in this matter. It may be possible that it will be decided that the fund is to be administered as it now is by the Dominion. If on the other hand, the courts decide that the provinces are entitled to have this money handed over to them, then, I do not see what else we can do than hand it over. However, as that matter is now under consideration I do not think it is necessary to take up the time of the House in discussing it at the present time. It is a question that will come up for discussion and probably for final settlement at the next session of parliament.

Mr. BELL. Are you discussing this matter with the provincial premiers.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes, on the 20th instant. If an amicable arrangement is made we will have a final settlement, and if it be referred to the courts I hope we will have it decided before next session.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I wish to set my hon. friend the leader of the opposition right with regard to a statement he made yesterday, and I am quite sure that he will be glad I should do so. It is with reference to the work on the Galops rapids.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Oh, yes, I may say that I was yesterday told by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) that during my absence on one occasion the vote had been withdrawn.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that. The minister is quite correct in making reference to the matter.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) was not properly informed on the subject. The expenditure upon this work for which we asked an appropriation this session was not for work that was done during the previous or current fiscal year, nor was it the Auditor General who made any communication to the effect that the work had not been authorized or that there had been no appropriation for it. The officer who advised the contractor, and advised him before he did any work during the last fiscal year, was the chief engineer of the department, whose duty it was to do so. The contractor appears to have gone on with the work to a limited extent, and he has been pressing for payment, but the hon. gentleman was wrong in saying that the department recognized his claim. There is no ground whatever upon which any gentleman in the House can say that the government intend to, or will pay for work which was done against notice and without appropriation and with the full knowledge that there was an intention on the part of the government not to continue it. This party no doubt assumed that the work would be proceeded with later, but he assumed it without any warrant. No officer of the

government, certainly with my knowledge, held out to him any such promise, and he therefore took upon himself the entire risk of getting recouped for any work he may have done. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), also made the statement that a member of this House had asserted that this work was not only useless but it was detrimental to the public interest and even injurious to navigation. I was present when the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) made that statement, and it is a statement which is entitled to proper consideration, but it would be a great mistake for this House to assume that any member of parliament, no matter how strong his opinion may be upon a question of that kind, can settle the matter on his mere ipse dixit. We will have to consider whether his judgment is sound on such a point, and whether he is in a better position to form an opinion upon it than experts who have made a life study of the business.

The question of the Galops rapids is not by any means an easy question to determine. The work was originally started by one of the most eminent engineers who had ever been in the service of the government. I had not the pleasure of knowing Mr. Page, but there is a tradition that Mr. Page was an engineer of exceptional ability and that he was an efficient and capable officer. Mr. Page initiated this work. It was upon his strong opinion and judgment that this work was undertaken as being a necessary and proper work, and the Minister of Railways and Canals of that day agreed in Mr. Page's opinion. After Mr. Page died the work was continued under Mr. Trudeau, who is recognized as an engineer whose opinion would be entitled to very great weight, and when Mr. Rubidge took charge of the St. Lawrence canal afterwards, his judgment was in entire accord with that of Mr. Page and of Mr. Trudeau. I am afraid to say how many years Mr. Rubidge has been in the service of the government, but he has been for probably fifty years, so that he has a very lengthened experience. Mr. Rubidge has now attained the ripe age of eighty-five years. All the officers and engineers of the department who had to do with this work were of the same opinion, so that there was a continuity of approval in the department in reference to it. I am sorry that the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) is not here, but I may say that I understand that some dispute arose which led to difficulties between Mr. Rubidge and the hon. member for Grenville, and that hon. gentleman brought this subject of the Galops rapids into parliament before I had the honour of a seat here, and he condemned the project very strongly and has continued of that opinion. But what course should a Minister of Railways and Canals take when a controversy arises in respect to a particular work upon which $700,000 or $800,000 have already been expended and for which $250,000 more will be required to complete ? The work proceeded for three years or so in my department before any doubt was raised at all with regard to the wisdom of continuing it. I am not an engineer myself and could not give an expert opinion, and until the matter was mentioned in parliament by the hon. member for Grenville I did not know that a doubt had arisen, and I concluded that as there was that doubt I would not ask for an appropriation for the work further. I have not done so except for the sum of $25,000 this session which was needed to pay, not for work which had been done since the appropriation had stopped, but for work which was done previously.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have been under a misapprehension with regard to a matter which took place when I was not in the House, and my attention was not directed to it up to the time I was addressing the House yesterday. I understand that while I was absent the vote was reduced by one-half. The hon. minister is quite right in directing my attention to it now. The gist of my criticism was that it seemed to me that the government might be responsible for the work which was done, owing to what I understood to be an admitted fact, viz., that officers of the government had been on board the dredge and in charge of the dredge during the time the work was being proceeded with.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are advised that the party has had notice that there was no authority, and that he should not go on with the work.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood that. I am only gathering, from what took place when the estimates were under discussion, that an engineer of the government was on board the dredge which was performing this work after the appropriation had lapsed, and I thought that there might be some question as to whether the government would not be liable for that very reason.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. We are advised not.

Mr. SPROULE. Had the minister any correspondence with the contractor about the money he earned ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, I think not. I think he sent his estimates in, but I do not think he applied for anything in any other way. He came here during the present session, and called at the office to see me, and I told him the work would not go on. I notified him that there would be no appropriation asked for to continue the work. He did not say a word to me about the work that had been done, and I did not know at that time that there had been any work done.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The question is a very simple one. The work was abandoned in June of last year in consequence of a message from the department stating that the appropriation for the work had been expended. But the minister brought down to this House an estimate for $50,000. What was it for ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I explained that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It could not be for anything but work executed after the expiration of the year, and to pay percentages which were retained by the government from the contractors for work already done.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not follow me or he has forgotten what I stated, and I will repeat it. I said that the estimate was handed to me by the chief engineer, and I took it to council with this statement, that the amount would be required in order to cover what was retained by way of drawback in respect to work done prior to the 1st of July, 1901, and for a balance—he did not know exactly how much it was, but he was sure that $50,000 would cover it—that was due up to the 1st of July, and after the estimate had been made previous to that date. The amount had not been ascertained accurately and definitely, and therefore though we had enough to close that, we had not one dollar for any work done subsequent to the 1st of July; and in order that there might be no possibility for any one to say that we were proposing by the vote of $50,000 to cover anything subsequent to the 1st of July, and because we did not know, and do not know, just what amount is necessary to pay for work done prior to the 1st of July, and after the estimate, I asked the committee to allow me to strike out everything but the drawback of $25,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. That is exactly the statement that I made in reference to the matter. The minister, in the first place, comes down to the House and asks for $50,000. He says that $25,000 or about that amount is drawback retained by the government for work executed by these contractors. The peculiarty of the drawback is this, that they were working by the day, except in the case of a small portion of the contract for which the drawback could not possibly amount to one-fourth of the amount which the hon. gentleman has retained. Why did he ask for $50,000 ? He thought possibly the drawback and the amount due to the contractors was due before the 1st of July. It could not possibly be so. The Minister of Railways would not spend an amount greater than the appropriation which was made for these works. He did not say that the amount expended was greater than what had been appropriated. All that the department said to the contractor was : 'This appropriation for the year is expended, and there is no more money with which to go on with the work.' What does the hon. minister ask the $50,000 for ? It is as plain as possible that his officers were on that dredge and were in charge of these excavation works from July to the end of the summer, and the intention of the hon. minister evidently was to pay the contractors for the rest of the year. But when he heard from my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) the absurdity of the work he was doing and what enormous sums he was paying for a useless work, he took the House into his confidence and said : 'I will make no more payments upon that work except the amount of the drawback,' and I took that promise from the minister at the time—that he was to apply the $25,000 which was voted for this particular work solely on the drawback which is retained by the government from the contractors. Under these circumstances, we will let the amount pass; but you can easily see how the right hon. leader of the government made the mistake he did when he stated that $50,000 was voted for the Galops rapids, because he was not in the House when the hon. Minister of Railways withdrew half the vote and only retained the $25,000 for the purpose of paying the drawback.

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

To provide for additional aids to navigation, principally on the St. Lawrence route, including the purchase of a steamer for tidal and surveying purposes, $280,000.

Mr. EARLE. I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if any portion of that is contemplated to be spent on the coast of British Columbia ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There is provision in this vote for some improvements to aids to navigation on the Pacific coast. Although the greater portion of it is intended for improvements on what is known as the St. Lawrence route, part of it is to be used in other parts of the Dominion. As the House is aware, very strong representations have been made for many years that the lighting and other aids to navigation on the St. Lawrence route are deficient. It is only necessary for me to mention, what every hon. member knows, that the larger portion of the trade of Canada is in Europe, and the object to be aimed at is to place the Canadian producer in a position to compete successfully with the exporters from other countries. To enable me to do this, I must be placed in a position to have the lowest possible charge imposed on the shipments of Canadian products to the European markets. This charge consists of two items—freight and

insurance. Ship owners have to provide for a profit on their enterprise. They have to add to the other expenses the insurance on the hull and there is also insurance on the produce to be taken into account, so that it will be seen that the high rates of insurance now charged are a heavy tax on the Canadian producers as against those of another country, who are charged lower rates. My information is that the insurance from St. Lawrence ports is from two to five times as great as from American ports. Figures given me by leading shippers of Montreal show that on a large steamer, worth say $500,000, the extra insurance charge is $5,000 per voyage, or $25,000 per season of five trips. Every one will see what a very heavy tax this is on the Canadian producer as compared with the American shipper. The reason of this high rate is undoubtedly the many casualties which have happened on the St. Lawrence route. It has been represented to us by the large shipping interests and by the marine and insurance people, that if we had very much improved aids to navigation, the rates would be reduced to those charged at American ports or at any rate would be very much reduced. I might quote from one of the official statements of the shipping interests of this country, that if the improvements recommended by them are made, the insurance rates would be very materially reduced. I have also had representations made to me by representatives of the largest marine insurance companies, and a representative of Lloyds, to the effect that the result would be, as I have said, to reduce the insurance very materially, if not to the same rates as are charged at American ports. Having been promised these reductions, I have come to the conclusion that it would be very much in the interests of this country to improve the aids to navigation. It must also be remembered that as our shipping season is short, lasting only during a portion of the year, we have to be particularly on the alert in competing with ports that are open all the year round, and must provide ourselves with the best facilities.

Mr. SPROULE. On what principle is this money to be expended ?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I will give my hon. friend and the House a full statement of how we propose to expend these moneys. On the southern route entering the St. Lawrence the following improvements are contemplated :

Cape Race—A quick flashing light to be established and whistle changed to syren.

Cape Pine—A first-rate light and fog signal to be established here, and as this is in Newfoundland, it is proposed to invite the imperial and colonial governments to co-operate with us.

Cape Ray—Improvement of light and signal.

Bird Rocks—Light to be made occulting.

Byron Island—Light to be established.

Cape Rosier—Fog alarm to be strengthened and light made occulting.

Fame Point—A syren is now being erected and light improved.

If any hon. gentleman is sufficiently interested to look at the map, which I have laid on the Table, he will see on it those points at which we propose to make these improvements.

Entering the St. Lawrence by the Strait of Belle Isle or northern route, we propose to make the following improvements :

Belle Isle—A new light and fog alarm will be placed on the north-east end.

Cape Bauld or Cape Norman—One of the fog alarms will be changed.

Point Amour—Light will be made occulting.

East End Anticosti—Lightship will be placed.

And between the points where the two routes above mentioned join, namely, Fame Point, and Quebec, the following improvements are contemplated :

Matane—Bell buoys being placed on extremity of shoal, a syren established at station and light improved.

Father Point—A syren is being erected and the light will be improved.

Princess Shoal—This danger at the mouth of the Saguenay is being marked by a combined gas and bell buoy, which will be placed in position as soon as one can be procured.

Lower Traverse—A pier light being erected.

Belchasse—Light being made occulting.

West end of Island of Orleans—Occulting light was established at this point last autum to guide vessels on making the turn at Quebec harbour.

With regard to the route from Quebec to Montreal, I wish to state in general terms that the policy of the department is to thoroughly mark each section of the ship channel, as improved, with buoys and range lights, and changes in aids to navigation are rapidly being made.

On the 1st day of May this year, three new range lights were established at St. Antoine, to more efficiently mark a turn complained of by the pilots, and three pairs of range rights were established near Vercheres to mark a new channel where the Department of Public Works have done splendid work in straightening and widening an intricate reach.

The next stretch that it is proposed to improve is a dredged cut at Pointe aux Trembles.

The deepening of Lake St. Peter will be followed by a rearrangement of the lights, and the semaphore showing the depth of water over Ste. Croix Bar, where the dredging has been completed, is being moved to show the depth over St. Augustin Bar, which is now the shoalest point above Quebec.

Gas buoys are being provided for different points on the ship channel and will be placed as fast as they can be utilized.

The aim of all these improvements will be to enable a ship to run through from

Quebec to Montreal without stopping, either by day or night.

I may say that this item was under discussion yesterday, and, at the request of some hon. members, I had it stand over. But I find that these hon. gentlemen are not present. Still, I am taking the time of the committee to submit this information, because I know that it is of the greatest possible interest to those engaged in shipping. With regard to the establishment of lights in British Columbia, I intend to ask the officers of the department to visit that province at an early date, and to learn what additional aids to navigation are urgently required. The different routes to be protected are first :

The route outside Vancouver Island on the great Circle Route to Japan, principally for the safety of the Canadian Pacific Railway steamers ; second, the inside routes to Ladysmith and other coal shipping centres for the protection of the large freight steamers now engaged in carrying coal to the United States and other ports, a traffic that is rapidly increasing ; and third, the coasting trade of British Columbia, largely increased by the rapid development of lumbering, fishing and mining industries and Yukon trade in all the inlets and inside passages from the boundary line north to Fort Simpson.

Then there is the small light to be provided in Prince Edward Island, three in Nova Scotia, one in New Brunswick and two in the province of Quebec, on the Gaspé coast. In Ontario, five new lights have been urgently pressed upon the department on account of the increase of trade, particularly on the Georgian Bay.

With regard to the portion of this vote to be devoted to tidal survey work, I may say that the survey of the tides and currents will be extended and it is particularly desirable that the set of the currents off Cape Pine and Cape Race should be at once investigated.

Tide tables are now prepared annually from tidal record secured by this survey for all the more important harbours in eastern Canada ; and also for the principal harbours in British Columbia. Tidal differences have also been determined, which enable the time of the tide to be known at a number of harbours of secondary importance.

An investigation of the currents was carried on during three seasons, as follows:—

1894.—In the Strait of Belle Isle and Cabot Strait ; two of the entrances to the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

1895.—The Gaspé current and the general circulation of the currents in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

1896.—The north-eastern arm of the gulf and the steamship route from Belle Isle to Anticosti.

The regions most requiring investigation are :

(1.) Around the south-eastern coast of Newfoundland, off Cape Race and the southern bays.

(2.) At the entrance to the Bay of Fundy.

(3.) Further investigation in several regions within the gulf, and off the outer end of Belle Isle Strait.

I am satisfied that this improvement of the St. Lawrence route will give satisfaction to the large shipping interests especially in the old country, and that it will so meet the views of the marine insurance people that we shall get a very largely decreased rate as compared with that in force at the present time. From this comparatively small expenditure, I believe the country will reap great benefits.

Mr. EARLE. In addition to the expenditure on lights, on the coast of British Columbia, I think it will be well to have a minute hydrographic survey of that coast. The steamer 'Quadra' has been doing that work spasmodically. But now that the department has two steamers to replace her, one for the lighthouse and one for the fisheries' protection service, could not the whole time of the 'Quadra' be occupied with this hydrographic work in future ? Her chief officer is a very competent man, who has been doing as I say, more or less of this work ever since she has been in commission. But the great difficulty is, he has not time to do all that needs to be done. He rarely comes in without being able to add to the stock of information possessed as to the dangerous rocks on that coast. As the hon. minister knows, wrecks have been frequent on that coast since the larger vessels began navigating there. Their presence makes the need of surveys all the greater.

Mr. BELL. If I understood the hon. minister right he said he intended to devote a good deal of the grant to improving our knowledge of Newfoundland around Cape Race.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Yes.

Mr. BELL. A large part of the bad reputation under which the St. Lawrence route labours is due to the number of wrecks that have taken place in the neighbourhood of Cape Race. The marine casualties in those waters are so numerous and so unaccountable that I think it not surprising that the marine insurance companies exact high rates. If, by any reasonable expenditure, any reasonable expenditure at all, our knowledge of that locality can be enlarged so as to render impossible, or at least improbable, the occurrence of more of the mysterious wrecks that every season occur there, it will do more to improve the reputation of the St. Lawrence route than any work that could be done within the gulf of St. Lawrence itself. The chart showing the wrecks that have occurred upon this south-eastern portion of the coast of Newfoundland must convince us that it is one of the most dangerous places for navigation in the whole world. It is not within our own waters, it

is true. But if we are to make the St. Lawrence route safe and available we must master, no matter at what cost, the knowledge of that very difficult and dangerous coast. I am glad to know that the minister has taken enough money to enable him to deal with that in a satisfactory and efficient manner. Anything short of that would be an unwise expenditure. Enough expenditure must be made in the shape of vessels and the employment of enough competent men to make that coast reasonably safe, and. if possible absolutely safe.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The particular point to which my hon. friend (Mr. Bell) refers is being covered by the British government. We have been in communication with them, and at the point where they leave off we are taking up the work. So that, for the whole coast, we shall have the information which is so necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I hope the navigation companies will do their part and share, as we are doing our part and share. It is hardly the thing perhaps, for one minister to congratulate another publicly, but I ask to be allowed to do so in this case. My hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has undertaken to carry out improvements that should have been carried out long ago. He is doing a most useful work for this country. But again let me ask the navigation companies not to forget that in spite of the best buoys, the best lights, the best dredged channels and other improvements, if they do not employ the right men, there will still be accidents and wrecks. It is within my personal knowledge that, in many cases our navigation companies—Canadian navigation companies as well as others—employ men who should not be engaged in such important work. They employ men who drink. For instance, I was on a ship two years ago. It was a clear day, and we were nearing Father Point, the ship struck. The captain had gone down to his room to write despatches. I had just been on the bridge, and I was glad not to have been there when the accident happened, or I might have been accused of having distracted the attention of the man who had charge of the ship. I inquired of the captain how it could be that, in full daylight, with a buoy clearly in sight, the vessel could have struck bottom. He did not tell me at the moment, but when we reached port, he said: Well, Mr. Minister, here are the facts : This is simply a result of false friendship; the man who was employed as my second had been commander of a steamer, but he had been drinking and was discharged, and we employed him—and here is the result of my kindness. We do our part, let the navigation companies do their part also.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the minister if he has received any suggestions from, or has had any communication with the underwriters whose rates have been so high on the St. Lawrence, with regard to the steps he is taking and for which he proposes to provide by this vote. The association of underwriters, or at least certain companies, have made representations to the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to what they thought ought to be done. I suppose it would be well, if we expect the rates to be reduced, that we should endeavour, so far as consistent with the public interest, to meet therir views in regard to this matter.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. I may say that when I took charge of the department I found that representations with regard to this matter had been made by the representatives of the marine insurance companies, by the large ship owners, and by the Board of Trade of the city of Montreal, in fact by merchants generally; and when I undertook to consider this question I took the reports furnished by these different bodies and asked for an interview with their leading representatives. Having gone into the matter with the chief engineer and officers of the department, we have formed a plan which I think will carry out almost entirely the views of the shipping interests and of the marine and insurance people as presented by them to the department. I think if we give them what they ask, and they certainly ought to be good judges of what they need, we shall meet their views on almost every point. Of course they have asked for a great deal, I suppose that is human nature, and they have been perhaps exacting; but the plan I am recommending meets their wishes almost to the whole extent.

Some resolutions reported.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, as follows :

MINTO.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1902, and in accordance with the provisions of 'The British North America Act, 1867,' the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, May 14th, 1902.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE moved that the message together with the esti-

mates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Relief to sufferers in Martinique and St. Vincent, $50,000.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). It had been understood that we would have no more estimates this session, but when I state the purpose for which this vote is asked, I am sure it will have the unanimous assent of the House. We have all had our attention drawn by the press to the story of the appalling disaster which has fallen on the French island of Martinique, and to the disaster, perhaps not so great, but of a very serious character, which has fallen upon the neighbouring British island of St. Vincent. The whole world is moved to sympathy by this terrible circumstance, and there seems to be a general desire that aid should be given to those who are suffering in consequence. It is thought well that the government of Canada should contribute to this relief fund. We have therefore presented to the House an estimate appropriating the sum of $50,000 for the relief of the sufferers from the volcanic disasters in the West Indies. We propose that one-half of that sum shall be at once supplied to the relief fund for the island in which the greatest disaster has occurred, the island of Martinique; and we think that perhaps it can best be applied by placing the money at the disposal of the French colonial minister in Paris, who will, of course, be able to see that it is applied in the right direction. As respects the balance, it will, either in whole or in part, be applied for the relief of the sufferers in the island of St. Vincent. The information respecting the disaster in St. Vincent is not yet perhaps sufficient to enable us to know whether the whole sum will be required there; but if the necessity seems to arise, the balance will be applied to St. Vincent. At all events, the aim is that all who are suffering by these terrible disasters shall have some assistance from the government and the people of Canada in this moment of their great need.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I fully concur with and support the action of the government in asking parliament to make this appropriation. On occasions in the past when our own people have been in need of substantial sympathy from other countries, they have received it on many occasions in a very substantial manner. I think it is a fitting thing that the government should take this step at the present time. The appalling suddenness of this disaster, its tremendous extent, the amazing number of people who, in, but a moment of time, were absolutely destroyed and their homes wiped out of existence, render this an occasion on which this country may well testify its sympathy in this effective manner. I am glad that the government propose to apply a portion of this sum at once to the relief of the sufferers in the island of Martinique, and I believe that the action of the government in that way will be regarded as an indication of the neighbourly feeling and good will which exist between this country and the great nation to which that island belongs. I have very much pleasure, therefore, in supporting the motion of the Minister of Finance.

Resolution reported.

PROROGATION.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received a communication from the Secretary of His Excellency the Governor General, as follows:

Office of the
Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, May 14th, 1902.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, on Thursday, the 15th instant, at three o'clock, for the purpose of proroguing the session of the parliament of Canada.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. S. MAUDE, Major,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Militia—Rifle ranges, $75,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have received a communication from Halifax respecting the Bedford rifle range, and I will read a brief extract from it so that it may be brought to the attention of the Minister of Militia whom I do not see at present in the House. The letter says:

As one of a number of interested militiamen I take the liberty of writing you to ask you if you will try and get some definite answer from the Minister of Militia as to when Bedford rifle range is going to be ready for the use of the militia. Perhaps it may not be possible for you to obtain the same publicly owing to the session being so nearly to a close.

Briefly the case stands this way. A contract was awarded for the making of the new range, work being commenced in the early fall, 1900, it being stipulated I understand that it was to be completed some time in June, 1901. Certain work done in the fall of 1900 not being properly arranged was destroyed by the spring freshets in 1901, the result was the militia had no range to shoot on last year and it was only through the kindness of the imperial government that the annual shooting of the provincial association was enabled to be held at Macnab's island.

The range is not ready yet and no one seems to know when it will be, at least no one here. It looks very much as if the militia will be without any rifle practice this year as well.

A gentleman who was up viewing the range a couple of days ago, says that before the targets could even be used there is fully 1000 loads of earth that would have to be removed that had fallen into the trench from the embankment at the back, this there would have been no trouble in guarding against, because it could have been foreseen, as last year they had a cave in only of a larger extent.

Entries for the 'Canadian Military League' close on May 17th, the matches commencing June 14th, our militiamen always took an interest in these matches but owing to the uncertainty of any place to shoot there will be no entries from here, and there were none of course last year. (Barring a few individuals who formed a club and managed to shoot the matches at Macnabs with considerable expense to themselves.)

There seems to be a very strong desire on the part of this gentleman, whose name I could give to the minister if he desires, that some active measures should be taken in order to place the range in a condition so that the militia may use it at the approaching season.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will call the attention of the Minister of Militia to the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Royal Military College, $75,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another matter which I intended to have mentioned to the hon. Minister of Militia when he was in the House, and it is this. Last year I brought to his attention the desirability of some memorial being erected by this country in memory of the graduates of the Royal Military College who have fallen in South Africa. The hon. Minister of Militia seemed disposed to take that matter into favourable consideration. I think the idea was to have a memorial placed in the college buildings. I have had another communication from the gentleman who brought this matter to my attention last year, and I trust that the hon. Minister of Finance will be good enough to bring it to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I will do so.

Quarantine—Salaries and contingencies, $110,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to bring to the attention of the government the fact that a medical practitioner, Dr. Andrew E. Porter, who resides in my province, has informed me that he has a claim against the government as to which he cannot get any reply or any satisfaction. He has brought it to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Customs, the Department of the Interior and the Prime Minister, and the only satisfaction he is able to obtain is that one department says that another department should attend to it, and occasionally a department says it will give the matter consideration. He has sent me a statement under oath of what his claim amounts to, and I will read it in order that the government generally may have it brought to their attention:

I, Andrew E. Porter, at present of River Hebert, in the county of Cumberland and province of Nova Scotia, physician, duly admitted to the practice of medicine, do solemnly declare that:

1. I have been engaged in the practice of medicine since 1876, and was admitted a practitioner in the Yukon Territory in the year 1899.

2. During the summer of 1900, a small-pox epidemic broke out in the city of Dawson.

3. I was instructed by D. Menzies, a customs officer and acting quarantine officer at White Horse in the said territory, to make an examination of the passengers and crews of all steamers arriving from Dawson during the prevalence of the disease.

4. In accordance with such intructions I inspected such steamers between the 11th day of July, 1900, and the 22nd day of August, A.D. 1900.

5. The account attached hereto gives the dates of such inspection and the steamers so inspected.

6. The amount charged per steamer is the regular medical fee allowed in the Yukon at that time for such medical work and is a reasonable charge, to which I am justly entitled.

7. The certificate at the end of the said account is in the proper handwriting of D. Menzies, collector of customs and acting quarantine officer as aforesaid.

8. I have tried all reasonable means to collect this Bill, but I have not been able up to the present date to collect the total amount or any part thereof.

I do not know whether this man has any claim or whether his statements are correct or not; but there is no reason why he should not receive an answer one way or the other, and be told whether the government intend to pay his claim or not. If they do not intend to pay it, I suppose he would ask them to grant him a petition of right, so that he could enforce his claim if he has any.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. How much is the claim?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know.

The PRIME MINISTER. Dr. Porter wrote to me on one or two occasions, and I think he was informed that his claim would not be entertained. Of course, if he wants a petition of right, he has only to address the Department of Justice, which he has never done. When he wrote to me, if I remember rightly, inquiries were made, and as a result of the inquiries, he was informed that nothing more could be done for him than what he had already received.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). He has received a part?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is my impression at the present time. I would not

speak positively as to that, but I will send word immediately to have the matter again brought to my attention, and I will give an answer to my hon. friend to-morrow.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I distinctly remember the claim coming before me. It came into the hands of my deputy and was referred to me, and I instructed my deputy to ascertain whether this man was instructed by any officer of my department to do the work. It was ascertained that he had not been instructed by any officer of my department, and he was notified to apply to the department who employed him. I have not heard from him since.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I cannot imagine that he did not reply to the hon. gentleman's letter, because he has written a good many letters to me on the subject, and shows a disposition to follow the matter up. He says he was instructed by the customs officer, who was acting as quarantine officer, to make this examination, and he acted for a period of some months.

Railways and Canals—Chargeable to capital—Intercolonial Railway—steel rails and fastenings, $600,000

Mr. BARKER. I wish to enter my protest——

Mr. SPEAKER. Will the hon. member please wait until the whole resolution is read.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would it not be more convenient for the hon. gentleman to make his remarks on this special item ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There is only one motion before the Chair—that the resolution shall be read the second time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But the result of that ruling would be that, instead of having one single subject for discussion, there may be a great many, according to the number of items covered by the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman prefers to proceed item by item ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes ; otherwise we would have many subjects to cover.

Mr. BARKER. Before the item, is concurred in, I desire to enter my protest against charging this expenditure to capital account. I do not propose at this stage of the session, to make any extended remarks on the subject, because I have already discussed it at some length. Shortly, my objection is this—that all the hon. gentleman is really doing, in relation to a capital charge, is adding to the structure of the road 13 pounds per yard of rail. He has at present rails of 67 pounds per yard, which were originally provided out of capital. He is putting down rails weighing 80 pounds per yard. He is entitled to charge the 13 pounds of increase to capital account, but no more. That is one of the most elementary principles in companies, whether railway companies or any other. The least important business concern in the country is dealt with precisely in that way. It makes no difference whether the government own a property or whether that property is owned by a corporation, the principle is just the same. Unless you adopt a recognized principle in keeping accounts no man can tell whether the business is worked at a profit or at a loss. The importance of observing that principle was illustrated by the fact that the Minister of Finance yesterday contrasted the results obtained by the hon. Minister of Railways, as shown in his report laid before this House, with the result of the operations of his predecessors. The absurdity of such a comparison must be obvious to everybody who will consider that the predecessor of the Minister of Railways would have charged not merely the 67 pounds per yard, but the whole 80 pounds per yard to maintenance account and not to capital. By charging these rails to capital, the present minister, by this one item alone saves, as compared with his predecessors, no less than $600,000. I do not say that the hon. gentleman's predecessors were under any obligation to charge the whole 80 pounds per yard to maintenance. On the contrary, I say, it would be reasonable to charge the betterment, as it is commonly called, in this instance the 13 pounds per yard, to capital. But it is absurd, and every business man in this House must see that it is absurd, when capital has provided rails of 67 pounds per yard that the hon. gentleman should replace them and charge the new ones to capital also. Why, what is the result ? You would have 67 pound rails on the road, but a charge on the books of 134 pounds. Suppose that stock was being taken of this property—that the property was being sold to some company. An accountant would be sent over to examine the property. He would find there 67 pounds of rails per yard, plus the 13 pounds, but the accounts would show a charge of 134 pounds against capital. He would naturally say : You are committing a fraud ; for your accounts represent that you have 134 pounds of rails per yard in your track, whereas you have only 67 pounds. According to the principle on which he proceeds, if the minister renews the rails again he will again charge them to capital, making the discrepancy still greater. The principle of charging to capital and to maintenance, respectively, is well understood, and, for my part, I never heard it questioned. If the hon. minister kept his accounts as any business man would keep them, he would charge to capital the betterment which he has made in the property and would charge to maintenance the replacing of the original 67 pounds of rails per yard, taking credit, against that charge to his maintenance account, for the value of the old scrap that he was taking up. If that method is fol-

lowed from year to year and from administration to administration, you can compare one working with the other. But, under the system of the hon. gentleman, not only can you not compare the hon. gentleman with his predecessor, but you cannot compare two years of the hon. gentleman's own administration. I, therefore, enter my protest against this charge, as I have done before, and I desire it to be distinctly understood that, in passing this vote without dividing the House, we do not for a moment admit the propriety of the course pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

To provide additional siding room and increased accommodation and facilities along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, $135,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Railways and Canals was to furnish to the House information as to the particular lines that he intended this vote to be applied to. He is not here.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I cannot furnish my hon. friend the information. I will call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to it, and try, before this House closes to-morrow, to see that the hon. gentleman gets it.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. It will be rather late then.

Rolling stock, $500,000.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to say a few words on this item, and to call the attention of the House to the question of rolling stock. I object to this capital charge very much on the same grounds as I did with regard to the item of steel rails and fastenings. In taking up this item as the first since my remarks on steel rails, I do not wish to be understood that it is the only item upon which criticism might be offered; because there are several items here that should call for remark. But I want to take up some special items and call attention to them. The question of rolling stock is a very large one and a very important one as regards the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railways. Hon. members will see that last year the Minister of Railways and Canals obtained authority to expend $2,000,000 upon rolling stock for the Intercolonial. In the present estimates he asks for authority to expend half a million dollars. Now the principles I refer to with regard to steel rails apply directly to the present item. The moment that a corporation, or a company, or a government, has provided for a particular work or thing upon capital account, whether it is a structure, whether it is a car, or a locomotive, or anything else, the going concern, must thereafter maintain that which capital has once provided. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and his predecessors have received from time to time certain sums on capital account to provide rolling stock with which to operate this railroad. As a going concern the railroad is required to maintain that which capital has thus provided. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, if he maintains out of his revenue that which capital has provided, and finds that in the improvement of his business, in the increase of his business, additional rolling stock is required, he is entitled to add to his capital account whatever may be necessary to provide that additional equipment. But that is always subject to the maintenance primarily of what capital has already provided. Now, the Minister of Railways and Canals, in his last report, has shown that of his cars, provided by capital and which it was his duty, as head of the going concern, to maintain out of its revenue, 364 were condemned as unfit for the service. In addition to that, Mr. Muhlfeld, his mechanical superintendent, who was examined as a witness before the Public Accounts Committee, admitted that there were in September last from 25 to 30 locomotives which ought to be condemned, that 12 or 14 of them were already abandoned and the balance were unfit economically to be continued in the service; and all of these 25 or 30, he said, ought to be replaced, and he admitted in his evidence that they should be replaced out of revenue and charged to maintenance.

Now, if the hon. Minister of Railways were conducting his railway as any ordinary railway company in America or anywhere throughout the world carries on business, he would before charging one dollar to capital for additional rolling stock be required to bring up to working standard the rolling stock that capital had already provided him with. If he were to replace out of maintenance these twenty-five or thirty locomotives, and to replace the 364 cars instead of allowing them to lie as he has been allowing them to lie year after year, dead and useless stock, he would not require this money on capital account. It is his business, before he asks one dollar from the country on capital account for rolling stock, to put in proper working order what he has already been provided with. I say, Sir, that before the hon. Minister of Railways is entitled to come here and ask for more stock it is his duty to show that he is already using to the full capacity what capital has provided him with; that is to say that it is his duty to replace and put in service these 364 cars, which he admits in his report to be condemned as unfit for service, and these twenty-five or thirty locomotives, which his mechanical superintendent condemns as unfit for service. Therefore, I protest here against this authority to him to expend $500,000 until he assumes the responsibility

of restoring the condemned stock. It is the hon. gentleman's duty, as it would be the duty of the manager of any ordinary railway, to charge the cost of replacing these cars and locomotives to his ordinary expenses. If parliament would insist upon that it would do something to protect the public against wild extravagance in the administration of government railways. I do not propose to enter into any elaborate argument upon that point. I am addressing gentlemen, who, I think, know that what I say is the ordinary rule in their own business. There are gentlemen sitting upon the opposite side of this House who are connected with large corporations, and these gentlemen would not for one moment permit the officers of those corporations to charge to the capital of the company the items that are here sought to be charged to capital, but they would say to them: You must maintain that out of your revenue, and though it will add to your operating expenses you will be telling us the truth and you will enable us to know whether the concern is working at a profit or a loss. What would be said of a board of directors, who, year after year, allowed their management to charge to capital that which was a charge upon revenue, and thus declared a profit, or a dividend, and distributed that dividend among their shareholders though it had not been earned, when it was a fictitious dividend, when the surplus they claimed to have was really due to the fact that they were improperly charging to capital that which did not properly belong to capital? Why, Sir, the board of directors guilty of that sort of thing would be personally responsible for their misconduct and in some countries would be severely dealt with. I protest under these circumstances against this item being made a charge to capital. Nobody, I think, from the province of Ontario desires to limit in the least degree the capacity or the usefulness of the Intercolonial Railway. We desire to see that road a success, but because we desire to see it a success we want it administered on business principles and under conditions applicable to every business organization. I repeat, that if such a manipulation of accounts as is allowed under the present administration and endorsed by hon. gentlemen opposite, were carried on in any business concern in England, the board of directors, who in this regard have the like responsibility as the hon. gentlemen who sit as ministers in this House, would be held personally responsible for their misleading statements, for such statements as produced the so-called surplus or surpluses which have been claimed in this country during the last two or three years. It is time we should stop that sort of thing.

Murray Harbour branch and Hillsborough bridge, Prince Edward Island Railway, $500,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I am sorry the Minister of Railways is not here. He promised that he would furnish information in regard to the amount of the expenditure for improvements on the government railways. I asked for the amount of the new steel rails that have been laid, the amount that was required to finish the work, and the sum necessary to provide additional rolling stock in order that parliament might know exactly what improvements are contemplated. I have not received that information and I suppose I must wait for it until next session. When the minister makes a promise of that kind he ought to carry it out. When we are discussing the government railways it is essential that we should know what changes he contemplates and what expenditure his changes entail. He has promised me that information time and again since I asked him when the first item was presented to the House.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Railways will be here before we conclude and the hon. gentleman will have the right to put the question to him no matter on what item we may be.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is very desirable that a promise on which items are allowed to be carried should be most carefully observed, because otherwise it will be impossible for us in future to allow items to pass on such an understanding. The Minister of Finance knows that even on concurrence the opposition is not by any means powerless, because we can move the adjournment of the House after every one of these items.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. We could stay here a month.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and while we have no disposition to obstruct the business of the House as has been perfectly evident by our conduct during the whole session, still we do not propose to have promises of this kind made and absolutely disregarded.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I should state that the Minister of Railways came over and spoke to me to-day and said that his deputy had telegraphed to Moncton for the information, but surely when the government adopts a policy in respect to its railways it must have decided on the extent of these improvements, and to have had before them some estimate as to the cost it was binding the country to in respect thereof. That information should have been laid on the Table before the minister asked for a single dollar from parliament.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to raise a point in respect to this particular item apart from that which my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has brought up. No one on either side of the House can doubt, from what has transpired here for the last week or two, that it is ample time that some restriction should be placed upon ministers who seem to wish to rule their departments as auto-

crats quite outside of the law and regardless of the law. The Minister of Railways admitted in his speech of the 6th of May that he had entered into a contract for the construction of 11½ miles of this railway a year or a year and a half ago. He complied with the law in regard to that contract by asking for tenders and presumedly he gave the contract to the proper party. The work has been proceeding on that 11½ miles which the hon. gentleman, as reported in 'Hansard,' declared to be a distinct portion of the railway. According to the statement of the minister, he having entered into that contract for that 11½ miles, was approched by members of parliament—not by parliament but by members of parliament; no doubt gentlemen in the neighbourhood who took a particular interest in the work—and not only by members of parliament but as he says in a general way, by other persons. And having thus been approached by members of parliament and other persons, the minister, as an individual—not representing this country, not representing parliament or the government even; not representing anybody but himself, for he had no authority to do what he did do—the minister arrives at the conclusion that it is expedient to let the same contractor construct the additional 31½ miles of the road. Looking at it simply as a matter of business, on what basis did the hon. gentleman act? Anybody who has ever had any experience of public work knows that you cannot take 11½ miles of railway in one district and accept the cost of work upon that section as a criterion or guide as to what you should pay for work upon another portion of the road. In all government contracts of this kind you find the road divided into sections because every one knows that the cost of moving earth and the blasting of rock, and so on, on any particular section varies materially from the cost on another section. A simple way to explain that to the House is by stating that on one section you may have earthwork that has to be excavated and carried for half a mile, while on another section it may not have to be carried further than 100 yards. Everything depends on the particular circumstances of the particular section under contract, but the Minister of Railways having got prices for 11½ miles jumps to the conclusion in his wisdom that these prices should apply to the 31½ miles beyond.

A contractor is generally presumed to know his own business, and I think we may take it for granted that the contractor was quite satisfied that the cost of moving the earth on the 31½ miles would not exceed what it cost on the 11½; but the gentleman who is supposed to be looking after the interests of this Dominion does not take the ordinary precautions to see whether he ought not to get the work done at a very much less price. What does the hon. gentleman do? Does he get estimates? Does he send his engineer over the 31½ miles to report to him what the earthwork is, what the haul is, what the rock blasting is? Not a bit of it. The hon. gentleman sets the contractor to work even without making a contract. The contractor goes to work upon no other authority. That is absolutely clear from the statements made to this House. After the work is actually going on, the hon. minister brings the matter before council and gets an Order in Council authorizing it. He has not even then the ordinary estimates that would be required by any business man. The hon. gentleman admitted last night that it was only within a week that he had got the estimates, although this work has been going on for some time; and what were the estimates he got? Did he get from his engineer an estimate of what would be a reasonable price per yard to allow this contractor for earthwork, for stonework, for blasting rock, for all the different elements that enter into the construction of a railway? Not a bit of it. He simply gets a lump sum estimate from his engineer of what the whole thing would probably cost; that is what he tells us. And what is the contract he enters into? Having got the lump sum estimate of the probable cost, does he enter into a contract with these gentlemen to do the work for that lump sum or any lump sum? No. The hon. gentleman simply tells them to go on at the price per yard at which they were doing the original work. The hon. gentleman has not a scratch of the pen that will enable him to say whether the work is going to cost double the price of the lump sum estimate of his engineer or half of it. And this is what is called a business administration! The hon. gentleman's colleagues support the hon. Minister of Railways, and hon. gentlemen opposite will support him on every occasion that the question is brought up—and they are all, I presume, business men. As a mere matter of business discretion, it seems to me the most outrageous thing ever presented to any assembly of intelligent men. But I am not arguing this matter on the question whether it was a matter of reasonable business discretion on the part of the minister. If it was the most reasonable thing that was ever presented, the minister had no more right to enter into that contract than I had. The Minister of Railways is acting under a statute which defines what he shall do, just as the Minister of Public Works in his department is acting under a statute which defines and limits his authority. But the difference between the two gentlemen is probably this, that the Minister of Railways is above all law. What does he care about statute law or any other? The hon. gentleman does what he pleases, and he relies on his supporters in parliament to back him up and stand by him, and no doubt they will. Is

that what might be expected from sensible business men. Surely we ought to expect something better than that from a number of gentlemen such as we see opposite to us. Last session their attention was directed to the method in which railway affairs were administered, and I did hope that among a number of business men who sit on the government side of the House there would have been one man with backbone enough to have gone to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Railways and to have said: 'Sir, this thing must stop; we will not be parties to it.' But apparently hon. gentlemen opposite are a party of invertebrates. Perhaps it is a little too much, in an assembly of this kind, to expect hon. gentlemen to stand up in the House, or even in the committee, where their votes are not recorded, and vote against their party; but surely we might have expected that some of these gentlemen would have gone to the ministers in the recess, or in caucus, and told them, 'This thing must come to an end; the reputation, if not of the government, at any rate of the men who sit behind the government, is at stake, and we will not submit to it any longer.'

But this matter goes away beyond that. It is not a question of business discretion at all. The minister lets this contract, he admits, without tender. He does not even ask for a tender. I beg to call the attention of the House to the 11th section of the Act of 1886, which gives the hon. Minister of Railways all the authority he possesses, and that section reads thus :

> The minister shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of all works, except in case of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the minister.

The hon. gentleman cannot pretend that this work comes within the last exception, because he is not doing the work. He has not made a pretense that there was any emergency in this case which prevented him calling for tenders. It was simply done at the arbitrary will of the Minister of Railways who, in the eyes of hon. gentlemen opposite, is apparently such a success in his department that they are willing to go it blind for everything he does. I can understand that hon. gentlemen facing us may look at the matter somewhat differently from what we do ; but to gentlemen on this side of the House the idea that the Minister of Railways should be allowed to exercise such authority is simply ridiculous. Even if ministers have absolute confidence in their fellow minister, they have no power to confirm this action of his ; they themselves are subject to the law, and while that statute is on the book they have no right to do what has been done. The whole thing from first to last is absolutely without authority, and I protest against it. As I said before, I do not desire to occupy time at this late hour by dividing the House, but we have heard so much from hon. gentlemen opposite about our not making any objections to such items that I think it is incumbent on this side to protest when we see such a gross avoidance of the provision of parliament has made for the protection of the country.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. Having referred to this matter some days ago, I find it necessary now that the opposition have returned again and again to this question, to repeat what I have already said. Considering the circumstances in connection with the road referred to, of which I consider myself in a position to judge, because I know the ground, have known it all my life and have travelled over it many times, I think that the giving of the contract for the balance of the 31 miles to the contractor who had built the other 11½ miles, was in the interest of the country. While the letting of contracts after calling for public tender is the principle to which we are all committed and while I think that principle is a good one, there are exceptions to every rule.

Mr. BARKER. Does the statute allow any exceptions ? It is imperative.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. I am discussing what was done from the point of view of a business man, and I say that under the circumstances the government acted wisely. The first 11½ miles had been tendered for and the lowest of five tenders accepted. Mr. Kitchen proved himself a good contractor. He did not belong to our province, but any prejudices we might have had against him on that score were removed by the fact that he showed himself a good man, and an able contractor. To get a good man and a good contractor is a great deal.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. Get a man who does not understand his work and you will soon find yourself in trouble. The question was asked why, in the first instance, the contract was not let for the whole distance instead of for 11½ miles, and the hon. Minister of Railways properly answered that after the 11½ miles had been located, the government were undecided whether the road should continue by Vernon river or take a northerly course, and it could go no further until the location was determined.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the hon. gentleman claim that the government let the contract before the road was located.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. I did not say that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. You said that you did not know where the 11½ miles would go.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. I did not say that. I went over this road with the hon. Minis-

ter of Railways and Canals and his engineer. We spent a whole day, from morning till night, travelling over it. The engineer of that road is a man, I think, above approach, and he has examined all the ground carefully, and no doubt reported to his superiors, and therefore when the 31½ miles were let on the same schedule rates as the 11½ miles, I do not think the government could have done better. And when that contractor had all his apparatus on the ground for building the 11½ miles, we thought no other man could do the rest of the work as cheaply or as well. But of course prejudices are apt to be created by letting a contract without tender, and the minister is liable to be under a cloud so to speak until the facts are all fully known.

Mr. FARQUHARSON. If these hon. gentlemen will wait a moment I will explain what I mean. This contract was not let after inviting tenders, but there are exceptions to every rule, and this is one of them. I do not think that this country has lost a dollar by the transaction. I am satisfied that no good business man would have done otherwise than the Minister of Railways did. But prejudices are liable to be created when contracts are let without tender. If, however, hon. members opposite knew the circumstances as well as I do, I have no doubt that, as honest men, they would take the same view. The contract was a fair one and a good one and one in the interests of the people, and I am pleased to be able to congratulate the government and people, as a new member, that the opposition can find nothing greater to complain of during this session.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman thinks that if we were honest men on this side we would concur in his view. Well, I do not want to proclaim that I am an honest man because whenever you see a man declaring to everybody that he is honest, you had better look out for him. The hon. gentleman said: We on this side could let the contract. I have not heard as yet that the hon. gentleman has become a member of the cabinet; but as there are great dissensions in the cabinet, it is quite on the cards that within a few days we may have the announcement that this hon. gentleman, who went up the hills and down the vales with the hon. Minister of Railways, in order to bring about the letting of this contract without tender, has become a member of the cabinet. He has told us the greatest lot of goody goody things I have heard from any hon. gentleman opposite. We had a good man he said, and if we get a good man we ought to keep him. Hon. gentlemen on that side ought to take that lesson to heart, because good men on that side are not any more plentiful than in the interests of the country, they ought to be. He says: We got a good man, a good contractor, a good engineer—and I have no doubt he said also a good government. There was one thing he omitted to say. He did not say that they had a good contract. No doubt this man got an eminently good contract for himself out of the government on that occasion. The hon. gentleman tells us that honourable and honest men would not protest against this transaction. Well, I am responsible to my constituents, and I venture to protest, and I want to make that protest as distinct and emphatic as I can. What are the circumstances? According to the statute the government are bound to call for tenders in every instance except in the case of an emergency. Was there any emergency in this case? I do not think that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has shown us there was. I do not think that any hon. gentlemen on the government side can show us that there was. What does it all amount to? It amounts to just this. If you can disregard the statutes in a case of this kind, the government or the Minister of Railways can let one mile of railway after calling for tenders, and then build 999 miles without tender. Is that the meaning of the statute? Is that the meaning of responsible government in this country? It was not the meaning of responsible government when hon. gentlemen on this side were on the government benches, nor was it the meaning of responsible government when the Liberals of old were in power, but it is to a large extent the meaning of responsible government today, as enunciated and proclaimed by these hon. gentlemen who now administer the affairs of this country. If they can do what they have done, they can do something more. It happens, but it is only a coincidence, that these two pieces of railway, the 11½ miles and the 31½ miles, are portions of the same railway. They might just as well have been portions of two different railways, and these hon. gentlemen might just as well have done this. They could have let the 11½ miles at the time when, according to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Farquharson), they did not know what the location of the balance of the railway would be or whether there would be any more constructed,—they could have let those 11½ miles after calling for tenders, and then let to the same contractor, say 300 miles of railway, in another province on the same terms, and without tender.

This shows us just where we are at, and it emphasizes the point that was made so plain by my hon. friend from Hamilton that this is a distinct violation of the statute by the government. I understand that we are not going to divide the House on this question. But I want to say to the government that we do protest. We may not have the remedy now, but we do not want them to do this again. We have called their attention to it as we have called their attention to a great many former violations of the principle of constitutional and responsible government. In old times who

called so loud for responsible government as the old-time Liberals ? But if these old-time Liberals came to this parliament to-night, I venture to say that they would go back to the retirement from which they came rather than associate themselves with the so-called Liberals of to-day.

Trent Canal—construction (revote), $300,000.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. We had some discussion in Committee of Supply on the claim of Messrs. Corry & Laverdure, contractors on this canal. That claim was dealt with under a reference of some kind. I do not know whether it was before the Exchequer Court, and, if so, whether it was on a petition of right, and whether the government stood upon their extreme rights, or whether there was a special reference as in the case of Messrs. Mackenzie & Mann. But I understand from the Minister of Railways and Canals that these contractors succeeded in obtaining a decision in their favour of $126,000—I am not very sure as to the amount. Is any portion of this vote to be appropriated towards the payment of that arbitration ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No. This is the vote for next year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, the hon. minister is now taking a vote for the present year—a revote of $300,000 for construction.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. No, that is for next year. Whatever is paid we expect to pay out of the current year.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister intend to pay that $126,000 ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. I have explained the matter, I think, four times since the session opened; but as the hon. gentleman has asked the question, I do not mind giving the explanation once more. The gentlemen selected as engineers, Messrs. Hobson, Surtees and Brophy, all examined into the claim for these extras, judging of the correctness and fairness of the prices, and made a report that, that of this claim, which was for over $400,000, the chief engineer might properly, in their opinion, certify to $126,000—I think the hon. gentleman has given the correct amount. I think the report came in after parliament opened, and since then no further action has been taken. The matter is now awaiting the consideration of council, as, in the midst of our other pressing duties, we have not been able to deal with the matter finally.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I must protest against the system adopted by the Minister of Railways and Canals. Under a contract——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the hon. gentleman that we are not now in supply, and, under the rules it is not permitted to an hon. member to speak more than once upon any question.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. But I simply asked a question of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am calling the hon. member's attention to the fact that we are not now in supply but in concurrence.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I can put myself in order very easily. I move that the item be struck out.

Mr. SPEAKER. As the hon. gentleman has spoken, he has no right to move a motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I move that this item be struck out.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. If the result of this motion is to prevent the appropriation, it will cause the suspension of work for the year, and all those interested will be placed in a very awkward predicament. The hon. gentleman must contemplate the possibility of that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister can restore the item if he likes.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. The responsibility is upon the hon. gentleman.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Here is a claim made by a firm of contractors against the government. Under the law, the responsibility is placed upon the deputy minister to certify as to the correctness of the claim of the contractors. In this case, the deputy minister refuses to certify that the contractors are entitled to this amount. There is no way by which the money can be obtained from the government without the certificate of the chief engineer, and he, by refusing to certify, virtually declares that the contractors are not entitled to the amount they claim. How does the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals get over it ? Instead of applying to the court that was specially established for the purpose of finding out whether contractors have just claims or not, he refers the matter to an arbitration of engineers. I do not know the case that was put before them, but it was not conducted by the Minister of Justice. The government did not stick for its extreme rights, and the legality of the claim is not decided upon. These arbitrators report to whom ? They report to the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, who, after all, is the man who must certify in order that the claim may be paid. We have the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals that his deputy minister has refused to certify to the amounts. Does the minister deny that ?

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. Yes.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I asked the minister, when the deputy was present, whe-

ther the deputy, on the recommendation of the three engineers, had amended his report, and the deputy minister stated to the minister that he had not done so, and the minister made that statement to the House. Then he goes over the report of his deputy minister who refuses to certify to this claim, and asks for an Order in Council to have the amount voted by this House. I contend that we should have an opportunity of inquiring into this matter, and that we should have a promise from the minister that this $300,000 we are voting at the present moment for the Trent canal, shall be expended on the Trent canal, and not expended on something else. The law requires that an expenditure on the Trent canal shall be certified by the deputy minister, and not ordered by an Order in Council superseding the report of the deputy minister, given contrary to the law, and contrary to the contract entered into between the government and the contractors. Under that contract, the chief engineer is to judge as to whether the work is performed and as to whether the quantities are right. He refuses to certify to that amount, the Minister of Railways and Canals overrules his own chief engineer, and asks three other engineers to come in for the purpose of assisting the conscience of the chief engineer. Then the chief engineer does not support the recommendation of the three engineers, and the Minister of Railways and Canals goes to Council for an Order in Council. Then I ask for some assurance that the sum we are voting to-day shall not be applied to the payment of any such claim as that when the law is not fulfilled. Under the contract entered into between the minister and these two parties, the chief engineer is to be the judge of the quantities and the judge of the performance of the work, and the chief engineer refuses to certify to that. If the chief engineer is wrong there is a remedy. We do not want, parliament nor the people of this country do not want, to be bound by the opinion of the chief engineer. If he is wrong in his opinion, there is a court established for the purpose of overruling him, the Exchequer Court has to decide whether the chief engineer is right or wrong.

The PRIME MINISTER. It is difficult to understand what the hon. gentleman who has addressed the House, is driving at.

Mr. COCHRANE. When you do not want to understand.

The PRIME MINISTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman understands it either.

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes I do.

The PRIME MINISTER. Then I am sorry for the hon. gentleman's understanding if he does. The hon. gentleman, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals, wants an assurance that this money shall not be expended on anything else than the Trent canal. There is no necessity for any assurance of that kind. The money is voted for the Trent canal, the Auditor General will see that it is expended on the Trent canal and nothing else. It is simply childish to ask for an assurance that this money shall be expended upon the Trent canal. The appropriation itself says it shall be. What more assurance does the hon. gentleman want than the fact that parliament has voted that money for a special object, that is, it is to be expended on the Trent canal. The Auditor General will see that it is expended on the Trent canal; and I repeat again it is simply childish to ask for a guarantee that it shall be so expended. The hon. gentleman is wrong again in the application which he wants to make to this item. He has in his mind the contract of Messrs. Corry & Laverdure who, I understand, are contractors for a section of the Trent canal. Now Corry & Laverdure have a disputed account, as I understand it. The hon. gentleman says that this account must be paid upon the certificate of the chief engineer of the department. Certainly it must be so paid, and the Auditor General will see that it is not paid to Corry & Laverdure unless he has before him the certificate of the chief engineer of the department. The chief engineer of the department is the referee under the circumstances. If there is a dispute between the contractors and the department, the contract, which the hon. gentleman has cited, says that under such circumstances the chief engineer shall be the supreme arbiter. Payment cannot be made unless the chief engineer gives his certificate to that effect. But there is more than that. There may be circumstances under which the chief engineer will refuse to certify, he may say the account is disputed, somebody is in the wrong. The contractors make a demand, and I understand the chief engineer will not certify to the account. There is a dispute which has to be determined in the courts. So far so good. I know nothing of this contract personally, the matter has not come before Council, and I speak simply on the statements made by the Minister of Railways and Canals and by the hon. member for Lanark. As I understand this matter, the chief engineer, finding his opinion was disputed, before issuing his certificate, has thought advisable to have the opinion of three expert engineers instead of sending the matter to the courts.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. Do you mean to say the chief engineer has thought so?

The PRIME MINISTER. I do say so, according to the statements made in the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I asked that question of the Minister of Railways and Canals, whether his chief engineer had accepted the

opinion of the three engineers who were called upon to report upon the question, and the chief engineer, standing beside the minister, instructed him to answer, no.

The PRIME MINISTER. Very good, let it be so. Then the hon. gentleman ought to be satisfied. If the chief engineer is not satisfied with the account then that account cannot be paid. The hon. gentleman ought to know that.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. No, I do not.

The PRIME MINISTER. Well, he ought to know it, because the chief engineer must certify to these accounts. The chief engineer has thought it advisable to take the opinion of other eminent engineers. One of them I know personally, Mr. Hobson, of the Grand Trunk Railway ; I think he is well known throughout Canada. I do not know that there is a more competent authority than Mr. Hobson. The other gentleman I have not the honour of knowing personally ; he lives in Ottawa, and I think his record in the city of Ottawa is unimpeachable, I refer to Mr. Surtees. The third engineer, Mr. Brophy, I think also stands high.

Mr. COCHRANE. Has not the Treasury Board overridden the decision of the Auditor General time and again ?

The PRIME MINISTER. The chief engineer and the Treasury Board have power to pass over the Auditor General. But whenever they do so their overruling comes before parliament and has to submit to the sanction or censure of parliament. But in this matter the chief engineer, as I understand, will not make a report, or has not made a report so far. As he has not made a report the matter cannot be dealt with. therefore like any other matter, it has to be reported in the way provided by law, either favourably or unfavourably. The hon. gentleman stated a moment ago that he was protesting because the law was not followed. He has no reason to speak in that way. The report will be made by the chief engineer, either one way or the other. Now the hon. gentleman says that instead of sending this matter to the arbitrators it should have been sent to the Exchequer Court. That is the way that the law provides for parties who cannot agree. They shall have their differences adjusted by the courts of law, and the Exchequer Court is established to determine disputes between subjects and the Crown.

Now, Sir, there is another mode of dealing with this matter. Arbitration has been found in a good many cases to be just as satisfactory as the courts of law, but up to the present time we have nothing that I know of to show that there has been an arbitration or a judicial adjudication. The whole thing is still pending, the whole thing will have to be determined according to the rules provided for by the law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is no arbitration it would be interesting to the House to know what there really is in regard to this matter. Is it merely the fact that the chief engineer has been so impressed by the difficulty of the situation that he has had to call to his assistance three other engineers ? The chief engineer of the Department of Railways is a man of great experience, a man who has never been afraid to deal with a question of this kind, in the past, as far as I know, and I find it difficult to believe that he has been so impressed by some difficulty in regard to this claim that he has called upon other engineers in the country to do work which he declares himself to be incapable of doing. If it is not that, what is it ? Has there been any reference of the claim, and if so what are the terms of the reference ? As to what has been done, we are entirely in the dark.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS. You have had all the papers before you.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know that we have had any papers before us disclosing these matters. Occasionally papers are brought down by hon. gentlemen and, handed to some hon. member of the House, not printed, not placed before the House in a way to convey information to most of us.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. I did not get them and I do not think they were brought down to the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have not had them and the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) says he has not had them.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. They were not brought down to the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know who has had the advantage of perusing these documents. The hon. member for South Lanark says that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has told us that he proposes to go to Council——

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. He said that he had gone to Council but that the order had not been passed yet.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals attempted to obtain an order for the payment of this money without obtaining the certificate of the chief engineer. That is the position attacked by the hon. member for South Lanark and that is the position which the right hon. leader of the government seems to think is the correct one.

The PRIME MINISTER. No, I have told the hon. gentleman that I did not remember that the matter had been brought up at Council. I am quite sure it has not.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals stated that he had prepared a report to Council recommending the payment but that Council had not acted upon it.

The PRIME MINISTER. That may be so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman may find that there is more for him to consider in this matter than he thinks. As far as the Auditor General is concerned, he has been overruled a great many times, and we have even had occasion to consider, during this very session, the appropriation of moneys voted by parliament to purposes that seemed somewhat foreign to the vote. I have pointed out in connection with the expenditure of money voted for Yukon buildings that large sums went to pay really for the living expenses of officials out there. Attention has been directed to sums, not great in amount, it is true, but still public money of this country, voted for the purpose of taking the census of 1901 and applied to other purposes. These are matters which are clearly the subject of criticism from this side of the House and matters which I think the right hon. gentleman ought to thank us for bringing up in order that he may direct the members of his cabinet to be a little more careful in future and not subject the government to the criticism which they so richly deserve in this case. I would have supposed that the right hon. gentleman would have been inspired by feelings of gratitude towards the hon. member for South Lanark for referring to these matters in the terms in which he has done, and I say again that I think this is a subject which will demand the careful consideration of Council when the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals brings it up for further consideration.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry that this session is so nearly at an end, as matters which are of great importance are crowding up very rapidly at the close. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) intimated that he took from the statements of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) sufficient information upon which to form an argument in answer to that hon. gentleman. Now, I do not possess, of course, any measure of the ability of the First Minister, but, I think, all the same, that he, in the course of his remarks, has raised a question which it is very important the government should in future take seriously into their consideration and as has been suggested, I hope they will take it in the most kindly spirit. The fact is that the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals is acting under a delegated authority. He is acting under a statutory authority and beyond the provisions of the statute he cannot go. He is the person pointed out by the statute who has to decide certain questions in cases of contract. It is well known as a universal principle of law that if a person possesses delegated authority he has no power to delegate that authority to another. Therefore, I suggest to the government and to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that it is not competent to delegate to these three engineers the power which can be exercised by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals alone. Therefore, if this course is pursued I submit, of course, with a great deal of deference, but with a certain amount of confidence, that unless there is an express provision in the statute to the contrary, this delegated authority must be exercised by the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals alone, and that without any enlightenment to be brought about by the instrumentality of the gentlemen who have been appointed in the matter, however eminent they may be.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

The PRIME MINISTER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Mr. HAGGART. There is only Bill (No. 161) respecting the incorporation of joint stock companies by letters patent, remaining ?

The PRIME MINISTER. That is all.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. And the Supply Bill.

The PRIME MINISTER. Yes, and there are also the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill about the remission of penalties.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 15, 1902.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

CANADIAN AGENTS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. BOURASSA asks (translation) :

Is the government aware that the commissioners and agents of the Dominion of Canada in the United Kingdom are subject to the income tax, while the foreign ambassadors, consuls and agents are not ?

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). (Translation.) The attention of the government has not been drawn to this matter, but it will soon be taken into consideration.

INSPECTION OF COAL OIL.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are

called I would like to ask—I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Bernier) is not in his place—what conclusion has been arrived at in regard to the inspection of coal oil, pursuant to a discussion which took place here some time ago.

The PRIME MINISTER (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I expect that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue will be in his seat within a few minutes, perhaps before the recess, and I would ask my hon. friend to renew his question when he comes in.

TAXATION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. OLIVER. I would also like to ask if a statement has been made by the hon. Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) in regard to the procedure to be taken to arrive at a decision before the courts in the matter of the taxation of Canadian Pacific Railway lands. I understood from the hon. Minister of Justice that he would make such a statement on his estimates. I do not know of my own knowledge whether such a statement has been made, and I would ask if any such statement has been made or if it is to be made ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Hon. Clifford Sifton). I think I can give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) the information which he asks for. The land commissioner in my department and the Deputy Minister of Justice had the subject before them, and they have been engaged from before the beginning of the session endeavouring to get the matter into shape so that it can be placed before the courts as quickly as possible. Of course, the hon. Minister of Justice and myself have given instructions that no delay should occur. I presume that both of the officials concerned have been endeavouring to expedite the matter so that it will be got into shape in a very short time now.

Mr. OLIVER. Can the hon. minister give me an idea as to the contention that is to be maintained by the government ? Has it been decided what is to be the contention of the government in regard to the period at which taxation begins ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That is, as to the time that the government should contend that the land becomes liable to taxation ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I cannot speak as to that with any degree of positiveness. I had a discussion with the Deputy Minister of Justice when I placed the facts before him, and I asked him to give full consideration to the question. I may say that proceedings would have gone on faster except that the Deputy Minister of Justice was obliged to go to England after I gave the instructions to him, and that was responsible for a good deal of the delay. I asked him to consider the whole case carefully and to take a position as favourable as possible in the interests of those who desire that the land should be taxed. No conclusion has been arrived at in regard to this point.

Mr. OLIVER. As this is an important point, I would like to know whether the decision is to rest with the Deputy Minister of Justice, or is to rest upon the government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The decision will not depend on the Deputy Minister of Justice. My hon. friend, of course, will understand that the Deputy Minister of Justice will consider the various points and after he has looked into the law and the decisions applicable to the case, the result will be communicated to us and the decision will rest with us.

EMPLOYEES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. J. B. MORIN (Dorchester). Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. Mr. Blair) is not in his place. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he will be kind enough to carry free from Montreal to the east the employees of the House who have been engaged here during the session. We all know that the session has been short, the expenses have been pretty high, and these employees this year have very little to take home with them, and if the government would carry them free from Montreal east, it would be very acceptable to them.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman wants to make a statement and not merely to ask a question, if he waits until we go into Committee on Ways and Means he will have an opportunity of discussing the question.

Mr. MORIN. That is all I have to say.

The PRIME MINISTER. We will take it under advice and consideration.

Mr. MORIN. Thank you.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES BILL.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 161) respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by letters patent.—The Prime Minister.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. (Hon. Clifford Sifton). Mr. Chairman, the Bill which is before the committee, the Joint Stock Companies Bill, is a formidable-looking one, but in reality the changes that are proposed in the law are comparatively few. I may say that the object of the government in introducing this Bill was to bring the position respecting incorporation of joint stock companies into a state somewhat more in accordance with

the requirements of modern business. It is our opinion that the law, as it at present stands upon the statute-book and the practice in regard to the incorporation of joint stock companies, is altogether cumbrous, unsatisfactory and out of date, and any member of the legal profession who has had anything to do with the incorporation of companies under the Joint Stock Companies Act of the Dominion, will agree that it requires amendment. The principle that is being followed now in countries where business is carried on under modern conditions is, that, in respect to that class of companies which can be described as industrial companies every possible facility should be given for incorporation, that incorporation should be made as speedy, as free from unnecessary difficulty and as inexpensive as possible. This is the most important object which we have in view in connection with the Bill which is now before us. The general provisions constituting the law respecting joint stock companies are not substantially changed, and the number of new sections is very few.

The effect of the law as it exists at the present time has been to drive the business away from the federal government. Persons have been compelled to go to the various provinces and the various states of the Union for the purpose of getting charters of incorporation. It will be agreed by the House that we should have our law in such a state that persons would not have to go somewhere else to get a charter to do business in Canada. The Bill was introduced in the Senate because it was thought that the Senate would perhaps give more time to the consideration of its various clauses than would perhaps be possible in this House. If any hon. gentleman thinks that a substantial change is required in any particular section, he might perhaps give the matter due deliberation, and bring an amendment if necessary next session. Our desire is that the Bill should be gone through with now, so that the proceedings for incorporating joint stock companies may be put upon a more modern and up-to-date basis. This subject of joint stock incorporation has received a great deal of attention, both in England and in the United States, and I think that the English system is perhaps the most simple of any. The principle of this Act is to some extent followed in this Bill. Most of the sections will be found just as they were in the old law. The second section is new, but it simply declares what companies the Act should apply to. The 5th section says : 'That upon an application being made by persons, not less than five in number, the Secretary of State may issue a charter.' It obviates a long process of advertising, and the passing from one department to the other, and is somewhat similar to the English law. Section 13 is new, and it enables persons who have been incorporated in any province or in a foreign country to get incorporated under Dominion charter, so that if people have been incorporated in the province of Ontario and desire to do business in another province, they can come here, and without expensive legislation get a charter from the Dominion. In the same way, if they become incorporated in the United States, with the object of doing business in Canada, they can get a Canadian charter. Proper precautions have been taken in the section to prevent any abuses. Section 18 provides that the company shall not commence its operations until ten per cent of its authorized capital has been subscribed and paid for. The provisions of the Joint Stock Companies Act in the past have been for the purpose of preventing companies starting in business until they had taken steps to put themselves in a bona fide position to do so. Many of the provisions in the existing law are in effect ludicrous. For instance, the provision which requires that a company had to pay a certain amount of money before they got their incorporation has at least the merit of age. But every lawyer knows that it is a common practice to borrow money from the banks to make the deposit, and when the incorporation is issued they get the cheque back. This section requires that ten per cent shall be bona fide subscribed before the business is begun, and it seems to provide all the safeguards that can be provided in a case of this kind. Section 35 provides that the corporation shall not make use of its funds for the purchase of stock in other corporations, unless and until a by-law for that purpose has been passed by two-thirds of the value of the stock, except the charter specifically provides otherwise that it may be done. It is claimed that the law heretofore has not been sufficiently flexible. Sometimes a trading company desires to take stock in other trading companies for the purpose of protecting themselves respecting the indebtedness of one company to the other, without incurring any liability for the general conduct of the business. Under this section, while there is a proper safeguard, they would not be prevented from taking that course. Section 46 is new. Section 57 provides for the borrowing of money by the corporation, and it is taken from the Ontario law, which received very careful consideration at the hands of corporation lawyers and of bankers, and has been found to work very satisfactorily. Section 79 provides for the inspection of the business of the company, and is new. There are two methods, one of which is that by which the shareholders representing one-quarter in value of the capital stock of the company may apply to a judge for the purpose of having an inspection of the affairs of the company made. That is for the pur-

pose of protecting the minority shareholders who might not feel that the majority were handling the business as it ought to be.

Mr. BELL. Can that inspection be required at any time ?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. At any time upon the application of shareholders representing not less than one-fourth of the value of the stock.

Mr. BELL. It might be used to embarrass the company.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The application must be supported by such evidence as a judge may require for the purpose of deciding that the inspection is necessary, and it is in the discretion of a judge of the Superior Court, to whom we must leave a great deal of discretion in such a matter. Section 89 provides that returns shall be made to the government. That, I think, covers everything that is new in the Bill.

On section 13,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I objected at first to having this Bill taken up on account of the very late date in the session. The Minister of Justice afterwards pointed out to me that a very small portion of the Bill was new, and indicated to me the sections that were new. I have not had an opportunity of verifying what portion is new and what portion is old. I take for granted that what he said in the House with regard to that is correct, and the government, of course, are responsible for the Bill. With regard to this section, I do not know whether it is taken from any existing legislation or not ; but it struck me, looking at the wording of it, that there may be some difficulty in working it out. The latter part of the first subsection provides :

> After the issue of the letters patent the company shall be governed in all respects by the provisions of this Act, except that the liability of the shareholders to creditors of the old company shall remain as at the time of the issue of the letters patent.

A difficulty is, I believe, not unknown in the United States, in the case of companies having double charters, the provisions of which are sometimes inconsistent with each other. Certain provisions of this Act, according to this section, are to be applicable to the company, and it may be incorporated under the laws of a foreign country, which are not in all respects the same as the provisions of this Act. There may be some difficulty in working it out, but I suppose there is no harm in allowing it to pass, with the suggestion that it may be amended afterwards if that is found necessary.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. That point has been pretty well considered in the course of dealing with the incorporation of joint stock companies. The provinces have laws authorizing the granting of licenses to foreign corporations, and the practice under this Act would be to all intents and purposes the same as that which the provinces follow. If any difficulty occurs in the working of the Act, which is the only way in which we can find out, we can amend it from time to time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I observe that the fees for letters patent fixed by the Governor in Council in the past have been considerably higher than they are in some other countries. For instance, in the province of Nova Scotia, it is not unusual for people siderably higher than they are in some other well known in the shipping trade, to form a joint stock company for every one of those ships.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Do they incorporate in the province ?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They usually come here, because they send their ships all over the world. The result is that the fees amount to a considerable sum. I brought this matter to the attention of the Secretary of State some years ago, because I thought the fees secured by the government would be more if they were somewhat lower.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. There is a great deal in what my hon. friend says, and an attempt ought to be made to prepare a scheme of fees which would be commensurate with the size and importance of the business with respect to which the incorporation is taking place, so that we could incorporate companies such as those to which my hon. friend refers at a very moderate expense.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be true, as the hon. Minister of the Interior has stated, that the former provisions of the law were very often evaded, or that attempts were made to evade them in the way he mentions. I am not quite sure that these attempts would prove successful if they were really tested in a court of law. I do not see any provision in this statute which would prevent a similar evasion in future, so that I do not know that it effects any improvement in that respect. I am not able to suggest at present any alteration in the section which would make it more secure.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The hon. gentleman will see that the Act does not profess to provide that any particular sum of money shall be paid in for the incorporation.

On section 38,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This section, by postponing the rights of the holders of common shares against their will to the rights of the holders of preference shares, might possibly work an injustice. However, I suppose you cannot provide against everything of that kind, and I have no objection to the section passing in its present form, subject

to the future possible necessity of amending it.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I think it is practically the same as the law at present. It was amended in 1900.

On section 51,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the language of this section, which says that it shall not apply to companies whose stock is listed and dealt with on the stock exchange. That is rather a general expression. What does it mean exactly? There are half a dozen stock exchanges in Canada. What would be the effect of that?

Mr. BELCOURT. It is very likely taken from the English Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The language may be taken from the English Act as there is only one stock exchange in England.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think it is taken from the English Act.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. My hon. friend will see that subsection 2 simply removes, as regards stocks listed in the stock exchange, the prohibition provided in section 51, under which every transfer of stock must be entered in the transfer book of the company before it can be valid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What do you mean by the term 'the stock exchange.' Suppose you have a company incorporated in Nova Scotia, where there is no stock exchange. The stock is listed in Montreal, and listed nowhere else. Is the Montreal Stock Exchange to be considered 'the stock exchange' within the meaning of the statute or not? Or could a transfer by means of endorsing the scrip be made in Nova Scotia?

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there will be any difficulty. The by-laws of the company will provide where scrip and certificates of stock will be transferable by delivery. There is no reason why a company should not provide by a by-law that its stock scrips shall be transferable by delivery.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it would better carry out the idea of this section and make it a little more definite, if we were to say 'any recognized stock exchange' instead of 'the stock exchange.'

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. What do you mean by a recognized stock exchange?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The stock exchange of Montreal or Toronto.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. The courts will decide that such and such a place was a recognized stock exchange, just as the courts in England decide what is an open market.

The MINISTER OF TRADE AND COMMERCE. Would it not be better to use the word 'incorporated' instead of 'recognized.' There are a number of stock exchanges which are not incorporated, and are of very inferior order to those which are incorporated. While I do not know sufficiently about the scope of the Act to say whether it is right to exclude those, I can see some inconvenience in the use of a term which might be held to apply to stock exchanges not incorporated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A broker will sometimes establish in his office what he calls a stock exchange, in cities where there is no recognized stock exchange, and I think the intention is to avoid legalizing transfers of scrip in such places. Probably we had better use the word 'incorporated,' as suggested by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I do not think there would be any difficulty in practice if we were to use the term 'recognized stock exchange.' The courts are competent to decide, in cases of dispute, whether a certain stock exchange was in reality a recognized stock exchange or not. I move that this section be amended by inserting the words 'recognized stock exchange,' in place of the words, 'the stock exchange.'

Mr. BELCOURT. Why not use the word 'incorporated'?

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. There are all sorts of stock exchanges, and if you use the word 'recognized,' that may lead to difficulty. If you use the word 'incorporated,' there are stock exchanges where a good deal of business is carried on, which are not incorporated. If the stock is listed on a regular stock exchange, it can be dealt in by curb brokers, and a purchaser who buys innocently from a curb broker should not suffer. I do not think there is any necessity for the amendment. After a year's trial of this Act, if any amendments be thought necessary, we can make them next session. I do not think any harm will result in leaving the section as it is, and we might do some injustice by amending it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is rather too indefinite to talk about 'the stock exchange,' and more difficulty will likely arise if the clause be left as it is than to make some change as suggested.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. If it were left open as it is, merely 'the stock exchange,' I think it would be interpreted by the court as it would appear to me to be—the incorporated stock exchanges of the various centres.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think my hon. friend (Hon. Mr. Sutherland) quite

appreciates the conditions which may arise. For instance, in Nova Scotia we have no stock exchange as that word is ordinarily accepted. The securities of many Nova Scotia companies are listed on the Toronto or Montreal stock exchanges, and they are purchased on these exchanges by the people in Halifax. Suppose you have a case before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, in which this question was involved, would these words mean the Toronto Stock Exchange, or the Montreal Stock Exchange—or would they mean anything? It would leave us in a position of very grave uncertainty. I do not think it makes much difference whether you say 'recognized' or whether you say 'incorporated' stock exchange, assuming that all the stock exchanges are incorporated.

Mr. BELCOURT. I quite agree with the hon. leader of the opposition that that word ought to be defined. Particularly in view of the wild speculations in the stock markets recently, this change is a very desirable one. I would prefer to see the word 'incorporated,' because 'recognized' is a relative expression and vague. What would constitute 'recognition?'

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. Recognition in the markets of the world.

Mr. BELCOURT. But what is the stamp of 'recognition?' How are you to determine whether a stock exchange is 'recognized' or not? The word 'incorporated' is the one to use, as the stock exchanges in Montreal and Toronto are incorporated, as any other recognized stock exchange ought to be incorporated.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Is there a stock exchange in Halifax?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not an incorporated stock exchange.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Is there an institution carried on as a stock exchange, but not incorporated?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The brokers, who have a very extensive business, call themselves the 'Halifax Stock Exchange,' or something of that kind. There is no place where brokers meet and go through the usual manœuvres that brokers do on first-class stock exchanges, as in some of the larger cities of the continent; but they carry on operations by purchasing in New York, Montreal, or Toronto.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Practically, they are brokers?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes.

The MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES. The difficulty about using the word 'incorporated' is simply that a company might be incorporated under the name of a stock exchange, yet have no substantial standing in the country whatever.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, say 'recognized and incorporated.'

Mr. MONK. I have not followed this discussion, but, if this refers to mining exchanges, I would point out that we have a very important mining exchange in Montreal, and I do not think it is incorporated.

Mr. BELCOURT. Is it not part of the Canadian Mining Institute, which is an incorporated body?

Mr. MONK. No.

Mr. BELCOURT. They surely must be incorporated, otherwise they could not carry on business.

Mr. MONK. They carry on business in Montreal, but they are not incorporated. The stock exchange is incorporated, but not this mining exchange.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should think the word 'recognized' might bear the burden for a year. My hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) suggests that it has no very definite meaning, but the position of the Prime Minister of this country is constituted by a word in the statute-book very much the same.

The MINISTER. OF THE INTERIOR Words that no difficulty is found in interpreting.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree with the hon. Minister of the Interior, but we might use the word 'recognized' and thus get over difficulties such as the one suggested by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

Amendment agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported, read the third time, and passed.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill (No. 77) to provide for the appointment of Assistant Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada in certain cases.—Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick.

WAYS AND MEANS—RAILWAY EXTENSION IN NOVA SCOTIA.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved that the House go into Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising a Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Mr. C. E. KAULBACH (Lunenburg). As the work on the Halifax and South-western Railway is about to be commenced, I desire to offer a few remarks in that connection, interested as I naturally am in the road which is to pass through the county I have the honour to represent.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Will my hon. friend allow me to make a suggestion?

I was proposing that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means for the purpose of disposing of the Supply Bill, for which the Senate is waiting, and if my hon. friend desires to make any observations, we will afford him an opportunity after that is over.

Mr. KAULBACH. I will only be a few minutes. The Nova Scotia Southern Railway, better known as the Hervey Line, was started, if I remember rightly, in 1894, upon which it is reported $400,000 was expended in preliminary surveys and construction, but owing to an interference or friction between the promoter of it and the Coast Railway Company—a war of route, if it may be so called—and the Dominion and Nova Scotia governments, not having sufficient decision to give the Hervey line so called the preference, it being the first that was subsidized, operations were suspended pending results. I am very desirous, nevertheless, that a road shall be built between Halifax and Shelburne, and properly located where it will open a country for settlement, and develop the resources for the farmers, miners and lumbermen. Some would say, locate the road where it will give convenience to the greatest number, meaning along the shore. This would serve the purpose for Halifax and Shelburne counties very well, as these counties, unfortunately, have little or no farming country in both, the settlers being on the shore, but I am happy to say it is not the case with Lunenburg and Queen's, as the interior of these counties possesses the very finest of land for farming, suitable for producing anything that can be raised in Canada, and for purposes of fruit growing cannot be excelled, settled by a thrifty people, the places being known as Caledonia, South Brookfield, North Brookfield, Pleasant River, Hempford, Ohio, New Germany, Foster Settlement and New Ross, which are villages and settlements thrifty and full of promise, awaiting the completion of the Hervey road. How are these places to be reached, I would ask, if the proposed road is to follow the shore route, where the settlers have now all the facilities for travel by water and for the transport of all their sea and soil products ? I say that the settlers referred to, attracted to the rich agricultural lands in the interior of Lunenburg and Queen's, who have made homes for themselves and their families, are they to be refused a road to a market, places proverbially well suited for agriculture and horticulture, with lakes and streams to beautify the scene, well supplied with fish to attract the sportsman, and as I said, for richness of soil and adaptability for agriculture and fruit growing is not surpassed by the far-famed reputation of Annapolis and King's county valleys, nor in any part of Canada ?

The interior also possesses rich productive gold mines, notably the Libby, Maliga and numerous others, as well as other mineral deposits, as also valuable timber of hard and soft wood, stretching from the confines of Halifax and Lunenburg counties in the east to Shelburne in the west, all awaiting railway facilities to reach a market. This country, rich as I have described in natural resources and other advantages, should be considered in the location of this road, more particularly as the right of way can be had 'without money and without price,' as we all have agreed to give the lands required for the road without charge, whereas by the shore road a tax will be exacted. As to the cost of construction of the road through the interior, as compared with the shore route, I feel safe in saying, as I have been advised, that there is a difference of 40 per cent in favour of the interior, as the interior has only brooks instead of rivers to cross, and the country moderately undulating, or almost a level, with few cuttings, and that alluvial, and a straight route with little expense for bridging, as the bridges would be little better than culverts, as the streams are light. Whilst the shore route would require heavy bridging, precipitous cross hills to overcome, which means moving around them, thereby necessitating a more expensive, circuitous, and necessarily a longer route.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after this brief review of the situation, as to the location of the proposed interior route, as compared with the shore route, you will permit me to state that I am familiar with the geography of the counties through which this proposed road will pass, and the locations of the two proposed routes, so far as projected surveys have been made, and the rich and varied resources and advantages of the interior route as compared with the other, and possessing this knowledge, I feel it my duty to give it to the country and the public free of any personal or political bias. My view as to route is as follows : Start from the city of Halifax at a convenient point for passenger and freight traffic, and from thence on a line as straight as possible for the head waters of St. Margaret's Bay and Hubert's Cove, and thence for Chester, Chester Basin, and Gold River, thence following the valley of said Gold River, which is all but a straight line, as far as New Ross, thence straight for Shelburne via Foster Settlement, New Germany, Ohio, Hempford, Pleasant River, North Brookfield, South Brookfield, Caledonia and Indian Gardens—Shelburne having a harbour second to none in the world for depth of water, easy of approach by night or day, on the shore of the blue waters of the Atlantic, with no tortuous waters, such as we encounter on the Bay of Fundy, and a harbour of refuge not to be excelled. This road would form the main artery, or trunk line from Halifax to Shelburne, and an international road as well, as by a line of steamers from Shelburne to Boston, or New York, it would be

the shorter route by five hours, and the most delightful of any of the routes at present travelled.

By this route Hubert's Cove and Chester, the favourite resort for tourists, Chester Basin, New Ross, and the other places I have named, will have direct communication with either Halifax or Shelburne, they being on the main artery or belt lines, and from this belt line, branches will run to Liverpool and Lockeport, Bridgewater, Mahone Bay and Lunenburg, being provided for already, thus practically making each town on the shore the terminus of a railway line, and receiving the products and traffic of each branch, as also a part of the main trunk. By this method the interior of the country with its resources, will be developed, and through it encourage a population five times that we possess at present.

As the road between New Germany and Caledonia is well on towards completion, with a heavy cut stone bridge across the La Have River, now built, the heaviest on the route, with other bridges and culverts either placed in position or the cut stone and material on the grounds to build them, sleepers piled up along the beach sufficient to lay the entire road between Caledonia and New Germany, road-bed all but completed for the laying of the rails, I would therefore ask that this portion of the road be cared for at once, so that the sleepers, tending to decay, may be utilized, as a very small outlay would be called for to complete this entire section.

There is one special feature I desire to present most forcibly to the attention of the government, and that is that the local government be advised as well as themselves of the necessity and justice for the payment of back bills due to workmen and traders for labour performed, and material furnished, including sleepers, in the construction of the road between New Germany and Caledonia; that every dollar of these bills be paid, before an appropriation is made for any other purpose, as the value of the road at present is the labour that has been put into it by the workmen, and those who supplied them, and as a consequence should first be paid.

As this portion of road is so near completion, I would ask when are the contractors intending to commence work, and will the work be submitted to tender ?

I would also ask if it is the intention of the government to have the entire road between Halifax and Shelburne definitely located by survey, before any portion of construction begins ?

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding). The subject of railway extension from the city of Halifax along the south shore of Nova Scotia, or through the south-western counties of Nova Scotia, has long occupied the attention of the government, and I am glad to say that during the last year or two the matter has taken a much more satisfactory shape than in former years. By the co-operation of the local and Dominion governments—I put the local government first, because they are bearing the heavier end of the burden—an arrangement has been made which I feel assured will give the people of that section of the country, at a very early date, the railway construction which they have so long desired.

Mr. KAULBACH. Hear, hear. I quite endorse that.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. As to the question of the rival routes—that is to say, the interior route and the shore route—I am afraid that I shall not be able to agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) as fully as he could desire. We gave a contract for a large portion of the railway by the interior route to a company, which failed to construct it, and we now find that the workmen who are employed on that construction are clamouring to be paid. The people interested in that interior route have had their opportunity, and unfortunately the enterprise has failed. The probability is now that the new company which takes hold of the enterprise will not build the interior route as it was originally contemplated, but will build the shore route from Halifax to Shelburne, and on to Barrington Passage, from which a road is now constructed to Yarmouth. However, a portion of the interior route has been constructed, the line starting from the village of New Germany, and running as far as the village of Caledonia Corner, in the county of Queen's. It is a fact that that portion of the road is far advanced ; it is in a condition that the expenditure of a very moderate amount of money would bring it up to the point where it could be operated. But, the bills remain unpaid. It is our strongest desire in dealing with a new company that we should bring about some arrangement whereby these bills can be paid, but we cannot expect any new contractor to pay any bills unless he gets value for them. If the value is there it will be our endeavour to use that value to pay the people who performed the work, and we will do our utmost in that direction. But. I think I must qualify that statement by saying that if there is no value to be got out of that portion of the road, I do not see how we can expect a new contractor to pay for anything he is not getting, but where he will get value, it is only right that he shall pay the money to the people whose time and energy and skill went into the work, and we shall do our utmost to see that these bills shall be paid. I anticipate that that portion of the road, although it will not form part of the main line from Halifax to Yarmouth, will be completed at a very early date. I do not like to speak too confidently in a railway matter, because difficulties frequently occur, but I am in hope that before the present calendar year ends the twenty odd miles

between New Germany and Caledonia Corner will be completed, and will be in operation, and I am in hope that it will ultimately bs extended down as far as Liverpool. That is a matter for future consideration, and I can say nothing further about it. As to the general location, I have already stated that I believe the shore route will be preferred for several reasons. The first reason I have already given, and it is that the company which undertook to carry out the work in the interior route did not carry out the work. We have a company offering to build the shore route, and we have no company offering to build the interior route. Besides that, the local government, who have borne the heavy end of the burden, have undertaken to make an arrangement for the construction of that road, which they have made with no other company in Nova Scotia. They propose that they shall aid the company by loaning them in cash $13,200 a mile for the whole road. That aid is granted on the understanding that the line shall follow what is generally called the shore route. Of course that will have to be so located as to meet the various districts along the shore as far as possible. While we are entitled, under the terms of our contract, to reserve the right to approve of the location, still, the government realize that the local government are bearing the heavy end of the burden, and that their views ought to have very great consideration—and they will have. So much for the general question. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Kaulbach) asks whether we shall approve of any part of the location before any work is commenced, or whether we shall require the whole of the location to be decided before the work proceeds. There are portions of the road as to which there is no question about the location, and if the company shall begin work immediately upon those portions we shall be very well satisfied, but I do not anticipate very much delay in the road being located. There is only a small portion of the road in regard to which there will be very much difficulty about the location. The general subsidy Act contains a provision which requires that these locations shall be subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council, and that approval must be applied for. As the local government are bearing the heavy burden in the matter, we are disposed to defer very largely to their views in regard to the location, not giving the matter up entirely, but still meeting them in every way possible, in order that this long delayed work may be carried out. As to the way in which the work is to be done, whether by tender or not, my hon. friend must see that as the work is to be done by a company and not by the government we have no right to dictate to them in that respect at all. They will make the best arrangement they can, and if they can make a better arrangement by tender than in any other way you may rely upon it that they will make it by tender ; but this is a matter for the company to do what they think proper, and one in regard to which we cannot lay down any terms.

RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE.

Mr. CHARLES MARCIL (Bonaventure). Mr. Speaker, I received a communication this morning from my county, dealing with item 122 in the main estimates for railways and canals chargeable to capital.

New superstructure for Restigouche Bridge, $102,000.

This new Intercolonial Railway bridge, which is about to be constructed, runs over the Restigouche river between the counties of Restigouche, N.B., and Bonaventure, Quebec. This is a federal undertaking, and it is one of an interprovincial character. I am sorry that the hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Reid) is not in his seat at the present time, because the people of both counties are anxious to know if, when we are expending this money, provision cannot be made also for ordinary traffic passing over the bridge. There is no communication between the two counties at that point at the present time. Communication is very difficult, and it is twelve miles lower down, where the river is a tidal river. In view of the fact that we are going to spend this money, I would like to ask whether a change cannot be made in the plan, so as to provide for ordinary traffic passing over the river. I regret that I have brought this matter up so late, but the matter was only called to my attention a short time ago. I hope that the matter will be carefully considered, and that the government will see its way clear to grant this request.

TAXATION OF CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. WALTER SCOTT (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, I would crave the indulgence of the House for a moment to make a suggestion in regard to a subject brought up by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Oliver), namely, the taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands, and the proposed test case which is to be instituted. I may say that this matter is of more direct interest to the school districts and municipalities in the localities affected than to this parliament, as the school revenues, the municipal revenues, the provincial revenues, and in the case of the North-west, the territorial revenues are very closely related to it. The suggestion that I wish to make is that the Attorney General of the North-west Territories, and the Attorney General of Manitoba, shall be allowed to be associated with the Justice Department in the prosecution of this action which was to be taken, and in the preparation of the case.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. It becomes necessary that we should adopt certain resolutions in the Committee of Ways and Means to give effect to the estimates, and I therefore move :

Resolved, that towards making good a supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1902, the sum of $5,866,-922.56 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Resolution agreed to.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I now make a similar motion with regard to the year 1903. A considerable portion of the expenditure which is dealt with in the House is governed by statute, and we only have to vote specifically the remainder, so that the total sum here does not represent the total expenditure, but only that which we are required formally to vote. I move :

Resolved, that towards making good a supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1903, the sum of $38,271,-129.68 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Resolution agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we forgot to strike out certain items which should have been struck out in regard to civil government.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there were one or two cases, but we will have to ask my hon. friend to accept assurance that in no case was it intended there would be a duplication of the officers, but merely that the promotion should be made or the increased salary paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That intention will be carried out.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is another matter which escaped my attention until this moment. The Minister of Justice promised he would make a statement with regard to the test case between the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, in reference to the taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands in the North-west. Perhaps the Minister of Justice made the statement when I was not present, but I have not noticed it in Hansard.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. We had it this morning.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was here this morning, but the Minister of Justice was not here, and therefore he could not make the statement to which I refer. On one occasion when a Bill was passing through the Commons the Minister of Justice promised that he would make a statement with regard to the test case between the government and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and at the request of the Minister of Justice the matter was postponed upon the understanding that we would make a statement when his estimates were being considered, setting forth the position of that matter. I do not think that statement has been made.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. It has not. The member for Alberta brought up the question this morning, and I explained that the matter was under consideration between my department and the Department of Justice, but I was not in a position to say positively what exactly was the legal position the government would take. That was the point which the Minister of Justice was to make clear, and I presume it escaped his attention.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is to be regretted that the statement was not made, because when we let business pass on the understanding that certain statements will be made at a future date, we rely implicitly on that promise being carried out. I have no doubt that the Minister of Justice spoke in the most perfect good faith, and I am not imputing anything to the contrary. What I am suggesting is, that understandings of that kind should so impress themselves upon the minister that they should not be overlooked and the session pass away without the opposition obtaining the information which it could have insisted on at the time, except for the understanding.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I am satisfied that it was forgetfulness on the part of the Minister of Justice, because I know that he had a statement prepared.

Mr. SCOTT. I fear that the minister did not hear the suggestion I made a moment ago, which was that the Attorney General of Manitoba and the Attorney General of the Territories be allowed to be associated with the Justice Department in the preparation of this case and in the prosecution of the case. I make this suggestion for the reason that Manitoba and the North-west Territories are more directly interested in this matter than is the Dominion. The school districts and the municipalities are chiefly interested, and school revenues and municipal revenues are intimately related to provincial revenues. I think it would be wise to have the law officers of the provinces of Manitoba and the Territories associated with the Minister of Justice in the matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I will see that the attention of the Minister of Justice is directed to the suggestion of my hon. friend, but of course I cannot say what view he will take.

Mr. BOYD. The Minister of the Interior says that a statement has been prepared,

and if so, the Minister of Justice can present it at three o'clock.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. The Minister of Justice is out of town.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to urge on the government the adoption of the suggestion of the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). As the case stands now, there is on one hand a party who is deeply interested, and on the other a party which is not directly interested at all. The Dominion parliament has no direct interest in enforcing taxation upon these lands, whereas the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has every interest to prevent that taxation as far as possible. It is the provincial government and the territorial government which has a direct interest in enforcing the taxation, and it is only fair that the parties who have that direct interest should have a part in the preparation of the case and in the conduct of the case. It may not be giving the case away, but it certainly is not taking the strongest ground to protect the interest of the people concerned, if through their governments they have not an opportunity to take part in the preparation of the case and its conduct before the courts.

Mr. BROCK. I do not doubt at all the interest which Manitoba and the North-west Territories have in this case, but the Dominion government ought to be very careful not to create a precedent in this matter that might cause great difficulties in time to come. The Dominion government should be very careful before giving away their prerogative in a matter of this kind.

Mr. BOYD. I do not think the government needs to be warned, because they have taken abundant time in regard to this matter. In fact, if I mistake not, they have had time since they came into power, and the government before them had time, to consider that question, and I do not think we can be said to be at all hurrying the government to take it up when we say that the time has come when, in the interest of Manitoba and the North-west Territories and of all the people living there, we should know exactly where we stand in regard to that matter.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. I have no fault to find with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Boyd). He will of course understand that it was only at the expiration of the year 1901 that this question came up for consideration.

Resolutions reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

SUPPLY BILL.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE (Hon. W. S. Fielding) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 168) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively June 30, 1902, and June 30, 1903. He said: In presenting this Bill I desire to say, just in a single sentence, what I am sure will be gratifying to the whole House, that since the budget speech was delivered two months ago the conditions of our revenue have proved to be so very favourable that I am satisfied that the outcome of this year will be considerably better than I then ventured to predict. We shall have a larger surplus and a smaller addition to the public debt.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first time and the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

INSPECTION OF COAL OIL.

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Alberta). Mr. Speaker, at an earlier stage of the session I addressed a question to the government relating to the Department of Inland Revenue; and as I see the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue present, I would like to ask what decision has been reached by his department as to the means to be taken to prevent a recurrence of the distribution of coal oil of low illuminating power throughout Manitoba and the North-west, such as occurred during the past winter.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE (Hon. M. E. Bernier). When my main estimates were before the House, that question of coal oil was brought up, and I promised then that I would investigate the matter and report to the House later on. In order to make the matter more clear, I will read to the House a report or memorandum which was prepared on that subject, giving the whole story:

(Memo.)

Ottawa, April 28, 1902.

At the end of December, 1901, the attention of the department was called, through the Hon. the Minister of the Interior, to complaints made in the North-west as to the inferior quality of coal oil.

On December 30, the Hon. Mr. Sifton was informed that if a sample of the oil complained of was forwarded to the department, a chemical analysis thereof would be made.

On the 10th January, 1902, two samples were received and submitted to the Chief Analyst for examination.

On the 7th January the Chief Analyst reported that from Mr. McGill's investigation it did not appear that the samples were of inferior quality. Both samples stood the tests provided by the Petroleum Inspection Act. The incrustation on the wick as well as the deposit on chimney, by burning in an ordinary lamp, was normal.

On January 18, Collector Alexander, of London, was instructed to visit the refinery at Sarnia and personally select several samples from the stock of refined petroleum on hand, said samples to represent the highest, lowest and medium grades.

These samples were collected by Mr. Alexander from barrels ready for shipment, and represented all the grades, except high test oils,

put upon the Canadian market by the Imperial Oil Company.

On January 24, Inspector Barrett was advised of the reports that had reached the department relative to alleged bad quality of coal oil, and was requested to instruct the officers throughout his district to make a systematic inspection of oil in the hands of dealers.

Twenty-two (22) samples were collected in Winnipeg and St. Boniface, four (4) at Portage la Prairie, six (6) at Brandon, four (4) at Moosomin, one (1) at Prince Albert, three (3) at Regina, two (2) at Moosejaw, one (1) at Souris, two (2) at Deloraine, three (3) at Boissevain, two (2) at Killarney, two (2) at Manitou, three (3) at Morden, two (2) at Morris, three (3) at Pincher Creek, three (3) at Macleod, two (2) at Lethbridge, five (5) at Calgary, four (4) at Edmonton, one (1) at Strathcona.

In all seventy-five (75) samples were collected and tested, and in every instance the sample was found to stand the flash-test and to be within the gravity established by the Act.

The collector at Winnipeg reported nine (9) samples as complained of by dealers. These samples were submitted to District Analyst E. B. Kenrick for chemical examination. The result of Mr. Kenrick's investigations failed to establish that any of the samples were of objectionable quality. In addition to the chemical analysis, oil from each of the nine (9) objectionable samples was burned in an ordinary lamp for six (6) hours and not noticeable incrustation was found upon the wick nor fouling upon the chimney. Mr. Collector Gosnel, of Winnipeg, reports that he personally burned oil from these nine (9) samples and found them all to burn well except a sample obtained from Mr. Geo. Wheeler, of Winnipeg, which for seven (7) or eight (8) hours gave a good light, then became dull and practically went out. After removal of the incrustation upon the wick the lamp was again lighted and burned satisfactorily. This sample, as reported on by Mr. Kenrick, was found to contain a much larger proportion of fixed residue than any of the other samples examined, the percentage being ·33, as compared with an average of ·061 in the remaining eight (8) samples. The oil represented by those nine (9) samples was believed to be all of American manufacture.

The three (3) samples of Canadian oil collected at the refinery at Sarnia and examined by Mr. McGill at the laboratory in Ottawa show that they are good oils, although the more delicate instrument used by Mr. McGill showed the gravity of the ·805 oil to be ·8063. Mr. McGill reports that neither the deposits on the lamp chimney nor the incrustation of the wick were sufficient to sustain serious complaint against them.

A fact apparent by the examinations made by both Messrs. McGill and Kenrick was that the oils of heavy gravity contained the largest percentage of sulphur. In the Canadian samples this ranged from ·03893 in the oil of ·797 gravity to ·07655 in that of the gravity of ·805. In the sample examined by Mr. Kenrick it ranged from ·0221 in an oil of a gravity of ·7921 to ·0365 in an oil of a gravity of ·8039. In none of these cases is the percentage of sulphur as large as that permitted by law to be found in ordinary coal gas, viz., 35 grains per 100 cubic feet or, computed as in the coal, oil ·147.

Any attempt made to reduce the range of gravities as now established by the Act, viz., ·775 to ·805 would add to the cost of production and give the oil refiners a reasonable excuse for increasing the cost to the consumer.

So far as it was possible to ascertain, the trouble arose in connection with a lot of oil placed in storage tank No. 2 at Fort William in July, 1901. This oil was discharged from tank barge No. 36, shipped by the Standard Oil Company, Chicago, and consigned to the Imperial Oil Company, Fort William.

This storage tank holds 10,000 barrels of oil. Mr. Inspector Barrett reports that 9,000 barrels drawn out of this tank gave perfect satisfaction but the remaining oil, taken from the bottom of the tank, did not give satisfactory results.

Mr. Barrett further reports that as soon as the Imperial Oil Company learned that complaints were made they examined the oil and found that it was unsatisfactory, inasmuch as the wick clogged after burning for a time and caused a diminution of the flame. They at once recalled the oil and paid freight both ways.

At the request of Mr. F. Oliver, M.P., further inquiries were made at Lethbridge where it was alleged serious complaints had been made. Mr. Acting-Collector Saucier advises the department under date, April 24, 1902, that he called upon the following dealers, viz. : A. McDonald & Co., H. Bentley, Hudson Bay Company, Brodie & Stafford, Sherlock & Freeman and Wm. Scott.

Of the above, A. McDonald & Co. state bad oil was first noticed in October ; H. Bentley had no complaints ; Hudson Bay Company had a few complaints ; Brodie & Stafford had no complaints ; Sherlock & Freeman had received complaints in October or November and some bad oil was returned to them in December, and Wm. Scott had complaints continuously from September, 1901, to February, 1902.

The Acting Collector states that there was probably not more than one consignment of inferior oil last October and that it was on the market from the middle of October to some time in December.

In conclusion, the department is of the opinion from the reports received that a quantity of inferior oil was put upon the market late in the autumn, that as soon as the Imperial Oil Company were advised of the fact that the oil was not giving satisfaction it was recalled at the company's expense, that in all probability this inferior quality of oil was not on sale for a longer period than three months, that with the exception of this one consignment the oil supplied has given satisfaction, and that for some months past no complaints have arisen.

Attached hereto are copies of the results obtained by Messrs. McGill and Kenrick.

It will be seen, therefore, from the reports and the correspondence attached, that as soon as complaints reached the department, we did our best to collect the oil in the North-west Territories and Manitoba, and subject it to an analysis, the reports of which are contained in this return.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish the hon. minister to assume——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is no motion before the Chair.

The MINISTER OF FINANCE. I think there will be no objection taken to the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) speaking.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member might put himself in order by making a motion.

Mr. OLIVER. I move the adjournment of the House. I do not wish the hon. minister to assume, as he apparently does assume, that there was any desire to attack his department or the administration of it. But a certain condition of affairs existed, and it was felt to be in the best interest of the country as of the government that the facts should be made known, with a view to finding a remedy for that condition at the earliest possible moment. I am willing to accept the statement of the hon. minister that every effort was made by the department to arrive at a knowledge of the facts, but I am compelled to call attention to this, that the efforts made by the department through its officers were not as successful as they should have been. The hon. minister has read us a statement of the reports of his officer that would indicate that there was no bad oil sold in Manitoba or the North-west Territories last winter. But after reading the result of these official reports, the hon. minister makes a statement from another and a higher officer who admits that at least a thousand barrels, or was it gallons ?——

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR. Barrels.

Mr. OLIVER. A thousand barrels of inferior oil were put upon the market.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. There was ten thousand barrels of oil in the one tank. Of this, nine thousand barrels gave satisfaction, but the residue of one thousand barrels did not.

Mr. OLIVER. Then one thousand barrels of inferior oil were put upon the market of Manitoba and the North-west Territories last fall, and consumers were supplied with inferior oil during a period of three months. And yet the officers who were sent out into Manitoba and the North-west Territories to examine the samples of oil were not able to —did not, as a matter of fact—locate that bad oil. I am not blaming either the minister for his intentions, nor his officers, but I point out this, as I did in my remarks when the question was under discussion before, that the present tests for flash and gravity do not determine the illuminating power of the oil. That, I claim, is unquestionably established by the report we have had placed before us to-day. And I again call upon the hon. minister to provide in some way for some test of the oil as to its illuminating qualities. It is not as to its flash or as to its gravity that we want to know in regard to this oil ; what we want to know is whether it will give light. And, if it is a fact, as it appears to be, that the present tests do not enable the officers to judge of the illuminating quality of the oil, then we must urge upon the minister, for our own protection and for his credit, to secure such expert ability as may be possible to provide a test that will determine whether the oil will give light or not. The facts are as he stated, that, for three months during the darkest part of last winter, the oil supplied throughout Manitoba and the North-west was of inferior illuminating powers. Whether it would stand the flash test or the gravity test is of no interest to the public. The fact is it would not stand the practical test of illumination, and we want such a test applied as will ensure that when we pay for oil we shall get light. Now, the assertion is made that the company withdrew the bad oil and paid the freight both ways. I am not in the oil business, but I am perfectly satisfied that that statement is not universally correct. What may have been done in some parts of the country I do not know, but I am perfectly satisfied that, so far as the town in which I live is concerned, the company certainly did not withdraw the oil or pay the freight both ways.

Mr. BOYD. Let me merely call attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that here, within twenty minutes of the close of the session, this question, the most important to the people of Manitoba and the North-west, except the transportation question, is brought up. The people of that country were to a very large extent in the dark last winter ; but here at this last moment of the session we have some light thrown on this subject. It will be most gratifying to the people of Manitoba and the North-west Territories to find at last they have this light. And the intimation is given us that we do not know anything about it. When we buy bad oil and that oil will not give light, it will be most consoling to know that we do not understand the ' gravity ' and the ' flash ' and all that business that the scientists of the department are so familiar with. The local conditions are such that we do not understand these things. But next winter, or some future time when the lamps will not burn, when the oil only blackens the glass, and sticks in the wick, we shall be able to send for some of these officers so that they may enlighten us with the explanation of the ' gravity ' and ' flash.' Or it will afford us delight to send for the Minister of Inland Revenue himself to come up. But I wish to warn him that if he comes up with the great document he has read us today and undertakes to read it, he will not be able to do so.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Why not ?

Mr. BOYD. Because there will not be light enough—unless he should do as he has done to-day, bring his report in in the middle of the day, when he will not need lamp light. The hon. minister tells us that his officers did not find any of this bad oil. And how could they, when, according to the hon. minister the bad oil had all been brought

back ? This oil was taken into the country in October, and it was not until January that any practical move was made by the Department of Inland Revenue. The result of it was, to use the hon. minister's own words, 'they recalled the oil and paid the freight both ways.' Then, after the oil had been recalled, the officers of the department were sent out, and, strangely enough, they were not able to find any of the bad oil in the country.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a second ?

Mr. BOYD. Certainly, a whole minute.

The MINISTER OF INLAND REVENUE. I merely desire to repeat that the first intimation that the department had was received from the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) in December, and it was acted upon at once. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyd) knew the facts. If he had given us information of the facts earlier, we certainly would have taken action earlier.

Mr. BOYD. Why, the facts were published broadcast in the press and discussed everywhere. And, in the first place, it was the fault of the officers of the Minister of Customs that the oil was allowed to come into the country. If it was necessary, in order to rectify their error, to notify the Department of Inland Revenue, why did they not do so ? But no, the information must come from a member of parliament and be communicated to the Minister of the Interior, and so be passed on up to the Department of Inland Revenue. I say it does not lie in the mouth of the Minister of Inland Revenue or of the Minister of Customs, as at this late hour particularly, to make the excuses they have made. They need not think for a moment that these excuses will be accepted by the people of Manitoba and the North-west. When this subject was under discussion before, I quoted the Act to show that it had been changed. These hon. gentlemen said that it had not been changed. But, if so, what is the explanation of the fact that the officers of the Customs Department did permit ten thousand barrels of bad oil to come into the country ? Was the oil inspected, or was it not ? It is evident, from the facts laid before the House by the Minister of Inland Revenue, that the department did not inspect it. After the oil was found to be bad, they recalled the oil. Seventy-five cases of that oil is found, and it is all right. I have just this to say, that it will take a great deal more than the statement that is read by the Minister of Inland Revenue at this late moment of the session, to convince the people of Manitoba that the government has taken that care they should have taken in regard to this matter.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. So far as the Department of Customs is concerned, the hon. gentleman should not say that the oil was not inspected. I informed the House that it was inspected. If it was not inspected, how does the hon. gentleman know that a personal test would not be effective? That shows the weakness of his objection. I say it was inspected.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would ask the hon. gentleman, if it was inspected, of what good is his inspection ? The oil was no good, and if it was inspected he is in a worse position than when he started out.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. If it is necessary, and that seems to be the idea of some hon. gentlemen here, that there should be new tests applied, that is a fair question for consideration. It is to be remembered, however, as the Minister of Inland Revenue tells us, I suppose from information in his possession, that if the test is altered and a stronger test required, either in the gravity or the flash, the probability is that you will have to pay an increased price for oil. The question is whether, on account of one misshipment you would be willing that a test should be applied that will raise the price of oil used by the people of that country for all time to come. That is the question for these gentlemen to consider. Perhaps the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), who seems to understand the question so thoroughly, would give us his advice on that point.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would be very happy to do so if I thought the minister would accept my advice. In our section of the country, I want to tell the hon. gentleman that we have not been so long in the darkness as he thinks we have. It is evident enough to my mind that if the test is all right the hon. gentleman's officers are not all right. If the test is all right his inspectors do not know their business any more than the hon. gentleman knows his own business. We import oil in our section of the country, the officers of the Customs Department test the oil, and we never have any complaint. It occurs to me that the people might well pay a little more for their oil and have some more light than to pay what they do and sit in darkness. They are paying for oil that has no illuminating qualities at all. I think this is a serious matter, although we may treat it lightly, that the inhabitants of Manitoba should be paying for oil, when the officials of the department are not doing their duty. If they are doing their duty, the test they make is of no use.

The MINISTER OF CUSTOMS. This oil is American oil, brought in in tank vessels, and the Minister of Inland Revenue says that his officers simply have to test the oil for gravity and flashing point. It comes in through the customs, and our officers have been furnished with the necessary instruments for determining the

gravity and the flash test according to the regulations laid down by the Inland Revenue Department. When the subject came up I made inquiry, and I was informed by the Commissioner that he had received from our officer a report, giving the actual test which he had taken. That convinced me that he had made the test. Now, this is what we have to consider. A mistake has occurred; it may occur again. There must have been many shipments going on. You can conceive of nothing much more irritating and annoying for people living in the country and having to illuminate their dwellings, than that they should find the oil unsatisfactory. But the point I want to ascertain is whether hon. gentlemen wish the test altered and made stronger, as a result of which the price of oil would be increased.

Motion withdrawn.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

House resumed at 2.45 p.m.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Taylor. Speech.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (South Leeds). When you left the Chair at one o'clock, Mr. Speaker, we were discussing the coal oil question, but inasmuch as there was no one speaking when I entered the Chamber I do not know whether this is a motion to adjourn or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. To prorogue.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to see that the messenger which has been sent to the Upper Chamber has returned in the person of my colleague (Mr. Calvert) the chief whip of the government. I can sympathize with that hon. gentleman very much because I occupied the position of chief government whip for a good many years. I know the troubles that the hon. member (Mr. Calvert) has in keeping his party in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR. I know there are more kickers in that party now than there were even when the Minister of Marine was its Liberal whip. As for myself, I have a pretty easy time of it in opposition. There are no kickers over here, and no dissensions. However that may be, I think the goverument and their supporters will give us credit for having fought a manly battle during this session and although we have criticised the government we have not criticised them nearly as much as they deserve. But on this side of the House we are anxious to get home to drive the Grit party from power in Ontario, which we hope to do two weeks from to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Other hon. MEMBERS. That's where you'll get left.

Mr. TAYLOR. I hope my colleague the chief government whip will entertain you for a few minutes by telling you all the troubles he has had in keeping his party in order.

Mr. W. S. CALVERT (Middlesex). Mr. Speaker. This is entirely unexpected. So far as I am concerned, I have been one of the silent members of the House pretty nearly the whole session. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that my duties as chief whip of the government party have been extremely light, because there are no kickers at all over here. We have not a single kicker in the whole party.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CALVERT. It has been the greatest pleasure to me to work with my fellow-members on this side of the House, and I can add that I have had not the slightest trouble with my good friend the chief whip of the opposition (Mr. Taylor). I have not had as hard a time as he had when he was chief government whip. My associations with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) have been most pleasant. We have trusted each other implicitly, and when the chief whip of the oppposition gave me his word I took it for granted that it would be carried out, and it has been carried out in every case. I have to thank my good friends on both sides of the House for their courtesy and kindness to me during the past session. Whatever the Liberal members were asked to do they did it willingly.

An hon. MEMBER. Right or wrong.

Mr. CALVERT. I cannot say right or wrong, because we have always been right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Other hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Speech. Jabel Robinson.

Mr. JABEL ROBINSON (West Elgin). Mr. Speaker, I cannot say much——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ROBINSON. I cannot say much in favour of the whip of the Independent party, because if I did I would have to sound my own praises——

An hon. MEMBER. Tell us about your leader.

Mr. ROBINSON (Elgin). If you consider that I have a leader, I might be able to say a few words with regard to his conduct. But most hon. members understand the position of an independent member perhaps as well as I do. I only say that since I have been a member of this House I have endeavoured, as far as my ability would allow, to discharge my duties. I have no favourites in the House. There is nobody that I call my master. I do not know any man as master. I do my own thinking, and I vote as I please. However, I am much pleased to know that this assembly is about

to disperse with the happiest feelings, and I trust that all of us will go home feeling the better for this session, and ready to discharge our duties faithfully at home—much more faithfully than some of us have done here.

PROROGATION.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod :

Mr. SPEAKER :

His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the Chamber of the Honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

IN THE SENATE CHAMBER.

His Excellency was pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act relating to the Regina Law Library.

An Act respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the River St. Clair Railway, Bridge and Tunnel Company.

An Act respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.

An Act respecing the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Grand Valley Railway Company.'

An Act respecting the Buffalo Railway Company and the International Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Velvet (Rossland) Mine Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.

An Act respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.

An Act respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Indian River Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.

An Act to incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company (Limited).

An Act to incorporate the Sovereign Life Assurance Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the St. Lawrence and Northern Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Westren.

An Act to incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.

An Act to incorporate the Crown Bank of Canada.

An Act respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.

An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.

An Act respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act to incorporate the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Knapp Tubular Steamship Company.

An Act respecting the James' Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

An Act respecting Pensions to Officers of the North-west Mounted Police.

An Act respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Ross Rifle Company, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Northern Express Company.

An Act respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Timagami Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Essex Terminal Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.

An Act to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.

An Act further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

An Act further to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act, 1894.

An Act further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.

An Act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, 1898.

An Act to amend the Rocky Mountains Park Act.

An Act respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railways Company.

An Act further to amend the Yukon Territory Act and the Acts in amendment thereof.

An Act for the relief of James Brown.

An Act respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

An Act incorporating The Molsons Bank Pension Fund.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.

An Act further to amend the Pilotage Act.

An Act respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the Bishop of Moosonee.

An Act to amend the Exchequer Court Act.

An Act to amend the provision with regard to Tolls of chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1881, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.

An Act to amend Chapter 41 of the Statutes of 1901, respecting the Administration of Justice in the Yukon Territory.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.

An Act to incorporate the Dyment Securities, Loan and Savings Company.

An Act to amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities.

An Act to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.

An Act to amend the Chinese Immigration Act, 1900.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.

An Act to authorize the raising, by way of loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.

An Act to amend the Naturalization Act.

An Act to amend the Acts relating to the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.

An Act respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia.

An Act respecting la Compagnie du chemin de fer de Colonisation du Nord.

An Act to incorporate the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Eastern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

An Act respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.

An Act respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Maritime Stock Breeders' Association.

An Act respecting the Quebec Southern Railway Company.

An Act further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.

An Act to amend the Railway Act.

An Act to amend the Act of 1899, respecting the City of Ottawa.

An Act to incorporate the Dominion Institute of Chartered Accountants.

An Act respecting the South Shore Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canada Central Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.

An Act to incorporate the North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company.

An Act to provide for the establishment of a Medical Council in Canada.

An Act to amend the Immigration Act.

An Act to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.

An Act to incorporate the Securities Bank of Canada.

An Act to incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.

An Act to incorporate the Union Life Assurance Company.

An Act respecting the Royal Marine Insurance Company.

An Act for the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman.

An Act further to amend the provisions of Chapter 183 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the Halifax Industrial School and Saint Patrick's Home at Halifax.

An Act respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons.

An Act further to amend the General Inspection Act.

An Act to amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.

An Act respecting the Coasting Trade of Canada.

An Act to amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.

An Act respecting the Remission of Penalties.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.

An Act respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by Letters Patent.

To these Bills the Royal Assent was pronounced by the Clerk of the Senate in the following words :—

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General doth assent to these Bills.

Then the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons addressed His Excellency the Governor General, as follows :—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY :

The Commons of Canada have voted the Supplies required to enable the government to defray the expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Excellency the following Bill :—

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively June 30, 1902, and June 30, 1903.

to which Bill I humbly request Your Excellency's assent.

To this Bill the Clerk of the Senate, by His Excellency's command, did thereupon say :—

In His Majesty's name, His Excellency the Governor General thanks His Loyal Subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this Bill.

After which His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to close the second session of the ninth parliament of the Dominion with the following

SPEECH.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In relieving you from further attendance in Parliament, I desire to thank you for the care and attention given to your important duties.

The unusual number of Acts that have been passed incorporating industrial and railway companies may be taken as an evidence of the rapid progress that Canada is making in wealth and prosperity. Further proof of that satisfactory condition is afforded by the increase in the trade and revenue of the country.

It has been gratifying to note the unprecedented flow of immigrants from Europe and from the United States that are now seeking homes in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories. The rapidly increasing population in that fertile section of the Dominion must yearly add to the trade of the country.

The agreement entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when authorizing an increase of its capital, to expend over nine million dollars in providing additional rolling stock, will, it is hoped, materially diminish in the future the serious losses that have arisen from the insufficient supply of cars to carry the products of the west to eastern ports.

The amendments made to the Manitoba Grain Act authorizing the farmers in Manitoba and in the North-west Territories to erect flat warehouses for storing their grain at railway stations will, it is believed, be found to serve a useful purpose, and defeat any attempt to depress prices by combinations.

The growing population in the Yukon territory and the rapid development in the trade of that section of Canada amply justify the Act granting to its residents a representative in Parliament who will be authorized to speak for his constituency in all matters affecting the more important interests of that remote part of the Dominion.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I thank you in His Majesty's name for the liberal supplies you have granted for the public service.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In bidding you farewell, I desire to express the hope that when we meet next year we shall be able to again rejoice in the continued prosperity which now prevails over this wide Dominion.

The SPEAKER of the Senate then said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S will and pleasure, that this Parliament be prorogued until Tuesday, the twenty-fourth day of June next, to be here holden, and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued until the twenty-fourth day of June next.

INDEX.

SECOND SESSION—NINTH PARLIAMENT, 1902.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn ; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass., Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div , Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved. Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4573 (ii).

Clinton, David, Postmaster at Wellington, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 613 (i).

——— (M. for cor.*) 2680 (ii).

Picton Public Buildings, Delay in Opening (Ques.) 1490 (i).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates, examination) 514 (i).

Yukon, Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4989 (ii).

Angers, Mr. C., *Charlevoix.*

L'Isle-au-Coudre Wharf, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3409 (ii).

Avery, Mr. M., *Addington.*

Coronation Contingent, Employmt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2464 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 465 (i) ; in Com., 3184 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Post Office (country postmasters) 3900 ; (Postmaster Lewis) 3909 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grande Vallée) 1041 (i).

Ball, Mr. Geo., *Nicolet.*

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com., 4662 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. to refer back to Com., 2061 (i).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4425, 4528 (ii).

Therien, Mr. H., Dismissal as Postmaster from Grandes Piles, Pet., &c. (M. for copy*) 3724 (ii).

Barker, Mr. Saml., *Hamilton.*

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2146.

Fishery Awards and P.E.I., Premier's Speech (remarks) 3859 (ii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Accounts, Vouchers, &c., (M. for ret.*) 529 (i).

——— Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3266 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Construction, Steaming Qualities, &c. (Ques.) 445 (i).

——— Revenue and Capital Account for 1901, &c. (M. for ret.*) 529 (i).

——— Rolling Stock, &c., Condition, &c., (M. for ret.*) 3724 (ii).

——— Steel Rails, Rolling Stock, &c., purchased in 1901, O.C.'s, Contracts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 885, 886 (i).

——— Ties and Sleepers, Purchase, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 444, 2065 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4038 (ii).

Railway (commission) Consolidation Act. Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2446 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals : Trent Valley (Corry & Laverdure's claim) 4014 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1163, 1180 (i).

Militia (properties) 2552 (ii).

Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto harbour) 1275 (i).

Railways and Canals : I.C.R. (additional sidings) 3812 ; (bridges, strengthening) 3809 ; (car couplers) 4794 ; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 4786 ; (Clergue's contract) 3791 ; (Drummond Co., &c.) 3527 ; (general vote) 3483 ; (Miramichi bridge spans) 3812 ; (rolling stock) 3814, 4784 ; conc., 5037 ; (St. John accommodation) 4786 ; (steel rails, &c.) 3781 ; conc., 5035 ; (Stellarton accommodation)

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
4788; (Sydney accommodation) 3806; P.E.I. (bridges) 3828; (Charlottetown accommodation) 4918; (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5040 (ii).

Béland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 16 (i).
Circular issued by P. Landry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2458 (i).
Fish Canners in B.C., Prof. Prince's Remarks (Ques.) 449, 613 (i).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 14) 1°*, 530 (i).

Belcourt, Mr. N. A., *Ottawa.*
Accountants Bill. *See* 'Chartered.'
Bell Telephone Co. of Can. (B. 143) 1°*, 3725 (ii).
Chartered Accountants (Dom.) incorp. (B. 160) 1°*, 4241; 2° m., 4571; on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693; in Com., 4694 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 107) in Com., 4414.
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4671, 4680 (ii).
Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 5061 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4460 (ii).
Metropolitan Bank incorp. (B. 144) 1°*, 3725 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 38) 1°*, 961; on M. to ref. back to Com., 2061 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4517 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, Relevancy of Deb., 4523 (ii).
Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4349 (ii).
Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4598 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Exchequer court) 229 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Yukon (Collinet, Mrs., dismissal, &c.) 4538; (official residences) 4546 (ii).

Bell, Mr. A. C., *Pictou.*
Accountants, Chartered, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4574 (ii).
Agricultural and Manufacturing Products of Can., Aggregate Amount, &c. (Ques.) 747 (i).
Aladdin, Str., Quantity of Coal carried (Ques.) 884 (i).
Archibald, P. S. (M.) to have called as Witness in Pub. Accounts Com., 1395 (i).
Blue Books, Publication, &c. (remarks) 2731 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1685 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 770 (i).
Census Figures quoted by Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 1764 (i), 2731 (ii).
Coal carried by Chartered Strs. (Ques.) 884 (i).

Bell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Dismissals of Govt. Employees for political reasons (M. for ret.) 428 (i).
Eastern Extension Ry., N.S., Refund of Amounts paid by Counties, &c. (Ques.) 781 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4416 (ii).
Govt. Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).
——— M. for Ret., 428 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3239, 4036 (ii).
I. C. R. Employees, Number, Salaries, &c. (M for ret.*) 440 (i).
——— (Ques.) 132 (i).
Joint Stock Companies B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5059 (ii).
Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4360 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re Year Book* (remarks) 1764 (i), 2731 (ii).
Peter Jetson, Str., Quantity of Coal carried (Ques). 884 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4039 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep. (M.) to ref. back, *re* P. S. Archibald, 1108, 1395; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 101) 1436 (i).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr *Charlton*) 276 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3232 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4036 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4103; (experimental farms) 2899; (*Year Book*) 2906.
Civil Govt.: Agriculture (Chittick, F. C., promotion) 4965 (ii).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1148 (i).
Fisheries (oyster culture) 555 (i).
Geological Survey (director, &c.) 4116 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Nfld., coast survey) 5028 (ii); (Traverse light) 527 (i).
Militia (Coronation contingent) 4263 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 4120 (ii).
Post Office (branch offices) 3887 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (Grosse Isle) 982; (quarantine stations) 982; N.S. (Halifax custom-house) 636; Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 564 (i), 4137; (elevators H. of C.) 4137 (ii); (telephones) 987 (i); (ventilation, H. of C.) 4140 (ii); Yukon (rentals, maintenance, &c.) 970 (i); Harbours and Rivers (Mar. Provs.) 4142; N.S. (Drum Head breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Pictou island) 1009; (Washabuck wharf) 1009 (i); (Windsor dams) 4624; Telegraph Lines, Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150; (pole contract) 4164 (ii).
Quarantine (unorganized districts) 2903 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Canso ferry service) 4295; (Windsor branch) 4292; P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4924; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4870 (ii).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren*) to Com. of Sup., 4398 (ii).
Yukon, Treadgold Syndicate, &c., Concessions (Ques.) 241 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
American Tugs in Can. Waters, &c. (Ques.) 441.

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Anten Mills and Hendrie Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1681 (i).

Census, Simcoe, N. and E., Cost in 1891-1901 (Ques.) 2224 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c. (prop. Res.) 2459 (i).

Craig, Judge, Interview *re* Yukon Irregularities: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Crow's Nest Coal Fields, Cor. with U.S.A. Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2471 (i).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2864 (ii).

Judges of County Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3310; in Com. on B., 3946 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* Compulsory Retirement (Ques.) 131 (i).

Noble Bros., Claims, &c., Papers, &c. (remarks) 3926 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4349 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2773 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3371; (census, exodus, &c.) 4435 (ii); (general statistics) 342; (Glasgow exposition) 358; (*Patent Record*) 330; (*Year Book*) 336 (i).

Canals: Galops (entrance) 4023; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4023; Sault Ste. Marie (deepening entrances) 4004; Trent Valley (construction) 4004; (Corry & Laverdure's claim) 4010; (dredging, &c.) 4273; Welland (Port Colborne entrance) 4019 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Inland Revenue (salaries) 176; Labour Dept. (salaries) 195; Public Works (salaries) 178 (i).

Customs (American tugs in Can. waters) 3297; (revenue cruisers) 3297 (ii).

Fisheries (Noble Bros. award, &c.) 4228 (ii).

Justice: Yukon (legal adviser) 3592; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3586; (witness fees) 3590 (ii).

Post Office (Barrie mail service) 3910; (LeSueur, Mr., superannuation) 3904; (mail service) 3914; (Midland postmaster) 3916 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 865; (contract or day labour) 674: Ont. (Clinton) 719; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 674; (Sorel works) 674; Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 972; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie wharf, repairs) 1217; (Goderich harbour) 1236; (Midland harbour) 1237; (Orillia wharf) 1241; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1264; (Tobermory harbour) 1247; Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1032; (Sorel wharf) 1053 (i); Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 391 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (Drummond Co. rental) 3516, 3550; (Lévis accommodation) 3810; (locomotives) 3823; (Rivière du Loup engine shops) 3828; (rolling stock) 3823; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4284, 4292 (ii).

Tiverton SS., Grounding, &c., Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 2856 (ii).

Transportation on St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3698 (ii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Tubercular Test, Res. by Shorthorn Breeders Assen. (Ques.) 130 (i).

Yukon Irregularities and Interview with Judge Craig (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 972 (i).

Bernier, Hon. M. E. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *St. Hyacinthe.*

Coal Oil Inspection (remarks) 5074 (ii).

Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Fraudulent Sale Act, Inspection *re* Commercial Commodities (Ans.) 744 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 85 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 4569 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Inland Revenue (salaries) 176 (i).

Electric Light Inspection (salaries, &c.) 1201 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1148; distillery duty) 1184 (i); (grain standards) 4258 (ii); (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1147 (i): (rents, fue &c.) 4961 (ii).

Gas Inspection (salaries) 1201 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1185; (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1185; (metrical instruments) 1201 (i), 4961 (ii).

Three Rivers, Inspector Gravel, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 2457 (i).

Tobacco Duties, Amount collected for 1901 (Ans.) 134 (i).

Bickerdike, Mr. Robt., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Montreal Bridge Co.'s (B. 38) M. to ref. back to Com., 2054; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 85) 2063 (i).

——— (B. 148) 1°*, 3919 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4515 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Binder Twine Advertisements, Circulars, &c. (Ques.) 410, 618, 885, 1439 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1490 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3662.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3382; (census expenses) 4434; (cold storage) 2640*; (creameries) 2654; (experimental farms) 2871; (fruit inspection) 2597, 2629 (ii); (general statistics) 343 (i); (poultry shipments) 2648.

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 1201 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1152, 1166 (i).

Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 544 (i).

Gas, &c., Inspection (salaries) 1201 (i).

Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3594; Man. (land purchase) 3618 (ii).

Militia (properties) 2556 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving rewards) 515 (i).

Post Office (country postmasters) 3875; (mail contracts) 3910 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.B. (Marysville) 640 (i); Ont. (Port Colborne) 4616 (ii); Ottawa (H. of C., additions) 848; Que. (L'Assomption) 657; Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Skeena river) 1277; Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1220; (Blind River wharf) 1223; (Port Credit) 1228; (transportation) 597; Que. (Valleyfield, dredging) 1062 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1189 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G. (Minister of Railways and Canals) *St. John City.*

Can. Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2661 (ii).

C.P.Ry. Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 3130 (ii).

Canals, Dom., Expenditure, Revenue, &c. since Confederation (Ans.) 784 (i).

Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2220 (i).

Chambly Canal, Wharf, &c., Maintenance by G.T.Ry. Co. (Ans.) 2069 (i).

Clergue's Contract, *re* Steel Rails, Quantity delivered, &c. (Ans.) 746 (i).

Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2670 (ii).

Financial Situation, Review, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4855 (ii).

Freight Rates, on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1205 (i).

Fruit Transportation, Excessive Ry. Charges, &c. (Ans.) 1109 (i).

Galops Rapids, Improvements, Personal Explanation, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5020 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com.. 4652 (ii).

Gilbert Blasting and Dredging Co., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3155 (ii),

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4672 (ii).

I.C.R., Accidents through Cattle on Tracks (Ans.) 883 (i).

——— Barbour, John, Charges against, &c. (Ans.) 2853 (ii).

——— Coal carried by chartered Strs. (Ans.) 884.

——— Coal purchased in Canada (Ans.) 883 (i).

——— Ditching along Temiscouata Farm Lands, Damages, &c. (Ans.) 2677 (ii).

——— Expenditures, Inquiry by Pub. Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3240, 3245 (ii).

——— Fire Insurance on Locomotives, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

——— Freight Rates on Pig Iron, &c. (Ans.) 783.

——— Horne, Mr. R. T., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2068 (i).

——— Locomotives and Ry. Cars purchased from 1896 to 1902, on M. for Ret., 2681 (ii).

——— (Ans.) 1108 (i).

——— Mulgrave and Point Tupper Ferry Service, &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).

——— Passes, on Inquiry for Ret., 4404 (ii).

——— St. John's Elevator, Amount of Grain handled, &c. (Ans.) 884 (i).

——— Ste. Monique Station, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 744 (i).

——— St. Octave Station, Tenderers, &c., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2222 (i).

——— Steel Rails, &c., Quantity, &c, purchased, on M. (Mr. *Barker*) for Ret., 886 (i).

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Ties and Sleepers, Purchase, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2066 (i).

——— Tantramar Marsh Washout, Repairs, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1108 (i).

——— Trucks, &c. purchased (Ans.) 2852 (ii).

King Bros., Claim against Govt., Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 3308 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3134 (ii).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2669 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., Southport to Murray Harbour, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 4696 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1399 (i).

Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 4126; in Com., 4580, 4586 (ii).

Railways and Canals Rep. (presented) 129 (i).

Railway Commission. Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 131, 883 (i).

Railway (commission) Consolidation Act Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2431 (i).

——— (remarks) 4404 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3222 (ii).

Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2673 (ii).

Ste. Catharine's Water Supply, &c. (Ans.) 883, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'Welland.'

St. Lawrence Canal Employees, Amount paid, collected, from 1896-1901 (Ans.) 2222 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals: Carillon (dredging, &c.) 4281; Cornwall (lighting, &c.) 4294; (repairs, &c.) 4311; Culbute (damages, &c.) 4281, 4309; Farran's Point (enlargement) 4300; Galops (deepening, &c.) 4021, 4300; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4021; Generally (extra services) 4294, 4312; Georgian Bay (surveys) 4299; Lachine (electric plant) 4299; (lock repairs) 4035; (Mill Street paving) 4307; (waste weir) 4308; North Channel (dam) 4034; (enlargement) 4300; Quebec (boundaries) 4281; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 4304; (Gilbert Bros.) 4021; Rideau (Poonamalie causeway) 4270, 4917; Sault Ste. Marie (entrances) 4001, 4298; Soulanges (construction, &c.) 4019, 4304; Trent Valley (construction) 4004; conc., 5047; (Corry & Laverdure, claim) 4007; (dredging) 4270; (Lindsay and Fenelon road) 4270; (Peterborough dam) 4918; Welland (lock walls) 4306; (Montrose bridge) 4801; (obstructions) 4798; (Port Colborne entrance, &c.) 4019, 4306, 4798; (Port Dalhousie) 4306 (ii).

Civil Government: Railways and Canals (Dixon, F. A., promotion) 4782; (salaries) 3779 (ii).

Railways: Generally (Ry. Commission) 4305; (remarks) 2866; I. C. R. (general statement) 3411; (additional sidings) 3811, 4792; (air brakes) 3812; (bridges, strengthening) 3809, 4792; (Canso ferry service) 4294; (car couplers) 4794; (Clergue's contract) 3781; (Drummond Co., rental, &c.) 3515;

Blair, Hon. A. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways and Canals—Con.

(Eel River station) 4796; (engine house, Chaudière Junction) 4786; (expenditure, &c.) 3559; (Halifax accommodation) 4790; (Lévis accommodation) 3810; (mechanical supt.) 3813; (Miramichi bridge) 3813, 4794; (Moncton, accommodation) 4797; (Moncton, engine house) 3830; (Moncton, shops) 3828; (Mulgrave improvements) 4297; (new machinery) 3812, 4297; (Nicolet station) 4796; (North Sydney improvements) 4796; (operation, maintenance) 4310; (original construction) 3809; (Ouelle River spur line) 4796; (Pictou accommodation) 4795; (Pintsch gas equipment) 3812; (Point Tupper) 3828; (private cars) 3828; (Rivière du Loup yard) 3828; (Rockingham improvements) 4798; (rolling stock) 3813, 4297, 4783; (St. John, increased accommodation) 4786; (steel rails) 3781; (Stellarton accommodation) 4788; (Sussex engine house) 3829; (Sydney, accommodation) 3805, 4789; (Sydney, branch) 3996; (Sydney, bridge) 4795; (tools, machinery, &c.) 4297; Miscellaneous (salaries, engineers, &c.) 4292; P.E.I. (bridges) 3828; (Charlottetown accommodation) 4918; (Murray Harbour branch) 3862, 4000, 4282, 4292, 4921; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4861, 4871 (ii).

Tay Canal, Collections and Payments, &c. (Ans.) 2067 (i).

Temiscouata and I. C. R., Traffic Facilities in 1900-1 (Ans.) 1861 (i).

Transportation Distances, &c., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 136 (i).

Webb and Sunday Travelling over P. E. I. Ry. (Ans.) 4700 (ii).

Welland Canal, Depth, Quantity, &c. of Water, leased or available, &c. (Ans.) 1683 (i).

——— Water Privileges, and Riordon Paper Co., Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 745 (i).

——— Water Supply, O. C. granting Power to St. Catharines, &c. (Ans.) 883, 1860 (i).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Ry. Management (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

Yukon (British) Ry., Tolls and Charges, &c. (Ans.) 3638 (ii).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) on Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii).

Borden, Hon. F. W. (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*

Cadets, R. M. C., Application *re* Coronation Contingent (Ans.) 3638 (ii).

Circular issued by P. Landry, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2458 (i).

Coronation Contigent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2461 (i).

——— Representation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3837 (ii).

Courts Martial in Militia Force, Number, Offences, &c. (Ans.) 740 (i).

Fenian Raid Medals, Issue, &c. (Ans.) 1109 (i).

Borden, Hon. F. W.—*Con.*

G. O. C., Increase of Salary, &c. (Ans.) 614 (i).

Hutton-Hughes, Ret. ordered by Hse. (Ans.) 446.

Larose, Jos., Indemnity, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 624 (i).

London Drill Shed, Allotment of Armouries, &c. (Ans.) 1446 (i).

Militia and Defence, Report (presented) 1322 (i).

Militia Officers, Training, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2708 (ii).

Montreal Rifle Ranges, Amount expended, Tenderers, &c. (Ans.) 2223 (i).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2488 (ii).

Pensions granted in British Army *re* wounded (Ans.) 2679 (ii).

Permanent Corps, Total Cost (Ans.) 409 (i).

——— Total Strength (Ans.) 740 (i).

Peters Target at London Camp, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 446 (i).

Rifle Associations' Regulations, Pamphlet, French Translations (Ans.) 2223 (i).

Rifle Practice for Young Canadians, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3157 (ii).

Royal Military College, Rep. of Commissioners (Ans.) 443 (i).

——— *See* 'Cadets.'

S. A. War, Canadian Casualties, Telegram read, 2191 (i).

——— Contingents, Land Grants to, &c. (Ans.) 1446 (i).

——— Horses purchased in N. W. T. for Fourth Contingent (Ans.) 2679 (ii).

——— Pensions to Canadians (Ans.) 2459 (i).

——— Small-pox Outbreak among Troops, &c. (Ans.) 1447 (i).

——— Socks for Third Contingent (Ans.) 3638.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4110 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2533; (armouries, &c.) 4259; (contingencies) 2562; (Coronation contingent) 4262; (Dom. arsenals) 2565, 4261; (Esquimalt defences) 2565, 4261; (grants to associations) 2561; (Halifax garrison) 4947; (Larose, Jos., indemnity) 4947; (Major Hurdman, allowance) 4262; (medals, &c.) 4262 (ii); (pay and allowance) 1134 (i) 2512 (ii); (permanent force) 1141; (promotions) 1134 (i); (properties) 2550, 4260; (rifle ranges) 2566; (Royal Military College) 2562; (R. M. C., electric lighting) 4261; (salaries, &c.) 2548; (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2560; (Valleyfield riots) 4260 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Generally (armouries) 862; (Baddeck armoury) 862; (Dundas armoury) 863; N.B. (Sussex armoury) 867 (i).

VanWagner, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re* Removal (Ans.) 616 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Halifax.*

Address, on The, 23 (i).

Alexander Gibson Ry. and Mfg. Co.'s B., on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to ref. Pet. to Com., 2846 (ii).

Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 795 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 776 (i).
Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. B. 105 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2455 (i).
Bills, Govt., wthdn. (remarks) 4971 (ii).
——— *See* 'Private.'
Budget, The, 1310, 1323 (amt.) 1322, 1342 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1920 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) *re* Letter of Sir Louis Davies, 762 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 148 (i).
Business of the Hse., Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 3920 (ii).
Cabinet Changes (remarks) 414 (i).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 3513 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2622, 2666 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2940; in Com., 3934 (ii).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2196 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3984 (ii).
Census Figures quoted by Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 1764 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4575; on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693; in Com., 4694 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 3933 (ii).
Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3776 (ii).
Clergue's Contract *re* Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 781 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4609 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2464; on Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2469 (i).
Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2671 (ii).
Customs Tariff (1897) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3°, 4977 (ii).
Dom. Lands Act (homestead sales) Amt. B. 120 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3770 (ii).
Dom. Securities Company, Par. in N. Y. newspaper (remarks) 4428 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2851; in Com., 3511.
Financial Situation, Review, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4810; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 84) 4859 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act (sale) Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4129 (ii).
Galops Rapids, Improvements, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5022 (ii).
Game Preservation Act Amt. B. 117 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com 3769 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4412 (ii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take Precedence on Wednesdays, 2720 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business,' 'Private,' &c.
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3715 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church, Incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2717, 3125; in Com., 4680 (ii).
Halifax Industrial School B. 151 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 4036; in Com., 4701 (ii).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2861, 2865 (ii).
Hamilton and Guelph Mail Service, Inquiry for Ret., 4465 (ii).
Hawbold's Cove, Beaver Cove, Cost of Breakwater (Ques.) 132 (i).
Hurley, Mr. J. M., Charges *re* W. Hastings Election, 4970 (ii).
Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3758; on M. for 3°, 3931; on Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Beland*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).
Industrial Properties Preservation Treaty, &c., Par. in Newspapers *re* (remarks) 2146 (i).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4704 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4426-7 (ii).
I.C.R., Barbour, John, Dismissal, Charges against (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
——— Mulgrave and Point Tupper Ferry Service, &c. (Ques.) 1683 (i).
——— Tantramar Marsh Washout, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1108 (i).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4803, 5059 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3942 (ii).
Kaulbach, Postmaster at Musquodoboit, Dismissal, &c., Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4927 (ii).
Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4128 (ii).
Magazines and Newspapers imported from G. B. and U. S., Value, &c. (Ques.) 2679 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4504; on M. for 3°, 4578 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1130 (i); in Com., 4439; on M. for 3°, 4446 (ii).
Miller Creek Concessions, &c., Tel. (read) 4426-7.
——— (remarks) 4465 (ii).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation (remarks) on M. to adjn., 155 (i).
Naturalization Act Amt. B. 154 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4484 (ii).
North Bay Pier N.S., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 144

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3979 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Act (asst. commissioner) Amt. B. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 3511 (ii).

——— Police Pensions B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 809 (i); in Com., 2487 (ii).

North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3133 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4604 (ii).

Oyster Beds in Shediac Bay, Licenses issued, Names, Dates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2473 (i).

——— (Ques.) 746, 1444 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 72 (Mr. *Morrison*) in Com., 2669 (ii).

Penalties Remission B. 151 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4579 (ii).

Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3936 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2495 (ii).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Cost of Shed, Amount collected, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2482; in Com., 4072 (ii).

Precedence in Canada for Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 438 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2746 (ii).

Private Bills and Govt. Business (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4567 (ii).

——— Suspension of Rules (remarks) 4464 (ii).

——— *See* 'Govt. Business,' &c.

Prorogation, Remarks, on M. to adjn., 4968 (ii).

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1092 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3920 (ii).

——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 439 (i).

——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1410 (i).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payments (remarks) 3779 (ii).

Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2444 (i).

——— (remarks) on M. to wthdrw., 4971 (ii).

——— (Expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4580, 4602 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3728 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3228 (ii).

Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4998 (ii).

Returns, Inquiry for, 3862 (ii).

Ross Rifle Co 's incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2672 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

——— Manufacture, &c., Remarks in Com. of Ways and Means, 4975 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

S. A. War, Can. Contingent, &c., Par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 1762 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 85 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 4569 (ii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1675 (i).

SS. Companies' Subsidies, Inquiry for Ret., 4466.

Stock Breeders (Mar.) Association incorp. B. 159 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4612 (ii).

Supply, Res. *re* Civil Govt. (remarks) 5071 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 4077; (cold storage) 371 (i); (experimental farms) 4966; (fruit inspection) 2600; (general statistics) 2835; (Pan-American exposition) 4967; (*Year Book*) 2817 (ii).

Canals: Galops (entrance) 4024; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4024; Trent (construction) 5052; (Corry & Laverdure's claim) 4014 (ii).

Civil Government: Agriculture (Chittick, F.C., promotion) 4965; Interior (salaries) 3062; Marine and Fisheries (Tyrwhitt, Mr., salary) 4958; Public Works (contingencies) 4137; (Desrochers, Mr., salary) 4535; Rys. and Canals (F. A. Dixon, promotion) 4534, 4782; (salaries) 3779; Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 4534 (ii); (printing, &c.) 533; (salaries) 531 (i).

Customs (salaries, &c.) 2924, 2929 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1167 (i); (rents, fuel, &c.) 4961 (ii).

Fisheries (bounty cheques) 553; (Can. exhibit) 553; (cold storage, deep sea) 559 (i); (hatcheries, P.E.I.) 4961 (ii); (inspectors, salaries, &c.) 533, 545 (i), 4228; (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4236 (ii); (oyster culture) 555; (protection service) 552 (i).

Geological Survey (map engraving) 4948 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 2989; (contingencies) 3029 (ii).

Indians (half-breed commission) 4954; (legal expenses *re* liquor traffic) 3062 (ii).

Interior: Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 4954; N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3086, 3112, 4948 (ii).

Justice: Generally (consolidation of statutes) 3622; (litigated expenses) 3620; Penitentiaries—B.C. (new wing) 3619; Dorchester (keepers' salaries) 3618; (general vote) 3593; (Prince Albert jail) 3620; Supreme Court (O'Regan, Jas., salary) 4965; Yukon (clerk of court) 3588; (judge's living allowance) 3584; (judge's salary) 3584; (law books) 3590; (legal advisers, &c.) 3590; (maintenance of prisoners) 2589; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3587; (transport of prisoners) 3589 (ii).

Legislation: Library of Parlt. (statutes of Canada) 4966 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4225; (St. Lawrence navigation) 5030 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Victoria, B.C. and Skagway) 4964 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2548; (contingencies) 2562; (Dom. arsenal) 2565; (Esquimalt defences) 2565; (Halifax Garrison, Sievert, Pte.) 4947; (pay and allowance) 2532; (rifle ranges) conc., 5032; (Royal Military College) 2563; conc., 5033 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous (St. Vincent, &c., relief *re* volcanic eruption) 5031 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (furnishing crew, strs. built in Scotland) 4958; (Str. *Newfield*) 4958.

Post Office (branch office, Halifax) 3882; (charges against postmasters) 4929; (Marconi system) 3908; (parcel service) 3911; (salary increases) 4941; (petitions of right *re* contracts) 3917, 4931 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—B.C. (New Westminster) 4185; (Vancouver drill hall) 4186; (Williams Head station) 4614 (ii); (caretakers, &c.) 987 (i); Generally, 4186; (heating, &c.) 4189; (immigrant, repairs, &c.) 4616 (ii); (policy of Govt) 661 (i); (rents) 4615; (repairs, &c.) 4181; Man. (Winnipeg, furnace, &c.) 4616; (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 4613 (ii); Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 642; N.B.; (St. John, custom-house) 641 (i); (St. John, immigrant shed) 642 (i), 4178 (ii); N.S. (Arichat, repairs, &c.) 635; (Iona wharf) 1002 (i); N.W.T. (Red Deer court-house) 4613; (Saskatoon immigrant shed) 4614; Ont. (Alexandria reformatory) 4184 (ii); (Fort William) 728 (i); (Hamilton warehouse) 4566 (ii); (London drill hall) 729; Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 560 (i); (eastern block, repairs to wall) 4565; (elevator attendants) 4615; (heating, &c.) 4138; (Major's Hill park) 4180; (rentals, &c.) 4139; (Rideau Hall, drain) 4566; (Rideau Hall, improvements) 4189 (ii); (royal mint) 560; (Victoria memorial museum) 564 (i); (Toronto, branch P.O.) 4565; (Toronto, P.O. locomobiles) 4187; (Toronto Junction P.O.) 4566; Que. (cartridge factory) 4180; (Drummondville) 4180 (ii); (Grosse Isle station) 645; (L'Assomption) 657; (Lévis cattle quarantine) 667 (i); (Peribonka) 4179; (Valleyfield) 4564; Yukon (Collinet, Mrs., dismissal, &c.) 4196, 4537; 4144, 4190, 4542 (ii), 968 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, crib work) 4627; N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4616 (ii); (Arnold's breakwater) 989 (i); (Bear river obstructions) 4621 (ii); (Black Point canal) 990; (Boularderie wharf) 997; (Burlington wharf) 999 (i); (Cape Cove breakwater) 4621; (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Clark's harbour) 990; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001 (i); (Cribbon's Point wharf) 4621 (ii); (Drumhead breakwater) 1001; (Friar's Head harbour) 1002 (i); (Glace Bay) 4622; (Grand River channel) 4622 (ii); (Gunning Cove) 991; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1002; (Lower Cove breakwater) 1004; (Minudie wharf) 1004; (Parker's Cove pier) 1006 (i); (Porter's lake outlet) 4622 (ii); (Port Latour, breakwater) 990 (i), 4624 (ii); (Port Mouton breakwater) 990 (i); (Round Bay beach) 4624; (Windsor dams) 4624 (ii); Ont. (Port Arthur) 599; P.E.I. (creosoted timbers, &c.) 1015 (i); Que. (Batiscan dredging) 4629; (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; (Cross Point) 4630; (Magdalen Island breakwater) 4631; (Maria wharf) 4630 (ii); (Montreal harbour) 608 (i); (Point St. Pierre breakwater) 4621; (Rivière aux Renards pier) 4632; (St. Francois wharf) 4632; (St. Irenée wharf) 4634; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 4634; (St. Laurent wharf) 4634 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 594 (i); Miscellaneous (engineers, &c., salaries) 4219; (surveys and inspections) 4780; Roads and Bridges—Yukon (wagon roads) 4147; Slides and Booms (repairs) 4142; (St. Maurice district) 4218; Telegraph Lines (Anticosti to Bryon) 4769; (B. C., Quesnel Forks) 4779;

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con. (cable service) 4144, 4773; (Govt. system) 4771; (Mabou to Hawkesbury) 4770; (Quesnelle to Atlin) 4150; (St. Peter's to Sydney) 4770; (Str. *Tyrian*) 4219; Yukon (pole contract) 4156, 4162; (supplies) 4157 (ii).

Quarantine (Porter, A. E., claim) conc., 5033; (public health, salaries, &c.) conc., 5033; (slaughter compensation) 4968; (small-pox) 4967; (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2909 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (additional sidings) 4793; (Canso ferry service) 4295; (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3538, 3547; (Halifax accommodation) 4791; (Mulgrave improvements) 4297; (Ouelle River spur line) 4796; (procedure, &c.) conc., 5035; (Sydney bridge) 4795; P.E.I. (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5040; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4861, 4889 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection binder twine) 4963; (metric system) 4961 (ii).

Yukon (Treadgold concessions) 4949 (ii).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 735 (i).

Treadgold Concessions, O.C's, Plans, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2472 (i).

——— *See* 'Yukon.'

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 953 (i).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).

Yukon—Irregularities and Interview with Judge Craig (remarks) 973 (i).

——— Council Amt. B. 119 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3126; in Com., 3832, 4485, 4530 (ii).

——— Police Magistrates Amt. B. 113 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3776 (ii).

——— Representation Act Amt. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3774, 4466; on Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2069 (i).

——— Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4977 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 2456 (i).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*

Address, on The (amt.) Ry. Policy 65, 68; wthdn., 119 (i).

Alaska Boundary, Declaration of Sir Louis Davies (remarks) 785 (i).

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of Acts, &c. (M. for cor.) 137 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1837, 1862 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo by G. B. (M. for cor.) 138 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 3980 (ii).

——— notice of amt., 3858 (ii).

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary (M. for cor.) 143 (i).

———Letter from Sir Louis Davies (personal explanation) 811 (i).

——— *See* 'Alaska.'

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army, Cor., &c. (M. for copies, &c.) 419 (i).

Coronation of His Majesty, Appnmt. of Can. Delegates (M. for cor.*) 153 (i).

Income Tax, G. B. and Can. Agents (Ques.) 5054.

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4441 (ii).

S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3327 (ii).

——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3848 (ii).

——— Cor. between His Excellency, Can. Govt. and G. B. *re* Recruiting Troops, &c. (Ques.) (M. for cor.) 137 (i).

SUPPLY:

Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2999, 3016.

Public Works: Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3288 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N., *Macdonald.*

C.P.R. Lands, Taxation Test Case (remarks) 5072 (ii).

Canned Beef for S. Africa, Quantity, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 746 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 3933 (ii).

Coal Oil Inspection, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to adjn., 5078 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Duty, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1206 (i).

Lisgar, Man., Revising Officer, Date of Appnmt., (Ques.) 3152 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. for 1°, 4245; in Com., 4486 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3623 (ii).

Man. School Lands Fund, Reduction of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 2941 (ii).

——— Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3035 (ii).

Maple Creek P.O., Change of Location, &c. (Ques.) 2853 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Parmelee*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3231 (ii).

S. A. War, Canadian Beef Exclusion from Imp. Contracts (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3840; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857 (ii).

——— (remarks) 3410 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3379; (census, Lisgar, &c.) 4113 (ii).

Customs (coal oil, Port Arthur) 2931 (i); (coal oil inspection) 3300 (ii).

Dom. Lands (Man. school lands) 4252; (salaries, &c.) 4117 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1148 (i); (grain standards) 4258 (ii); (inspectors' salaries) 1148, 1155 (i).

Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3084, 3114 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries–Kingston (binder twine) 3599, 3606 (ii).

Boyd, Mr. N.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Dredging (Lake Manitoba) 3286; Harbours and Rivers (western transportation) 4554; Telegraphs—Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150; (operators pay) 4154, 4172; (pole contract) 4156 (ii).

Railways: I.C.R. (Halifax accomodation) 4790 (ii).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1198 (i).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren*) to Com. of Sup., 4392 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 908, 960 (i).

Brock, Mr. W. R., *Toronto Centre.*

Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 775 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1559 (i).

C.P.R. Lands, Taxation, Test Case (remarks) 5073 (ii).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Gov., Cor., &c., on M. for Com., of Sup., 4731 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2477 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2779 (ii).

Samples sent by 'Sample Post,' Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 617 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2833; (*Year Book*) 2815 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 183 (i).

Miscellaneous (conference of Colonial Ministers) 4334 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 509 (i).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigrant, furniture, &c.) 974; (quarantine stations) 983; Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 692; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 714 (i); Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3288 (ii).

Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4924 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 942 (i).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2184, 2201 (i).

Census, Amount expended on Livery Hire (Ques.) 2069 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2467 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3256 (ii).

Mineral, Agricultural Products imported from U.S. for Home Consumption, Value, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).

Mulloy, Trooper, Pension to (remarks) 3315 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 3315 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3201 (ii).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3391 (ii).
U.S. Imports for Home Consumption, 1901, Total Value, &c. (Ques.) 782 (i).
Brunet, Mr. Jos., *Montreal, St. James.*
Ry. Act. (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 463 (i).
Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 39) 1°*, 961 (i).
Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 20) 1°*, 611 (i).
Huron and Erie Canal Co. incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1902 (i).
Knapp Tubular Steamship Co.'s incorp. (B. 75) 1°*, 1673 (i).
Niagara St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 50) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Prorogation (remarks) 5082 (ii).
Securities Bank of Can. incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 4464.
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) on Sen. Amts.. 2675 (ii).
Calvin, Mr. H. A., *Frontenac.*
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 524.
Campbell, Mr. A., *West York.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 7 (i).
Australia, Can. and New Zealand, Cor. *re* Trade Transportation (M. for copies*) 154 (i).
Canadian Manufacturers' Association (B. 47) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Chartered Accountants, , Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693 (ii).
Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) 2298 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4500 (ii).
Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3657.
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1985 (i).
—— (B. 101) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 961 (i).
Patent Relief (B. 49) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Sovereign Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 29) 1°*, 781 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2831.
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1169 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 711 (i).
Railways: I. C. R. (general vote) 3496 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 100) 1°*, 2146 (i); in Com., 3625 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act Amt. (B. 150) 1°*, 4035 (ii).
Westren, John, Paten Relief (B. 49) 1°*, 1204 (i).

Carroll, Hon. H. G., (Solicitor General) *Kamouraska.*
Binder Twine, Circulars issued for Prices, &c (Ans.) 885 (i).
Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council, on M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor., 3673 (ii).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1100 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Vet. Surgeon, &c. (Ans.) 3831 (ii).

Carscallen, Mr. A. W., *North Hastings.*
Ricketts, T., Postmaster at Gilmour, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2224 (i).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir Richard, G.C.M.G. (Minister of Trade and Commerce) *South Oxford.*
Anglo-German Treaty, Date, &c. (Ans.) 617 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 801 (i).
Boards of Trade Act Amt. (B. 132) 1°*, 3304; in Com., 4136 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1342 (i).
—— Personal Explanation *re* Figures quoted 1763 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Speaker*) 1920 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., &c., 768 (i).
Business of the House (M.) to postpone Notice of Motions, 3158 (ii).
Butter and Cheese Weighing Commission, Rep., &c. (Ans.) 1684 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 156) prop. Res., 3623; in Com. on Res., 3933; 1°*, 4127.
Commodities, Packing and Sales (B. 141) 1° m., 3622; in Com., 4246, 4354 (ii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 1569 (i).
German Tariff applicable to Nations, &c. (Ans.) 617 (i).
—— *See* "Anglo."
Grain Inspection in Man., Changes *re* Standard (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Grain Inspection at Montreal, Certificates, &c. (Ans.) 450 (i).
Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. (B. 142) 1° m., 3623 (ii).
Jamaica Tax on Commercial Travellers from Can. (Ans.) 622 (i).
Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5061 (ii).
Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4358 (ii).
Magdalen Islands, Trips, Tonnage, &c. of Str. *Amelia* (Ans.) 1680 (i).
Mail Steamers between Can. and G. B., Rate of Speed (Ans.) 130 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 4245; 2° m., 4354; in Com. (amt.) 4355, 4487; 3° m., 4578.
—— *See* "Grain."
Paspebiac and Gaspé as Ocean Ports, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5014 (ii).

Cartwright, Hon. Sir R.—*Con.*
Personal Explanation *re* Census Returns used in Budget Speech, 1763 (i).
S. S. Subsidies, Contracts, Ret. laid on Table, 4466 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Year Book*) 339.
Civil Govt.: Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 532; (salaries) 530 (i).
Public Works: Buildings (policy of govt.) 661; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1220 (i).
Trade and Commerce (grain inspectors) 532 (i).
Trade and Commerce Rep. (presented) 122 (i).

Casgrain, Mr. T. Chase, *Montmorency.*
Bouillon, Dr. Alfred, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2854.
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4569; on M. for Com. (amt.) 4647 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4680 (ii).
I. C. R., Fire Insurance on Locomotives, &c. (Ques.) 2854 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 319 (i).
Isle of Orleans Mail Service (Ques.) 246 (i).
Joliette Postmasters, Dismissal, &c., Charges against (Ques.) 2856 (ii).
——— Dismissal of J. J. Sheppard (Ques.) 2068.
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3940 (ii).
Maranda, Alfred, Emplymt. of (Ques.) 246 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4520 (ii).
Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3937 (ii).
Ste. Anne River Works, Timber used, Price, &c. (Ques.) 2858 (ii).
Sheppard, J. J., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).
Strong, Chief Justice Sir Henry, Amount paid *re* Judicial Committee (Ques.) 1986 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice: Supreme Court (*ad hoc* judges) 4264 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (*Patent Record*) 331 (i).
Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 187 (i).
Railways and Canals: Canals—Trent (construction) conc., 5048; Railways—Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4863, 4913 (ii).

Champagne, Mr. L. N., *Wright.*
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. (presented) 1489; conc., 1673 (i).
——— Translators, 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4121, 4241 (ii).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 125) 1°*, 3509 (ii).

Charlton, Mr. John, *North Norfolk.*
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. (B. 34) 1°*, 882 (i).
Amnesty to Boers: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts (prop. Res.) 773; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 96) 777 (i).

Charlton, Mr. John—*Con.*
Bills on Order Paper, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 2481 (i).
British Supremacy: *See* 'S. A. War.'
Brown, Jas., Relief (B. 118) on M. for 3°, 4121 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1523 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. for Com. of Sup., 828 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 769 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 7 (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com., 1279 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4607; (amt.) on M. for 3°, 4612 (ii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com. (presented) 1204 (i).
Divorce Court (remarks) 4121, 4692 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*), in Com., 4672 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuations, Remarks, &c. on M. for Com. of Sup., 1207 (i).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4735 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4500 (ii).
Nickel Exportation, on M. for Com of Sup. (remarks) 3030 (ii).
North Pole, Capt. Bernier's Expedition, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3951 (ii).
Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4604 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade (prop. Res.) 248 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co's. B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3207 (ii).
Sabbath Observance *re* Militia Parades (remarks) 4646 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy, and Terms of Peace (prop. Res.) 3239; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3316 (ii).

Christie, Mr. T., *Argenteuil.*
Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 882 (i).

Clancy, Mr. J., *Bothwell.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2339.
Dom. Elections Act (1900) Amt. (B. 27) 1°*, 734; 2° m., 1132 (i).
Indian Treaty, No. 3, Amount claimed by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 1681 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (advances to dairies) 2657 (ii); (aids to societies) 343; (archives) 321; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (cheese stations) 2634 (ii); (classifying patents) 349; (cold storage, &c.) 368 (i), 2571, 2592 (ii); (criminal statistics) 335; (experimental farms) 344 (i), 2877; (fruit inspection) 2592, 2625 (ii); (fumigating stations) 353; Glasgow and Pan American expositions) 357; (general statistics) 339 (i), 2827 (ii); (Imperial institute, Can. Exhibit) 364; (*Patent Record*) 334 (i); (poultry shipments) 2643 (ii); (*Year Book*) 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

Clancy, Mr. J.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Customs (appraisers) 2927; (Dresden port) 2925; (salaries, &c.,) 2921 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1173; (distillery duties) 1184; (Gow, Mr., superannuation, &c..) 1155; (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1154; (Windsor, inspector) 1154 (i).

Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.,) 550 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 636; N.W.T. (contract or day labour) 839; Ont. (Bothwell, Dresden, &c.) 658; Que. (L'Assomption) 658; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1219; (Goderich harbour) 1234; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1254; (Sarnia, dredging) 1224; (Sydenham, dredging) 1226 (i).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2920 (ii); (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 372; (Public Works Health Act) 403; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 403.

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1184; (inspectors' salaries, &c.) 1184.

Clare, Mr. Geo. A., *South Waterloo.*

Census Commissioner, South Waterloo, Name and Amount paid to (Ques.) 1861 (i).

——— Enumerators, S. Waterloo, Names, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 1066 (i).

Free List, Articles placed on since 1897 (Ques.) 244 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3373 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3615 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2543; (properties) 2553.

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *West Toronto.*

Abraham, Plains of, Rights reserved for Militia, &c. (Ques.) 3409 (ii).

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 95 (i).

Brown, James, Relief (B. 118) 1°*, 3509; 3° m., 4121 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1604, 1624 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's. B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2612 (i).

C.P.R. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3934 (ii).

Census, Dom., Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 129, 612.

——— Mr. Coté's Circular, Replies received (Ques.) 133 (i).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for Com., 4693; in Com., 4694 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. on Res., 3933 (ii).

Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 3237 (ii).

Collegiate Institute, Cadet Corps (Ques.) 240.

Coronation Day, Public Holiday, &c. (Ques.) 747 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc. 4243 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 126 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4130 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co's. B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4419 (ii).

Immigration during 1892 (Ques.) 244 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

Immigrants, Italian, Destitute, &c., Par in *Herald*, 3744 (ii).

——— Article (read) 3756 (ii).

——— Italian Immigration, &c. (remarks) on B. 112, 3927 (ii).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112. (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3742; on M. for 3°, 3927.

I.C.R., Locomotives and Ry. Cars, purchased from 1896 to 1902 (M. for ret.) 2681 (ii).

——— *See* 'Locomotives.'

Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3939, 3944 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., Par. in *Montreal Gazette*, 4702 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4129.

Locomotives, bought, rented, &c., by Govt. Rys. (Ques.) 1108 (i).

Mail Steamers between Can. and G.B., Rate of Speed, &c. (Ques.) 130 (i).

Montgomery, General, Permission to erect Monument, &c. (Ques.) 129 (i).

——— M. for Cor., 2681 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3961 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (*Sir Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. 2488 (ii).

Passes issued on Govt. Rys., List of Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 810 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4403 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2497 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2482; in Com., 4038, 4058 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3173 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies paid since 1901, (Ques.) 448 (i).

Representation in House of Commons by Provs. *re* Census, &c. (Ques.) 2677 (ii).

Return, Passes, I.C.R., Inquiry for, 4403 (ii).

Soulanges Canal Water Powers, Applications, &c. Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 631 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (remarks) 534 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (bulletins, printing, &c.), 345, 347 (i); (census irregularities, 1891) 4080. 4430 (ii); (Imperial Institute, Can. exhibit) 366; (Pan-American exposition) 360 (i).

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4277 (ii).

Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (engraving contract, &c.) 4317 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Post Office (Knauf, H., promotion) 4313 (ii); Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 532 (i).

Fisheries (Steamboat Inspection Act Amt.) 534 (i).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 4329 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses, &c.) 521 (i).

Militia (annual drill) 2544; (properties) 2555; (salaries, &c.) 2549 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. E. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service (masters and mates, examination) 513 (i).

Post Office (drop letter rates) 3915; (letter carriers) 3867; (mail service) 4314; (Matheson, Mr., superannuation) 3909; (postage rates) 3915; (superannuations) 3910 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, repairs, &c.) 975; Man. (renewals, &c.) 834; (Winnipeg immigration shed) 834; N.B. (Marysville P.O.) 636; (Richibucto) 641; (St. John's immigrant shed) 641; N.W.T. (Carnduff court house) 836; (contract or day labour) 836; N.S. (Halifax customs house) 635; Ont. (Clinton) 721; (Cobourg armoury) 722; Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 563 (i); (leases, &c.) 4140 (ii); (rentals, &c.) 966; (telephones) 989; (Victoria memorial museum) 564; (Toronto, drill shed) 868 (i); (Toronto P.O., branch office) 4182; (Toronto P.O., locomobiles) 4186 (ii); Que. (Grosse Isle station) 645, 650 (i); (Lévis cattle quarantine) 667; (Montreal examining warehouse) 671; (Quebec military building) 710 (i); (Roberval building) 4180 (ii); (Valleyfield) 719 (i); Yukon (judges' residences, &c.) 4147 (ii); (rents, maintenance, &c.) 969; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (foremen, &c.) 1006; Ont. (Port Arthur) 599; (St. Mary's river) 600; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 570, 579; P.E.I. (tax legislation) 1012 (i); Roads and Bridges, Yukon (wagon roads) 4148; Telegraphs (cable service, &c.) 4143; Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4151; (pole contract) 4156; (rates, &c.) 4175; (supplies) 4158 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 379, 384 (i).

Railways: P.E.I. (Murray branch) 3863 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (grain inspectors) 532 (i).

Telephone Companies B. 2 (Mr. *Maclean)* on M. for 2°, 789 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* on M. for 1°, 736 (i).

Toronto Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of Mechanical Engineer (Ques.) 884 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp, B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell)* in Com., 3623; (amt.) 3624, 3636; Neg. (Y. 18, N. 74) 3636 (ii).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren)* to Com. of Sup., 4395 (ii).

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia (Ques.) 242.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas)* for Cor., 905, 940 (i).

Yukon (British) Ry., Tolls and Charges, &c. (Ques.) 3638 (ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis)* in Com., 2613 (ii).

Coal Oil Inspection, on M. (Mr. *Oliver)* to adjn., 5080 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher)* in Com., 4134 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* in Com., 3942 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Léonard)* for Ret, 492 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* in Com., 2497 (ii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock)* in Com., 4043 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3377; (cheese stations) 2647; (fruit inspection) 2586-7 (ii); (general statistics) 342 (i); (poultry shipments) 2642 (ii).

Canals: Lachine (waste weir) 4307; Trent (construction) conc., 5049; Welland (Port Colborne) 4307 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Public Works (salaries) 178 (i).

Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3605 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (printing, &c.) 4327 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 981; Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 721; Ottawa (royal mint) 563; Que. (Grosse Isle station) 646; Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 972; Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence ship channel) 592 (i); Telegraphs—Yukon (Rochester's contract) 4155 (ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*

Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s (B. 12) 1°*, 529 (i).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver)* in Com., 4673 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick)* in Com., 2497 (ii).

Procedure *re* Bills (remarks) 611 (i).

Railway Lines in N.B., Tracings, &c. (M. for plans*) 961 (i).

Cowan, Mr. M. K., *South Essex.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B 130) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Boundary Line through Detroit River (Ques.) 242 (i).

Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 13) 1°*, 530 (i).

Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 58) 1°*, 1438 (i).

Dom. Ry. and Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 97) 1°*, 2146 (i).

Drainage across Railway Property (B. 4) 1°* 121, 2° m., 626 (i).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 1323 (i).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy)* in Com., 4522 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 86) M. to ref. back to Com., 3202; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 3234 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4081 (ii).

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4275 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 687 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell)* in Com., 3629 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 632 (i).

Davis, Mr. T. O., *Saskatchewan.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1759, 1766 (i).
Canadian Northern Express Co. incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1985 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1278 (i).
Canadian Northern Tel. Co. incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1985 (i).
Canals, Dom., Expenditure, Revenue, since Confederation (Ques.) 784 (i).
Census, Classifying Half-breeds as Indians (remarks) 1902 (i).
Govt. Business, Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 3925.
Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2718 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1214 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4506 (ii).
Man. and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. 16 (Mr. *Douglas*) in Com., 2667 (ii).
Metis, Description of in Census Bulletin (remarks) 1675 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2054 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police Pensions B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 808 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 883 (i).
Railway Act (commission) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2452 (i).
SUPPLY:
Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3603, 3606 (ii).
Transportation on St. Lawrence, Amount spent (M. for ret.) 3674 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 900 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2126 (i).
Chambly Canal, Wharf, &c., Maintenance by G. T.R., &c. (Ques.) 2068 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4577 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4610 (ii).
Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council, on M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor., 3672 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1126 (i); in Com., 4441; (amt. 6 m.h.) 4450; neg. (Y. 16; N. 76) 4463 (ii).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1106 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 455, 479 (i); in Com., 3170 (ii).
——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., (Roy vs. C.P.R.) 4585 (ii).
Railway Fires Indemnification (B. 56) 1°*, 1323.
Ste. Thérèse Island Dam, Pets. against (M. for copies*) 3724 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3363 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 41) 1° m., 1063 (i).

Douglas, Mr. J. M., *East Assiniboia.*
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4503 (ii).
Man. Grain Inspection, Changes in Standard (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
Man. and North-western Ry. Co.'s (B. 16) 1°*, 530 (i).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1569 (i).
SUPPLY:
Interior: N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3074, 3085 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and N.W.T., (M. for cor., &c.) 888 (i).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *Algoma.*
Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 23) 1°*, 632 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Blind River wharf) 1223; (Midland harbour) 1239 (i).

Earle, Mr. T., *Victoria, B.C.*
B. C. Fisheries, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3308 (ii).
Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
Seine Licenses issued in B. C., Number, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2680 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) B.C., 4434 (ii).
Fisheries (hatchery, B.C.) 4225 (ii).
Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 3058 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (B.C. coast navigation) 5024; (hydrographic survey) 5028 (ii).
Miscellaneous (assay office, Vancouver) 4117; (Banff park) 4118 (ii).
Post Office (Dawson and Victoria mails) 4314.
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (engineers' salaries) 4186; Dredging—B. C. (Victoria harbour) 3286; Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (Anderson Lake outlets) 4642; (Hardy Bay wharf) 4643; Ont. (Pelee Island wharf) 4217; Miscellaneous (National Art Gallery) 3292; (surveys, &c.) 4781; Roads and Bridges—Yukon (wagon roads, &c.) 4149; Telegraphs—B. C. (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293, 4151, 4782; (Port Simpson-Hazleton) 4779; (Quesnel Forks) 4779; (Skeena, &c.) 3292; Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4151; (Bennett to Dawson) 4153; (Kelly, Douglas & Co.'s tenders) 4157; (Yukon lines, revenue) 4771; (supplies) 4157 (ii).
Railways: I. C. R. (Halifax accommodation) 4790 (ii).

Edwards, Mr. W. C., *Russell.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1545 (i).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1673 (i).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c., (remarks) 2864 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3965 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 272 (i).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 912, 920 (i).

Emmerson, Mr. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Bathurst, P. O., Charges against Henry Bishop (Ques.) 4700 (ii).
Canada Temperance Act, Res. from Mar. Baptists, &c. (Ques.) 1109 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3707 (ii).
I. C. R., Shims purchased in 1901, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 1438 (i).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. (B. 37) 1°*, 961 ; in Com., 1675 (i).
SUPPLY :
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1177 (i).
Fisheries (hatcheries) 552 ; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 538 (i).
Railways : I. C. R. (expenditure, &c.) 3517 ; (general vote) 3474 ; (mechanical supt.) 3816 ; (rolling stock) 3816 (ii).

Erb, Mr. D. K., *South Perth.*
Canadian Railways, Casualties, &c., Employes, Cattle, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2472 (i).
I. C. R., Accidents through Cattle on Tracks (Ques.) 883 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 472 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2871 ; (general statistics) 2837 (ii).

Farquharson, Mr. D., *West Queen's, P.E.I.*
Fishery Regulation (1893) Modification by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 3307 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3713 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (hatcheries, P.E.I.) 4960 (ii).
Immigration (printing, advertising, &c.) 4250.
Post Office (Charlottetown P. O.) 3870 (ii).
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Canoe Cove) 1013 ; (memorial *re* daily communication with mainland) 1020 ; (tax legislation) 1011 (i).
Railways : P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4286 ; conc., 5044 (ii).
Tidal Waters, Dom. and Provincial Rights, &c. (Ques.) 1861 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne & Queen's, N.S.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 119 (i).
Auditor General's Rep. (presented) 122 (i).
——— Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 773 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Ashcroft to Dawson, &c., Tel. Lines, Length, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1986 (i).
Budget, The, Financial Statement, 1279 (i).
——— (remarks) 962 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) *re* Letter of Sir Louis Davies, 762 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2612 (ii).
C. P. R. Lands, Taxation, Test Case (remarks) 5071 (ii).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2201 (i).
Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3983 (ii).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4571 ; in Com., 4694 (ii).
Chartered Banks, List of Shareholders (presented) 3128 (ii).
Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124, 1° m., 3236 ; in Com., 3775 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4609 (ii).
Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c., (remarks) 2298 (i).
Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *McCreary*) on M. for 2°, 2022 (i) ; in Com , 2607.
Customs Tariff (1897) Amt. (B. 169) 1° m., 4977 ; 3°m., 4977 (ii).
Devlin, Mr. C. R., Interview in Montreal *Witness* (Ans.) 622 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 635 (i).
Dom. Bank Notes, Circulation from 1892 to 1901 (Ans.) 616 (i).
——— Number of Sheets issued since 1892 (Ans.) 619 (i).
Dom. Securities Company, Par. in N. Y. newspaper (remarks) 4428 (ii).
Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 151 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4123 (ii).
Eastern Extension Ry., Refund of Amounts paid by Counties (Ans.) 781 (i).
Estimates, The (presented) 120 (i).
——— (1902) Suppl. (presented) 785 (i) ; 3918, 5030 (ii).
——— (1903) Suppl. (presented) 4353 (ii).
——— (Remarks) 4342 (ii).
Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4817, 4822.
German Duties on Can. Imports (Ans.) 156 (i).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3722 ; (M.) to adjn. Deb., 3723 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4674 (ii).
Indian Treaty No. 3, Amount claimed by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 1681 (i).
I. C. R., Truro Round-house, Rebuilding, &c. (Ans.) 4352 (ii).
——— Truro Station, Rebuilding, &c. (Ans.) 4353.

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Knapp Tubular SS. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2607 (ii).
Loan (B. 157) prop. Res., 3926; in Com. on Res., 4127; 1°*, 4129; in Com. on B., 4357 (ii).
Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy, Agreement, &c., *re* P. E. I. (Ans.) 1684 (i).
Market Gardeners, Protection *re* Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) M. to adjn. Deb., 3665 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 483, 498 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 158, 615 (i).
Nickel Exportations, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Ottawa City Improvement (B. 164) 1° m., 4344; in Com., 4604 (ii).
Paper Combine, Rep. of Commission (presented) 3128 (ii).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2749 (ii).
Private Bills and Govt. Business (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4567 (ii).
Printing of Parlt., 4th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4644 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) on M. to adjn., 4968 (ii).
Public Accounts (presented) 121 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1407 (i).
Ry. Construction, N.S., on M. for Ways and Means, 5067 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 315 (i).
Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Manufacture of, Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4974 (ii).
S. A. War, Can. Contingent, Par. in *La Patrie* (remarks) 1762 (i).
——— Canned Beef from Can. condemned by Imp. Govt. (remarks) 3410 (ii).
Supply (B. 168) Res. prop., 5071; 1° m., 5073 (ii).
——— (remarks) 127 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (archives) 323 (i); (census) 3386; (general statistics) 2844; (*Year Book*) 2821 (ii).
Charges of Management (printing Dom. Notes) 171 (i), 4533; conc., 4342 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Agriculture (clerical assistance) 207; Aud. General (clerical assistance) 204 (i) 4535 (ii); (salaries) 175; Finance (cleaning deptl. buildings) 214 (i); (contingencies) 3303 (ii); (salaries) 175; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 172; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 209; (salaries) 180; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 207; Interior Dept. (clerical assistance) 202 (i); (salaries) 3063 (ii); Labour Dept. (salaries) 183; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 204; N. W. M. Police (clerical assistance) 212; Printing and Stationery (clerical assistance) 199; (salaries) 174; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i); Public Works (Desrochers, Mr., increase, &c.) 4535 (ii); (salaries) 179 (i); Railways and Canals (Dixon, F. A., promotion) 4782, 4534 (ii); Sec. of State (clerical assistance) 199; (salaries) 173 (i); Trade and Commerce (clerical assistance) 4534 (ii); Treasury Board (clerical assistance) 204 (i).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1158 (i).
Finance (Wallace, Mr., superannuation) 3303.
Fisheries (inspectors, overseers, &c.) 533 (i).
Insurance (expenses) 4117 (ii).
Justice (Leeds & Grenville, jun. judge) 4966; Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3605; Yukon (legal adviser) 3592 (ii).
Legislation (general printing, &c.) 237 (i); conc., 4343; H. of C. (ballot gratuities) 4330 (ii); (printing laws, &c.) 237; Library (salaries) 236; (voters' lists) 237 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4226 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and France) 4332; (Victoria and Skagway) 4964.
Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon) 4339; (Coronation, expenses of Ministers) 4332; Labour Dept. (salaries) 4119; (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 4120; (Eastern Extension arbitration) 4340; (Marconi telegraph construction) 4338; (printing bureau plant) 4119, 4956; (St. Vincent, &c., relief *re* volcanic eruption) 5031; (unprovided items) 4341 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 507 (i).
Public Works: Buildings, N.S. (Halifax custom house) 635 (i); Ont., Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 562; (rentals) 976 (i); (Toronto P.O., alterations) 4566; Yukon (judges' residences) 4208; (official residences) 4536; Harbours and Rivers, Mar. Provs. (La Have river) 4214; N. S. (Amagandus wharf) 4618; (Bear river obstructions) 4621; (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Clark's harbour) 991 (i); (Glace Bay) 4622 (ii); (Lockeport harbour) 991 (i); (Petit Rivière breakwater) 4211; (Porter's lake outlet) 4623; (Port La Tour) 4624; (Round Bay beach) 4624; (Windsor dams) 4624 (ii); P.E.I. (tax legislation) 1012 (i); Que. (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3290; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4775; (Yukon supplies) 4158 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Clergue's contract, *re* steel rails) 3793; (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3550; (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (explanation) 3410; (general vote) 3459, 3476; (Halifax accommodation) 4790; (locomotives) 3824; (North Sydney pier) 4796; (sidings, &c.) conc., 5037; P.E.I. (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5040; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4914 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 527 (i).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 4964; (iron and steel bounties) 4331 (ii).
Weights and Measures (binder twine inspection) 4963 (ii).
Timber Limits, Sale by Govt., Names of Purchasers, &c. (Ans.) 885 (i).
Ways and Means (Res. for Com.) 120, 1279 (i), 5064 (ii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

Ways and Means—The Budget, 1279 (i).

——— The Tariff (M.) for Com., 4972; in Com., 4972 (ii).

——— (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 4973 (ii).

Welsh Immigrants from Patagonia, Remarks of Mr. Chamberlain *re* Climate of Canada (Ans.) 1441 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*

Agricultural and Manufacturing Products of Can., Aggregate Amount, &c. (Ans.) 747 (i).

Agriculture, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 237 (i).

Bouillon, Dr. Alfred, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2854.

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2147 (i).

Bull, Charles A., Produce Co., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4808 (ii).

Can. Cattle Embargo by G.B, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 138 (i).

——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3990 (ii).

Canned Beef for South Africa, Quantity, Inspection, &c. (Ans.) 746 (i).

——— *See* "S. A. War."

Census, Amount expended on Livery Hire (Ans.) 2069 (i).

——— Classifying Half-breeds as Indians (remarks) 1902 (i).

——— Commissioners, Atlin District, Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 3155 (ii).

——— Commissioner at South Waterloo, Name and Amount paid to (Ans.) 1861 (i).

——— Coté, Mr., Circular, Replies received (Ans.) 133 (i).

——— Dom., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 130, 612.

——— East and North Simcoe, Cost in 1891-1901 (Ans.) 2224 (i).

——— Enumeration, 1891 and 1901, Cost, &c. 1064 (i).

— —— 1881, 1891, 1901, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2222 (i).

——— Enumerators for South Waterloo, Names, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1066 (i).

Chickens purchased by Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 3408 (ii).

Colchester Regiment, Pets. *re* Medals, &c. (Ans.) 4699 (ii).

Cooling Plant on Steamships, Names, Number, &c. (Ans.) 882 (i).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 635.

Fans for Cooling Steamships *re* Products, &c. (Ans.) 616 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 136) 1° m., 3307; in Com., 4130; on Sen. Amts., 4702 (ii).

Grapes purchased by Dept. of Agriculture, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).

Hay purchased for War Office in Quebec (Ans.) 2223 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4744 (ii).

Japan Exposition, Can. Representation, &c. (Ans.) 2225 (i).

Medical Council in Can., Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1131 (i).

Mutton Shipments in Cold Storage, Indemnity to Mr. Wheatley (Ans.) 4695 (ii).

P.E.I., Chicken-fattening Stations, Location, &c. (Ans.) 1065 (i).

'Rothesay Blues,' Pets. *re* Medals (Ans.) 4699.

S. A. War—Can. Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3843 (ii).

——— *See* "Canned."

——— Horses purchased in N. W. Can. (Ans.) 1989 (i).

Stock Breeders' (Mar.) Association incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 4344; in Com., 4612 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 357 (i); (advances to creameries) 2657 (ii); (aids to societies) 343; (Archives) 321 (i); (bonuses, &c.) 2653 (ii); (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (census) 3365, 4076; (census cheques *re* Lisgar, &c.) 4429; (census investigation *re* 1891) 3394; (cheese stations) 2634 (ii); (classifying patents) 349; (commissioner's branch, cold storage, &c.) 368 (i), 2568 (ii); (criminal statistics) 335; (experimental farms) 345 (i), 2867, 2892, 4966; (fruit inspection) 2585, 2622 (ii); (fumigating stations) 353; (general statistics) 339 (i), 2827 (ii); (Glasgow exposition, &c.) 358; (Imperial Institute) 365 (i); (Japan exposition) 4966; (St. Louis exposition) 4966; (Pan-American exposition) 4967; (Paris exposition) 4967 (ii); (*Patent Record*) 329 (i); (poultry shipments) 2640 (ii); (*Year Book*) 336 (i), 2814.

Civil Government: Agriculture (Chittick, F. C., promotion) 4965 (ii); (clerical assistance) 205; (salaries) 177 (i).

Militia (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2560 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—B.C. (William's Head quarantine) 4614 (ii); Generally (experimental farms, renewals) 875; Que. (Grosse Isle station) 645; (Lévis, cattle quarantine) 668 (i).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2919; (*Monitor* SS.) 2900 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 403 (i); (public health) 4967 (ii); (salaries, organized districts, &c.) 371 (i); (slaughter compensation) 4968; (small-pox) 4967; (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2909 (ii); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 403 (i); (unorganized districts) 2903 (ii).

Telephone Co.'s in Can., Total Mileage, &c. (Ans.) 3151 (ii).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4376 (ii).

Tubercular Test, Res. by Shorthorn Breeders Association (Ans.) 130 (i).

Wellington Mutch, Payments to by Dept. of Agriculture (Ans.) 3152 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles, (Minister of Justice) *Quebec County.*

Beauchamp, Oscar, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 158 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles--*Con.*
Bills of Exchange Act (1890) Amt. (B. 105) 1°, m., 2455 (i).
Binder Twine, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 410, 618, 1439 (i).
Can. Evidence Act Amt. (B. 115) 1° m., 2852; in Com., 3513 (ii).
C.P.R. *vs.* Roy, Privy Council Judgment, on M. for Copy (Mr. *Lemieux)* 504 (i).
C.P.R. Act (tolls) Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 2933; in Com., 3934 (ii).
Civil Service List (presented) 129 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt. (B. 165) prop. Res., 4126; in Com., 4607 (ii).
Commutations for Arson, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Ret., 419 (i).
Dom. Elections Act (1900) Amt. B. 27 (Mr. *Clancy*) on M. for 2°, 1133 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Eilbeck, Sheriff, Leave of Absence from Yukon (Ans.) 745 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (appeal) Amt. (B. 114) 1° m., 2851; in Com., 3511 (ii).
——— (B. 139) prop. Res., 3239; in Com. on Res., 3311; 1°*, 3510 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4682 (ii).
Halifax Industrial School Act Amt. (B. 152) 1° m., 4036; in Com., 4701 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Beland*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 4804 (ii).
Judges of County Courts, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) 418 (i).
——— Legislation *re* Retirement (Ans.) 131 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 138) prop. Res., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3510; in Com., 3939 (ii).
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 121 (i).
Knapp Tubular SS. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 2607 (ii).
Larose, Jos., Indemnity, &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 624 (i).
Leeds and Grenville, Jr. Judge, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4701 (ii).
Manitoba Liquor Act, Constitutionality of Referendum, Letters, &c. from Man. Govt. (Ans.) 1682 (i).
Marconi's Wireless Tel. Co.'s B., on Order for 1°, 530 (i).
Medical Council in Canada Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2474 (i); on M. for 3°, 4457 (ii).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4522 (ii).
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 491 (i).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3134 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2491 (ii).
O'Keefe, Magistrate, Pet. *re* French Language in Courts (Ans.) 2858 (ii).
Penalties Remission (B. 151) 1°*, 4036; in Com., 4579 (ii).
Petition of Right Act Amt. (B. 135) 1° m., 3306; in Com., 3936 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 76) 1° m., 1673 (i); in Com., 2495 (ii).
P. E. I. Tax on Commercial Travellers, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1096 (i).
Queen's and King's Counsel, Appnmt. since 1896 (Ans.) 3155 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3171 (ii).
Referendum Act, Pet. from Man. Prohibition Alliance *re* (Ans.) 785, 1682 (i).
Regina Law Library (B. 19) 1°*, 530; 2° m., 1205.
Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2674 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, Appnmt. of Physician (Ans.) 159 (i).
——— Coal Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 159 (i).
——— Letter *re* Misconduct of Employees (Ans.) 1445 (i).
——— Relations between Warden and Dep. Warden (Ans.) 1445 (i).
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 451 (i).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1675, 2192 (i).
Strong, Sir Henry, Amount paid *re* Judicial Committee (Ans.) 1986 (i).
Superior Court, Que., Writs issued, &c. (Ans.) 442 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (judges' salaries) 214 (i); (Man. judges) 4266 (ii); N.B. (Divorce Court) 217; Ont. (Exchequer Court) 230; (Supreme Court) 218, 223; (*ad hoc* judges) 4265; Yukon (clerk of court) 3587; (judges' living allowance) 3584 (ii); (judge) 233 (i) 3583; (law books, &c.) 3590; (legal advisers, &c.) 3590; (maintenance of prisoners) 3589; (sheriff Eilbeck) 3586; (surgeon's salary) 3588; (transport of prisoners) 3589; (witness fees) 3590 (ii).
Dominion Police (salaries) 234 (i).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1167 (i).
Fisheries (Dom. and Provincial) 548; (overseer, &c.) 548 (i); (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4239 (ii).
Justice (consolidation of statutes) 3622; (contingencies) 4264; (legal agents) 3620; Miscellaneous (Farewell, J. C., payment to) 4269; (law books) 4267; (litigation expenses) 4266; (witness fees) 4267; Penitentiaries—B.C. (new wing) 3619; Dorchester (salaries, &c.) 3618; (general vote) 3593; (inspector Dawson) 4267; Kingston (binder twine) 3593; Man. (land purchase) 3618; (Prince Albert jail) 3620; St. Vincent de Paul (Lussier arbitration) 4269; (purchase of land) 3617 (ii).
Legislation (printing laws, &c.) 237 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works: Buildings—Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 972 (i), 4191 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (tax legislation) 1010; Que. (Grande Vallée, title, &c.) 1043; (Isle au Coudre) 1047; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 586 (i).

Supreme Court Act, Amt. *re* Man. (Ans.) 411 (i).

——— Assistant Judges (B. 77) 1° m., 1673 (i).

Supreme Court Judges, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ans.) 2225 (i).

Telephone Companies B. 2 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 788 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s (B. 28) 1° m., 734; 2°*, and M. to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 1206 (i).

Tidal Waters, Dom. and Provincial Rights, &c. (Ans.) 1861 (i).

Wales, Prince of, Visit, Cost of Illuminations, &c. (Ans.) 615 (i).

Yukon—Territorial (court of appeal) Act Amt. (B. 113) 1° m., 2851; in Com., 3776 (ii).

——— (magistrates) Amt. (B. 137) prop. Res., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°*, 3509; in Com., 3939 (ii).

——— M. to introduce (remarks) 2850 (ii).

——— Irregularities and Interview with Judge Craig (remarks) 973 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B., *Yarmouth.*

Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 60) 1°*, 1490.

Canada Temperance Act, Names of Counties, &c. under Operation (Ques.) 1682 (i).

Chipman, Samuel Nelson, Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 4344; in Com., 4692 (ii).

Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1569 (i); in Com., 2670, 2887 (ii).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc., 4243 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2717, 3123 (ii).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3274 (ii).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (M.) to suspend Rules, 1569 (i).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4452 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3963 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2783 (ii).

Printing Committee, 4th Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4644 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (M.) 780 (i), 4464 (ii).

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1083 (i).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1418 (i).

Flint, Mr. T. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2830; (*Year Book*) 2824 (ii).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) on Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's, N.B.*

Representation Unit by Census 1901 (Ques.) 2854.

Restigouche Indians, Investigation *re* Complaint, Rep. of Inspector, &c. (M. for copy*) 2473 (i).

Round Hill to Armstrong's Corners, Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1987 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agrieulture, &c. (bonuses, &c.) 2653; (census) 3367; (cheese stations) 2636; (poultry shipments) 2643 (ii).

Justice: Yukon (clerk of court) 3588; (legal adviser) 3591; (maintenance of prisoners) 3589; (surgeon's salary) 3588 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2532; (pay and allowance) 2529; (properties) 2549 (ii).

Post Office (Round Hill service) 3916 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (clerks of works, &c.) 878; N.B. (armoury, Sussex) 866; (Alma pier) 1031 (i); (Andrews Hollow) 4626 (ii); (Bay du Vin wharf) 1022 (i); (Campbellton wharf) 4626; (Campobello breakwater) 4626 (ii); (Caraquet wharf) 1023; (Chance Harbour) 1024; (Grand Anse breakwater) 1025; (lumber, price, &c.) 1027; (Marysville) 640; (Negro Point) 1031 (i); (Oromocto wharf) 4628; (Partridge Island pier) 4628 (ii); (Point Wolfe breakwater) 1025; (Richibucto pier) 1026; (St. John's immigrant shed) 641 (i); (Salmon River breakwater) 4628; (tidal water wharfs) 4629; Que. (Batiscan dredging) 4629; (Crane Island wharf) 4630; (Cross Point) 4630 (ii); (Grande Vallée) 1033 (i); (Maria wharf) 4630; (Point Fortune wharf) 4631; (Point St. Pierre breakwater) 4631; (St. Irenée wharf) 4634; (St. Laurent wharf) 4635 (ii); (title for property, &c.) 1042 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (additional sidings) 3811; (expenditure, &c.) 3556; (Moncton engine shops) 3829; (Sussex engine house) 3829 (ii).

Fraser, Mr. D. C., *Guysborough.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1884.

Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 123) M. *re* Pet., 2846; 1°*, 3202 (ii).

Canso Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2197 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4422 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2716, 3125 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2862 (ii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditure, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3244, 3260 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 317 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection *re* Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3650 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2474 (i).

Fraser, Mr. D. C.—*Con.*
Precedence in Can. at Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 436 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2798 (ii).
Presbyterian College Board incorp. (B. 22) 1°*, 632 (i).
Public Accts. Com. (M.) to ref. Pub. Accts. to Sel. Com., 198 (i).
——— Meetings, &c. (remarks) 440 (i).
——— 1st and 2nd Reps. (presented) 810 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 1108 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3172, 3192 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2194 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3387; (fruit inspection) 2604; (*Year Book*) 2820 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 538 (i).
Indian Affairs (schools) 3045 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3599 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 524.
Public Works: Buildings—N. S. (armouries) 871; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Larry's River breakwater) 1004; (New Harbour breakwater) 1005 (i); (Windsor dams) 4625 (ii); Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 576 (i).
Railways: I. C. R. (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3542 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3631 (ii).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne's.*
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3706, 3712 (ii).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Yale and Cariboo.*
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2199 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) M. to present Rep. of Sel. Com., 4693, 4694 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2469 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (armouries) 872 (i).
United Gold Fields Co.'s (B. 9) 1°*, 408 (i).
Velvet (Rossland) Mine Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 18) 1°*, 530 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2425 (i).
Clergue Steel Rail Contract, &c., Quantity delivered, &c. (Ques.) 746, 781, 1439 (i).
I. C. R., St. John Elevator, Amount of Grain handled, &c. (Ques.) 883 (i).
North Head, N. B. Breakwaters, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1441 (i).
Richibucto Pier, Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 1439 (i).
St. John and Halifax Govt. Elevators (Ques.) 612.
Scotia Str., Contract Price, &c. (Ques.) 1440 (i).
Steel Rails Contract, Quantity delivered by F. H. Clergue, &c. (Ques.) 746, 781 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3367; (census, manufacturers, &c.) 4111; (experimental farms) 2889 (ii); (general statistics) 343 (i).
Fisheries (bounty cheques) 554; (cold storage, deep sea) 557; (hatcheries) 551; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 539, 546 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries, &c.) 519 (i).
Ocean and River Service (biological station) 517.
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (armouries) 861; N. W. T. (Carnduff court-house) 844; (Wilson's Beach work) 844, 847 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Bay du Vin wharf) 1022; (Caraquet wharf) 1023; (Dipper Harbour breakwater) 1025; Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1269; Que. (Grande Vallée pier) 1031 (i); Telegraph Lines (Charlotte Co.) 3291 (ii).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
I. C. R. and Temiscouata Ry., Traffic between Rivière du Loup and Wharf (Ques.) 1860 (i).
——— Ditching along Farm Lands, Temiscouata, Damages, &c. (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Rivière aux Renards) 4632 (ii).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2062 (i).
Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 87) 1°*, 1986 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1985 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Criminal Code Act Amt. (B. 33) 1°*, 882 (i).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3974 (ii).
Ontario and Niagara Power Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1438 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2776 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4272; Welland (Port Colborne) 4799 (ii).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (redemption) 4325 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 4316 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 4327.
Post Office (pets. of right *re* cancelled contracts) 3918 (ii).
Public Works: Dredging, Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 4765; Harbours and Rivers (Port Colborne) 4558 (ii).
Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr *Sifton*) in Com., 4477 (ii).

Gibson, Mr. A., Jr., *York, N.B.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 636 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J., *East Middlesex.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2613 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4132 (ii).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1209 (i).

Gilmour, Mr. J.—*Con,*
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 496 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3186 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (advances to creameries) 2658; (cheese stations) 2638, 2647; (experimental farms) 2872; (fruit inspection) 2588.
Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 855; (Red Deer immigration shed) 853.

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3144 (ii).

Gourley, Mr. S. E., *Colchester.*
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 150 (i).
Colchester Regiment, Pets. *re* Medals, &c., (Ques.) 4699 (ii).
I. C. R., Truro Station, &c., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4352 (ii).
Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* Confederation with Can. (Ques.) 4698 (ii).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2786 (ii).
'Rothesay Blues,' Pet. *re* Medals, &c. (Ques.) 4698 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.: Aud. Gen.'s Office (clerical assistance) 4535; Rys. and Canals (F. A. Dixon, promotion) 4534 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2999 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, Yukon (official residences) 4543 (ii).
Truro Round-house, I. C. R., Rebuilding, &c. (Ques.) 4352 (ii).
Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4475 (ii).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1673 (i); in Com., 3129 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 79) 1°*, 1860.
Ry. Act (limitation) Amt. (B. 25) 1° m., 632 (i).
Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 110) 1° m., 2847 (ii).

Hackett, Mr. E., *West Prince, P.E.I.*
Alberton Ry. Station, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1441
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1823 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour, Range Lights, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
Customs Forfeited Goods, Sale of at Sydney, N.S. (Ques.) 783 (i).
Fishing Gear, P.E.I., Confiscation, &c. (Ques.) 1440 (i).
Fishing Licenses, Prince Co., P.E.I., Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
Kemp, Mr. Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 135 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Steam Communication, Trips, Tonnage, &c. Str. *Amelia* (Ques.) 1680 (i).
Mutton Shipments in Cold Storage, Indemnity Mr. Wheatley (Ques.) 4695 (ii).

Hackett, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Oyster Fishing (P.E.I.) Protection Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 135 (i).
P.E.I. Chicken-fattening Stations, Location, &c. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Southport to Murray Harbour, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 4695 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Pets., O. C's., &c., on M. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) for Ret., 163 (i).
Sandhills, P.E.I., Range Lights, Removal, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 220.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 356 (i); (apple grafting) 2653; (census) 3371, 4093; (census enumerators) 4097; (cheese stations) 2656; (cold storage) 2632; (poultry shipments) 2644 (ii).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (Burland litigation) 4322 (ii).
Customs (Charlottetown port) 2932; (salaries, &c., Mr. Curry) 2924 (ii).
Fisheries (cold storage, deep sea) 557 (i); (salmon and lobster hatchery) 4222 (ii); (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 540; (oyster culture) 555 (i).
Indians: P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3053 (ii).
Miscellaneous (national park, Banff) 4118 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (biological station) 516; (Govt. steamers, maintenance, &c.) 510; (winter mail service) 516 (i).
Post Office (Kehoe, Mr., mail contractor) 4932; (P.E.I. mail service) 4939 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, repairs) 1023 (i), 4627 (ii); P.E.I. (Brae breakwater) 4625 (ii); (Canoe Cove) 1012; (Cape Traverse, &c.) 1021; (Carleton Point) 1021; (Cascumpec Harbour) 1013 (i); (Chapel Point) 4625; (New London breakwater) 4212 (ii); (tax legislation) 1011 (i); (Tignish breakwater) 4212, 4626; (West Point pier) 4211; Miscellaneous (Percival River survey) 3292; (surveys, &c.) 3292; Telegragh Lines (P.E.I. and Mainland) 3293.
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 377 (i); (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2918; (unorganized districts) 2902 (ii).
Railways: P.E.I. (Hillsboro bridge) 3863; (Murray Harbour, &c.) 3997, 4288, 4293, 4922 (ii).
Webb and Sunday Travelling over P.E.I. Ry., &c. (Ques.) 4700 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 104 (i).
Alexander Gibson Ry. and Mfg. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. *Fraser*) to ref. to Com., 2846 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2661 (ii).
C. P. Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2935 (ii).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2219 (i).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) in Com., 2888 (ii).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 152 (i).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 824 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Letters read by Mr. Bourassa, 812 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Coasting Trade of Can. B. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 4608 (ii).

Cosmos Cotton Co. incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2670; on M. for Com., 2888 (ii).

Crossen Mfg. Co.: *See* 'I.C.R., Trucks, &c.'

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (objection) 1204 (i).

Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 629 (i).

Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 151 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4124 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. 114 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3512 (ii).

——— B. 139 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3311 (ii).

Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4832 (ii).

Galops Rapids, Improvements, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5023 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4569 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1° m., 2714; in Com., 4416 (ii).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. *Heyd*) in Com., 1620 (i).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4671 (ii).

Intercolonial Con. with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4741 (ii).

I. C. R., Horne, Mr. R. T., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 2068 (i).

——— and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditure, &c., Inquiry by Pub. Accounts Com., (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3235, 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281.

——— Notice of Motion, 3126 (ii).

——— Trucks, &c., purchased (Ques.) 2852 (ii).

Joughin's Truck: *See* 'I.C.R., Trucks, &c.'

Judges of County Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3310 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. on Res., 4128.

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4509 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4520 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69, in Com., 3136, 3150 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2484 (ii).

Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 3306; in Com., 3938 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 2496 (ii).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2483 (ii).

Preferential Trade with Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2809 (ii).

P. E. I. Ry., Southport to Murray Harbour, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 4697 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1089 (i).

Public Accounts Com., 1st and 2nd Reps., on M. to conc. (objection) 810 (i).

——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1404 (i).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Malouin*) in Com., 1622 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 459 (i).

——— Commission and Consolidation Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2442, 2447 (i).

——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4580, 4590 (ii).

——— Subsidies (remarks) 4972 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3218 (ii).

Regina Law Library B. 19 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 2°, 1205 (i).

Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2671 (ii).

——— Manufacture, &c., Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4974 (ii).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1677, 2021 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 229; (judges' salaries) 214; (miscellaneous expenditure) 214; (Supreme Court) 217 (i).

Canals: Carillon (guide pier) 4280; Cornwall (repairs, &c.) 4294, 4310; Culbute (damages, &c.) 4281, 4309; Farran's Point (enlargement) 4300; Galops (deepening, &c.) 4024, 4301; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4024; Generally (extra service) 4294, 4312; Georgian Bay (surveys) 4298; Lachine (electric plant) 4300; (lock repairs) 4035; (Mill St. paving) 4307; (waste weir) 4307; North Channel (dam) 4035; (enlargement) 4300; Quebec (boundaries) 4281; Rapide Plat (enlargement) 4304; Rideau (Poonamalie causeway) 4270, 4917; Sault Ste. Marie (entrances) 4002, 4298; Soulanges (construction, &c.) 4019, 4304; Trent (construction) conc., 5047; (Corry & Laverdure claim) 4007; (dredging) 4269; (Lindsay and Fenelon road) 4270; (Peterborough dam) 4918; Welland (lock walls) 4306; (Montrose bridge) 4800; (Port Colborne entrance) 4020, 4307, 4798; (Port Dalhousie) 4306 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Agriculture (salaries) 177; (clerical assistance) 206; Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 175; Customs (clerical assistance) 208; Finance (salaries) 175; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 173; High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 209; Inland Revenue (salaries) 175; (clerical assistance) 207; Interior (clerical assistance) 202; Labour (clerical assistance) 213; N. W. M. Police (clerical assistance) 213; Printing and Stationery (salaries) 174; (clerical assistance) 201; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i); Railways and Canals (Dixon, F. A., promotion) 4783 (ii); Sec. of State (salaries) 174; (clerical assistance) 199; Treasury Board (clerical assistance) 204 (i).

Justice: Miscellaneous (Farewell, J. C. (accounts) 4269; (litigation expenses) 4266; Penitentiaries (inspector Dawson) 4268; (Lussier arbitration) 4268 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Legislation: House of Commons (salaries) 234.

Militia (pay and allowance) 2517 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings,—N.W.T. (Carnduff court-house) 840; (day labour and contracts) 840; Ottawa (heating, engineers, &c.) 4138 (ii); Que. (Grosse Isle station) 648 (i); Yukon (judges' residences, &c.) 4146, 4209; Harbours and Rivers–N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4617 (ii); (Boularderie wharf) 998; (Burlington wharf) 1000; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1000; (Drumhead breakwater) 1001; (Barrie wharf) 1217; (Blind River wharf) 1222; (Collingwood harbour) 1227; (Depot Harbour) 1231; (Goderich dredging) 1232; (Kingsville pier) 1236; (Petewawa narrows) 1239; (St. Joseph wharf) 1247; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1242; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 566 (i); Roads and Bridges—Yukon (wagon roads, &c.) 4148; Telegraphs—Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150.

Railways and Canals (remarks) 2866; Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 4792; conc., 5037; (bridges, strengthening) 4792; (Canso ferry service) 4294; (Chaudière Junction, engine house) 4786; (Drummond Co., rentals, &c.) 3533; (general vote) 3418, 3452; (Halifax accommodation) 4790; (Miramichi bridge) 4794; (Moncton accommodation) 4797; (Nicolet station) 4796; (operation, maintenance) 4310; (Ouelle River spur line) 4796; (Pictou accommodation) 4795; (Rockingham improvements) 4798; (rolling stock) 4783; (St. John accommodation) 4786; (Stellarton, increased accommodation) 4788; (Sydney accommodation) 4789; (Sydney bridge) 4795; P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 3862, 3996, 4282, 4919; conc., 5039; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4868 (ii).

Supreme Court (assistant judges) B. 77 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 1673 (i).

Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 4406 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 4973 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1620; on Sen. Amts, 2676 (ii).

Yukon Territory, Magistrate's B. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. to introduce (remarks) 2850 (i).

——— Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3306 (ii).

Halliday, Mr. J., *North Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Presqu'Isle) 1239; (Tobermory harbour) 1246.

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2367 (i).

Bronte Harbour Improvements, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

——— Lighthouse (Ques.) 134 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 141 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *McCreary*) on M. for 2°, 2023 (i).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4131 (ii).

German Duties on Can. Imports (Ques.) 156 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Milton Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ques.) 133 (i).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2063 (i).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4425, 4568 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3969 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3129 (i).

Oakville Harbour, Construction of Docks, &c. (Ques.) 135 (i).

Ontario Provincial Subsidy, Amounts paid, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2473 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3174 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3220 (ii).

St. Lawrence Canal Employees, Amounts paid, collected, &c., 1896-1901 (Ques.) 2222 (i).

S. A. War, Socks, Contract for Third Contingent (Ques.) 3638 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (Exchequer Court) 232 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 326 (i); (cold storage) 2579; (fruit inspection) 2596 (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 363 (i); (*Year-Book*) 2817 (ii).

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4276 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. notes) 171 (i).

Customs (collectors and inspectors) 3295 (ii).

Immigration (agents, salaries. &c.) 2993 (ii).

Interior: N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3118 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 235 (i).

Post Office (outside service) 3894; (securities, &c.) 3876 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (immigration shed, Red Deer) 853; Ont. (Clinton) 719 (i); Ottawa (ventilation H. of C.) 4141 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 731; (Toronto Junction) 733); Yukon (official residences) 4548 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (New Harbour, breakwater) 1004 (i); (Windsor dams) 4625; Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1226 (i); (Burlington channel) 4637 (ii); (Collingwood harbour) 1228 (i).

Tobacco Duty, Amount collected for 1901, &c. (Ques.) 134 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B., *South Brant.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1447 (i).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 611 (i).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1213 (i).

Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Ry. Co.'s Change of Name (B. 21) 1°*, 611 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4039, 4051 (ii).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 297 (i).

Heyd, Mr. C. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2897 ; (fruit inspection) 2591, 2602 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1263 (i).
Railways and Canals: I.C.R. (steel rails) 3785.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 910, 914 (i).

Holmes, Mr. R., *West Huron.*

Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 776 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1974 (i).

Cattle Exports to U. S. from 1890, Value, &c., (Ques.) 3153 (ii).

Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 440 (i).

Horses imported into Man. and N. W. T., Customs Valuation, &c., Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3969 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 467 (i).

Riordon Paper Co. and Welland Canal Water Privileges (Ques.) 745 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Year Book) 339 (i).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (engraving contract) 4321 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1173 (i).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3601 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1218 ; (Goderich harbour) 1233 ; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1270 (i).

Welland Canal, Water Privileges, &c., (Ques. 409, 745 (i).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1647 (i).

Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3705 (ii).

P. E. I., Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2721 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Customs (collectors and inspectors) 3296 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—P.E.I. (armouries) 874 (i).
Railways: P. E. I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4923 (ii).
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 378 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *North Victoria, Ont.*

Ashcroft to Dawson, &c., Tel. Lines, Total Length, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1986 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2666 (ii).

Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2219 (i)

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Commissions on Disbursements for Imp. Authorities (Ques.) 1065 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Employmt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2462, 2465 (i).

Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp. B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2670 (ii).

Consular Agencies, Flags, &c. (Ques.) 132 (i).

Courts-Martial in Militia Force, Number, Offences, &c. (Ques.) 740 (i).

Fenian Raid Medals, Issue, &c. (Ques.) 1109 (i).

G. O. C., Increase of Salary, &c. (Ques.) 614 (i).

——— Right to rep. to Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 239 (i).

Grain Inspection at Montreal, Certificates, &c. (Ques.) 450 (i).

Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Waterways, Commission, &c. (prop. Res.) 886 (i).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2864 (ii).

Hutton-Hughes, Ret. ordered by Hse., &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).

Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2969 (ii).

King's Birthday, Official Observance (Ques.) 2226.

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1131 ; in Com., 2478 (i).

Middleton, Gen., Rep. of, &c., *re* Rebellion of 1885 (Ques.) 239 (i).

Militia Officers, Training, &c. (prop. Res.) 2682.

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. incorp. B. 73 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Ontario Legislature, Extension of Duration, Disallowance by Govt. (Ques.) 131 (i).

Permanent Corps, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 409 (i).

——— Total Strength (Ques.) 740 (i).

Peters Target at London Camp, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 446 (i).

Precedence in Can. for Official Functions, (prop. Res.) 429 (i).

Preferential Trade within the Empire, on Ques. of Order, 2946 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 460, 464 (i).

Rifle Practice for young Canadians (prop. Res.) 3155 (ii).

Royal Military College, Rep. of Commissioners (Ques.) 443 (i).

S. A. School Teachers, Information *re* (remarks) 962 (i).

S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Sup., 3347.

——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3856 (ii).

——— Conduct of Canadian Soldiers : Par. in *Daily News* (remarks) 2069, 2088 (i).

——— Small-pox Outbreak among Troops, &c. (Ques.) 1446 (i).

Staff Course at Kingston (Ques.) 239 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (experimental farms, beet root experiments) 345 (i) ; (experimental farms) 2868 ; (general statistics) 2828 (ii) ; (Imp. Institute) 364 (i) ; (*Year-Book*) 2815, 2824 (ii).

Canals : Trent (dredging, &c.) 4271 (ii).

Customs (appraisers) 2927 ; (salaries, &c.) 2923.

Fisheries (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4235 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries) 3020 (ii).

Militia (pay and allowance) 1133 ; (permanent force) 1135 ; (promotions, &c.) 1134 (i).

Post Office (branch offices) 3898 ; (control of cables, &c.) 3908 ; (parcel service) 3913 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—B.C. (armouries) 872 ; Generally (armouries, &c.) 861 ; (experimental farms, renewals) 875 ; (telephones) 986 ; N.S. (Baddeck armoury) 861 ; Ont. (Wentworth armoury) 863 ; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Maurice, dredging) 1053 ; (Sorel wharf) 1060 (i).

Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2919 (ii) ; (organized district, salaries, &c.) 376 (i) ; (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2917 (ii).

Railways : I.C.R. (steel rails, &c.) 3781 (ii).

Tassie, Major, Retirement of (Ques.) 241 (i).

Transportation, Distances, &c. (Ques.) 135 (i).

Welsh Immigrants from Patagonia, Mr. Chamberlain's Remarks *re* Climate of Canada (Ques.) 1441 (i).

Yukon—Telegraph Lines, Construction, &c. (remarks) 2859 (ii).

Hyman, Mr. C. S., *London.*

Buffalo and International Ry. Co.'s B. 31 (Mr. *Osler*) in Com., 1623 (i).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s B. 21 (Mr. *Heyd*) in Com., 1620 (i).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4690 (ii).

I.C.R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditures, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3280 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2057 (i).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. *Matouin*) in Com., 1622 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3209 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2836.

Railways : I.C.R. (expenditure, &c.) 3558 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1620 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 7) 1°*, 316 ; in Com., 1270 (i).

Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4344 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1431 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 472, 477 (i) ; in Com., 3190 (ii).

——— Commission and Consolidation Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2443, 2451 (i).

——— Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3226 (ii).

Rifle Practice for Young Canadians, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3155 (ii).

St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 530 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 324 ; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i) ; (census) 3371 ; (census enumerators) 4433 ; (census investigations, &c.) 4435 ; (fruit inspection) 2595, 2622 (ii) ; (general statistics) 339 (i), 2828 (ii) ; (Imperial Institute) 367 ; (Pan-American exposition) 358 ; (*Patent Record*) 329 ; (St. Louis exposition) 360 ; (*Year Book*) 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 181 ; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i).

Customs (St. Thomas collector) 2930 ; (St. Thomas port) 3205 (ii).

Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 542 (i).

Indians : B.C. (industrial schools) 3059 ; (inspectors, &c.) 3069 ; (medical attendance) 3059 ; N.B. (medical attendance) 3051, 3052 ; N.S. (seed grain) 3050 ; Ont., &c. (liquor traffic suppression) 3050 ; (medical attendance) 3043 ; (printing, &c.) 3060 (ii).

Interior : N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3079, 3087 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2534 ; (Dom. arsenal) 2565 (ii) ; (pay and allowance) 1134 (i) ; (properties) 2550 ; (rifle ranges) 2567 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, engineers, &c.) 987 ; (immigration sheds, &c.) 976 ; N.B. (Marysville) 639 ; Ont. (architect's fees) 729 ; (London drill hall) 729 ; (renewals, &c.) 728 ; Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 967 ; Que. (contract or day labour) 705 ; (Montreal examining warehouse) 705 ; (plans, specifications, &c.) 666 ; Dredging (plant) 3283 ; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (foremen, &c.) 1006 ; (Parker's Cove pier) 1006 ; Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1217 ; (Collingwood harbour) 1230 ; (Depot Harbour) 1231 ; (Goderich harbour) 1233 ; (Kingsville pier) 1236 ; (Lime Kiln crossing) 603 ; (Presqué Isle harbour) 1240 ; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1254, 1270 ; (St. Mary's river) 603 ; (Grand Vallée) 1040, 1043 ; (St. Lawrence transportation) 597 ; (Sorel elevator) 1062 (i) ; Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3289 ; Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293 (ii).

Quarantine (Public Works Health Act) 404 ; (organized districts, salaries) 389 (i).

Railways : I.C.R. (air brakes) 3812 ; (expenditure, &c.) 3565 ; (general vote) 3416 ; (mechanical supt.) 3813 ; (new machinery) 3812 ; (objection) 3411 ; (original construction) 3809 ; (rolling stock) 3813 ; (Sydney accommodation) 3807 ; (tie inspection) 3565 ; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 3862 (ii).

Union Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158) 1°*, 4241.

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1622 (i).
Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4467 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. A., *Cape Breton.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1724 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2196 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4572 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3709, 3717 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Post Office (country postmasters) 3901 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Que. (Montreal examining warehouse) 687 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4617; Telegraphs (Scatari Island) 4774 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3467; (North Sydney) 4796 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. R., *Cardwell.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1651 (i).
Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1216 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 476 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census enumerators) 3396 (ii); (cold storage) 370 (i); (experimental farms) 2873 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1269 (i).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1190 (i).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*
SUPPLY:
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1203 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., *Lunenburg.*
Halifax and South-western Ry., Construction, on M. for Ways and Means, 5064 (ii).
Jeanie Myrtle, Schr., Small-pox, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 5015 (ii).
Shipping (Atlantic) Combine, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cheese stations) 2651; (experimental farms) 2874, 2896 (ii).
Fisheries (herring slaughter) 4223 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (La Have River) 4213 (ii); N.S. (Boularderie wharf) 998; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1000; (Herring Cove breakwater) 1002; (Lunenburg breakwater) 1007 (i); (Lunenburg, dredging) 4622 (ii); (Mill Cove breakwater) 1008 (i); (Petit Rivière breakwater) 4210 (ii); (Port George breakwater) 1007; Ont. (dredges, &c.) 1236 (i).
Quarantine (*Monitor*, SS.) 2899 (ii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*
Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 802 (i).
——— Date, &c. (Ques.) 617 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Boards of Trade Res., Inquiry for Ret., 4404 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1788.
Can. Transatlantic Mails, via U.S. (Ques.) 447.
Commercial Travellers, Tax by Jamaica (Ques.) 622 (i).
——— Tax by P.E.I., &c. (Ques.) 781 (i).
Freight Rates, Report of Mr. McLean, Inquiry for 1205 (i).
——— *See* 'Ry. Freight.'
German Tariff *re* 'Most Favoured Nation Clause' (Ques.) 617 (i).
I.C.R., Freight Rates per Ton on Pig Iron, &c. 782 (i).
Jamaica Tax on Commercial Travellers from Can. (Ques.) 622 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
——— Res. from Boards of Trade, &c. (Ques.) 3153 (ii).
P.E.I., Tax on Commercial Travellers, &c. (Ques.) 781 (i).
Public Accts. Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).
——— (M.) to print Evidence *re* Gaudry, 4343 (ii).
Ry. Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2449 (i).
Ry. Freight Rates, Rep. of Prof. McLean (Ques.) 448 (i).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3359 (ii).
——— Contingents, Expense of Equipment, &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4270 (ii).
Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (redemption) 4325 (ii).
Interior: Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 4954 (ii).
Post Office (district offices) 3885; (mail service) 3911; (outside service) 3874 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 980 (i); Ont. (Toronto P.O., branch office) 4182; (Toronto P.O., locomobiles) 4187 (ii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 732 (i); Que. (Lake St. John district) 4179 (ii); Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 971 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot harbour) 1232; (Goderich harbour) 1234; (Toronto harbour) 1275; P.E.I. (Canoe Cove breakwater) 1010; (tax legislation) 1010; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 570, 574; (Sorel wharf) 1055 (i); Telegraphs—Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4151; (pole contract) 4154; (Rochester's contract) 4152; (supplies) 4160.
Trade and Commerce (treaty negotiations) 4964.
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4395 (ii).

Kendall, Mr. A. S., *Cape Breton.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1930 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3709 (ii).
I.C.R., Coal purchased in Can. (Ques.) 883 (i).

Kendall, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (cold storage, deep sea) 556 (i).

Indians: N. B. (medical attendance) 3053; N.S. (medical attendance) 3051 (ii).

Post Office (Magdalen islands) 3906 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N. S. (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001; P. E. I. (creosoted timber) 1017 (i).

Sydney Land and Loan Co.'s incorp. B. (30) 1°*, 781 (i).

Kendrey, Mr. J., *West Peterborough.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2290 (i).

SUPPLY :

Post Office (Peterborough postmaster) 4943 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4571.

Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take Precedence on Wednesdays, 2720 (ii).

North Shore Power, Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3137 (ii).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4057 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 68; 2° m., 451, 457 (i); M. for Com., 3158; in Com., 3171 (ii).

——— M. to proceed (remarks) 2480 (i).

Rifle Practice for Young Canadians (M.) to adjn. deb., 3158 (ii).

St. Catharines Water Supply, &c. (Ques.) 883, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'Welland.'

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aids to societies) 344 (i); (fruit inspection) 2603 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (medical attendance) 3058; N.S. (medical attendance) 3051; Ont., &c. (Leduc, Mr. J. D.) 3049 (ii).

Justice (legal agents) 3620; Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3599; Yukon (legal adviser) 3593 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ont. (St. Catharines drill hall) 715 (i), 4567; Yukon (official residences) 4547 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Port Colborne) 609; Que. (Montreal harbour) 608; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 593.

Welland Canal Water Supply, O.C. granting St. Catharines Power, &c. (Ques.) 1683, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'St. Catharines.'

Yukon Representation in H. of C., B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4468, 4532; (amt.) 4578 (ii).

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C., *Provencher.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2136.

Census, Description of Metis (remarks) 1674 (i).

Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc., 4242 (ii).

Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 151 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4123 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to receive Rep. of Sel. Com., 2715, 3121, 3304; on Order for 2°, 3866; on M. for 2°, 4076; in Com., 4667; on M. for 3° (amt.) 6 m. h., 4690; neg. (Y. 34; N. 71) 4691.

LaRivière, Mr. A. A. C.—*Con.*

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation; remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

Interior Dept. Officials, Date of Appnmt., Salaries, &c., 1896, 1901 (M. for ret.*) 961 (i).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4357 (ii).

Man. School Lands, Sales, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 154 (i)

Metis, Description in Census Bulletin (remarks) 1674 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4043 (ii).

Printing of Parlt., 4th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 4644 (ii).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3305 (ii).

Roseau River Indian Reserve (Ques.) 247 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ques.) 247 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 440 (i).

School Lands, Man., Sale, &c. (M. for cor.*) 154 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (divorce court, N.B.) 217; (judges' salaries) 216 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives) 324 (i); (*Year Book*) 2816 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 183; Post Office (salaries) 179 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 403; (Winnipeg hospitals) 407 (i).

Supreme Court Act, Amt. *re* Man. (Ques.) 410 (i).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 932 (i).

Winnipeg Post office Officials, Date of Appnmt., 1896-1901 (M. for ret.*) 961 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister) *East Quebec.*

Abraham, Plains of, Rights reserved for Militia (Ans.) 3409 (ii).

Address, on The, 35 (i).

———Consdn. (M.) 6 (i).

Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. *Monk*) 794 (i).

Auger, I. A., Contract *re* Spruce Planks, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 2483, 2677 (ii).

Ballot Papers for Laval, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 157 (i).

——— St. James Division, Montreal, Printing, &c. (Ans.) 157 (i).

Banking and Commerce Com. (M.) to add Name, 2482 (ii).

Bills on Order Paper, Procedure, &c. (remarks) 612, 2481 (i).

——— wthdn. (remarks) 4970 (ii).

———*See* 'Private'.

Boer Immigration, Par. in *Mail and Empire* (Ans.) 3408 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
B. C. Chief Justiceship (remarks) 611 (i).
B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of Acts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 138 (i).
Bronte Harbour Lighthouse, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 756 (i).
Business of the Hse., Ascension Day Adjnmnt. (M.) 4353 (ii).
——— Private Bills, &c. (remarks) 3920 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Cabinet Changes (explanation) 412 (i).
C. P. R., Increase in Capital Stock, Papers respecting laid on Table, 129 (i).
Can. Temperance Act, Memorial from Baptists in Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 1110 (i).
——— Names of Counties, &c., under Operation (Ans.) 1682 (i).
Census, Description of Metis (remarks) 1674 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) prop. Res., 3832 (ii).
Chinese Immigration, Rep. of Com., First Part (presented) 451 (i).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4575 (ii).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 143, 147 (i).
——— Letter from Sir Louis Davies (read) 821 (i).
——— *See* 'Bulwer,' &c.
Clergue's Contract *re* Steel Rails, &c. (Ans.) 781 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection, 5055 (ii).
Collegiate Institute Cadet Corps (Ans.) 240 (i).
Colonial Troops in Defence of Empire, Par. in *Ottawa Citizen* (remarks) 786 (i).
Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 425 (i).
Commissions on Disbursements for Imperial Authorities (Ans.) 1066 (i).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 6 (i).
———Com. to prepare Lists (M.) 7 (i).
———Lists (presented) 122 (i).
———(M.) to add Name, 1063 (i), 2568 (ii).
Consular Agencies, Flags, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).
Coronation Day, Public Holiday, &c. (Ans.) 747 (i).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 7 (i).
——— 4th Rep. of Com., French Translators, on M. to conc., 4244 (ii)
——— (remarks) 4121 (ii).
Dom. Securities Co., Par. in New York Paper (remarks) 4428 (ii).
Employees of H. of C., Transportation to Homes (remarks) 5056 (ii).
Fishery Awards, Distribution to Provs., &c. (remarks) 3861 (ii).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com. 4570 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order, 4656 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
G. O. C., &c., Right to rep. to Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 240 (i).
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings (M.) 3920 (ii).
——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 961 (i).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 1278 (i), 2720 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business,' &c.
Govt. Employees, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).
——— Interference in Federal Elections, &c. (Ans.) 619 (i).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3718 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. (remarks) 3623 (ii).
Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2718 (ii).
Ile-aux-Coudre Wharf, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3410.
Immigration, on Inquiry (Mr. *Wilson*) for Ret., 1205 (i).
Income Tax, G.B. and Can. Agents (Ans.) 5054.
Industrial Properties Preservation Treaty, &c., Par. in Newspapers (remarks) 2146 (i).
Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt, Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4724 (ii).
——— (remarks) 4427 (ii).
I.C.R. Officials, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).
——— P.E.I. Rys., Expenditures, Ques. of Order, 3235 (ii).
Internal Economy Com. (presented) 154 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Commissioners (remarks) 1323 (i).
——— Rep. of Royal Commission laid on Table, 2658 (ii).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 4245; in Com., 4803 (ii).
King's Birthday, Official Observance (Ans.) 2226 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com. (M.) 128 (i).
Lisgar, Man., Revising Officer, Date of Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 3153 (ii).
Man. School Lands Fund, &c. (Ans.) 2942 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1129; in Com., 2476 (i); on M. for 3°, 4454; on Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3925, 4246 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 154 (i).
Ministerial Changes, Explanation, &c., on M. to adjn. (remarks) 155 (i).
Montgomery, General, Erection of Monument, &c., (Ans.) 129 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. *Clarke*) for Ret., 2681 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Board, Appnmt. of Mr. Doran (Ans.) 3920 (ii).
Mulloy, Trooper, Pension *re* (remarks) 3315 (ii).
Naturalization Act Amt. (B. 154) 1°*, 4121; in Com., 4484 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Newfoundland, Negotiations *re* Confederation with Can. (Ans.) 4698 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3977 (ii).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3142 (ii).
N.W.M. Police Act (asst. commissioner) Amt. (B. 147) prop. Res., 3308; in Com. on Res., 3510; 1°* of B., 3734 (ii).
——— Police Pensions (B. 40) prop. Res., 779; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 962; in Com., 2484, 3311 (ii).
——— Police Report (presented) 1063 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°* *pro formâ*, 4 (i).
Ontario Legislature, Extension of Duration, &c. (Ans.) 131 (i).
Oriental Commission, Rep. of Commission (Ans.) 444 (i).
——— Rep. laid on Table, 2658 (ii).
Precedence in Can. at Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 433 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2739 (ii).
——— Res. from Boards of Trade, &c. (Ans.) 3154 (ii).
Private Bills, on M. to extend Time, 781 (i).
——— and Govt. Business (remarks) 4568 (ii).
Procedure *re* Bills (remarks) 612, 2481 (i).
Provincial Subsidies and B.N.A. Act. Amt. (Ans.) 442 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 440 (i).
——— 1st and 2nd Reps., on M. to conc., 810 (i).
——— 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1413 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3197 (ii).
——— on M. to proceed (remarks) 2481 (i).
——— Commission B. (remarks) 4970 (ii).
——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4601 (ii).
Railway Com. (M.) to add Name, 1278 (i).
Railway Expenditures, &c. (remarks) 3126 (ii).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3733 (ii).
Railway Subsidies (remarks) 4972 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3229 (ii).
Representation in House of Commons, Provinces *re* Census, &c. (Ans.) 2677, 2854 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 3862 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. *Bell*) 4036 (ii).
Sabbath Observance *re* Militia Parades (remarks) 4646 (ii).
Sessional Clerks employed in Civil Service (Ans.) 619 (i).
Shipping (Atlantic) Combine, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
S.A. War—British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3333 (ii).
——— Commissions on Outlay, &c. (Ans.) 1064.
——— Constabulary, Selection of Officers (Ans.) 244 (i).
——— Contingents, Expense of Equipment, &c. (Ans.) 1685 (i).
——— School Teachers, Information *re* (remarks) 962 (i).
——— Volunteers, Land Grants to, Memorial from N.W. Ter. (Ans.) 3831 (ii).
Speech from the Throne (M.) 6 (i).
Staff Course at Kingston (Ans.) 239 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (construction) conc., 5049 (ii).
Civil Govt.: N.W.M. Police (clerical assistance) 212; (salaries) 174; Privy Council (salaries) 173 (i).
Dom. Lands (Man. school lands) 4252 (ii).
Legislation: House of Commons (Franchise Act) 4329 (ii); (salaries) 234; Library (books) 237 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and France) 4332 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Chinese commission) 4340 (conference of Col. ministers) 4332; (coronation, expenses of ministers) 4332; (eastern extension arbitration) 4340; (Nipissing election, payments to stenographer) 4339 (ii).
N.W.M. Police (service, &c.) 4247 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (St. Joseph's wharf) 1271; Que. (Sorel wharf) 1058 (i); Telegraph Lines (Anticosti to Bryon) 4769 (ii).
Quarantine (Porter, A. E., claim) 5034 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Drummond Co., rental, &c.) 3539; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4864 (ii).
Tassie, Major, Retirement of (Ans.) 241 (i).
Telephone Companies B. 2 (Mr. *Maclean*) on M. for 2°, 786 (i).
——— (remarks) 526 (i).
Trackmen's Wages: *See* 'Govt. Rys.'
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 956 (i).
Windmill, Battle of, Pensions (Ans.) 238 (i).
Yukon, Employment of Japanese (Ans.) 242 (i).

Lavell, Mr. J. R., *Leeds and Grenville.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2030 (i).
SUPPLY:
Customs (laboratory) 2927; (salaries, &c.) 2922; (sugar testing) 2927 (ii).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
King Bros., Claim against Govt., Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 3307 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*
Canoe Cove (P.E.I.) Breakwater, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 3831 (ii).
P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 2728 (ii).
——— Winter Communication, Pets., &c. (M. for copies) 160, 170 (i).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (hatcheries, P.E.I.) 4960 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, salaries) 520 ; (*Stanley*, Str.) 520 (i).

Public Works: Dredging (Cape Tormentine) 3284 (ii) ; Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Cape Tormentine, memorial *re*) 1018 ; (Cape Traverse memorial *re*) 1018 ; (Summerside breakwater) 1017 (i) ; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4772 (ii).

Railways and Canals: P.E.I. (Kinkora, Res., &c.) 3863 ; (Murray Harbour branch) 3863 (ii).

Legris, Mr. J. H., *Maskinongé.*

Dominion Cotton Co.'s (B. 71) 1°*, 1673 (i).

I.C.R., Ste. Monique Station, Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 744 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3949 (ii).

Tay Canal, Amount expended, 1896 to 1901, &c. (Ques.) 2067 (i).

Lemieux, Mr. R., *Gaspé.*

B.N.A. Act *re* Provincial Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 441 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2398 (i).

Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) in Com., 2888 (ii).

Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council (M.) for Cor., 3668 (ii).

Gaspé Basin as an Ocean Port, on M. for Com. for Sup., 5011 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com., 4661 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. for 2°, 3866 ; in Com., 4680 (ii).

Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).

Japan Exposition, Can. Representation, &c. (Ques.) 2225 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3944 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1129 (i) ; in Com., 4438 (ii).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2055 (i).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 496 (i).

Northern Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1569.

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3967 (ii).

Provincial Subsidies and B. N. A. Act Amt. (Ques.) 441 (i).

Queen's and King's Counsel, Appnmt. by Govt. since 1896 (Ques.) 3154 (ii).

Roy *vs.* C. P. R., Privy Council Judgment (M. for copy) 499 (i).

Superior Court, Quebec, Writs issued, &c. (Ques.) 442 (i).

Lemieux, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Militia (properties) 2557 (ii).

Post Office (Magdalen Islands) 3903 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Ottawa (telephones) 986 ; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Gaspé, dredging, &c.) 1049 ; (Grande Vallée) 1039 ; (Murray Bay wharf) 1052 (i) ; Telegraph Lines (Magdalen Islands) 4144 (ii).

Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4916 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*

Allandale Station, Mail Transfer (Ques.) 884 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2207, 2226 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Representation, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3839 (ii).

Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).

Fruit Transportation, &c., Excessive Charges, Res. of Georgian Bay Fruit Growers' Association (Ques.) 1109 (i).

House of Commons, Addition to Central Block, &c., Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1442 (i).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4756 (ii).

I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditure, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3277 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3974 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1422 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 468 (i) ; in Com., 3177 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) Ques. of Order, 3224 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3367, 3376 ; (experimental farms) 2883 (ii).

Canals: Trent (construction) conc., 5053 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 3060 ; (inspectors) 3060 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3610 (i).

Public Works: Buildings, N.B. (Marysville) 638 ; Que. (Levis cattle quarantine) 668 (i) ; Miscellaneous (surveys and inspections) 4781.

Railways: P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) conc., 5045 ; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4911 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Beauchamp, Oscar, Emplymt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 158 (i).

Descary, C. A., Surgeon at St. Vincent de Paul (Ques.) 3831 (ii).

Govt. Employees and Interference in Elections, &c. (Ques.) 618 (i).

I. C. R., Classifying of Employees, Salaries, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2472 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition (prop. Res.) 3639 ; Neg. (Y. 33 ; N. 71) 3666 (ii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E.—*Con.*
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, &c. (M. for ret.) 481 (i).
Rifle Associations' Regulations, Pamphlet, French Translation, &c. (Ques.) 2223 (i).
St. Eugène de Grantham Mail Service, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4350 (ii).
St. Jerome Postmaster, Interference in Political Meetings (Ques.) 159 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Pen., Appnmt. of Physician (Ques.) 159 (i).
——— Coal Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 159 (i).
——— Employees organizing Political Meetings, &c. (Ques.) 158 (i).
——— Indemnity to Trefflé Nantel (M. for ret.*) 2471 (i).
——— Leave of Absence of Warden (M. for cor., &c.*) 2472 (i).
——— Letter *re* Misconduct of Officials (Ques.) 1445 (i).
——— Relations between Warden and Dep. Warden (Ques.) 1445 (i).
——— Surgeon, &c. (Ques.) 3831 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings, Yukon (matron, court-house, &c.) 4193, 4197; Harbours and Rivers, Que. (St. Genevieve) 4215; (Valleyfield channel) 4216 (ii).
Vadnais, Francois, Contractor for Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 4350 (ii).
Vegetables imported into U.S., Quantity, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 171 (i).
——— Readjustment of Duties (M. for pets.*) 171 (i).

Logan, Mr. H. J., *Cumberland.*
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c. (prop. Res.) 3702, 3719; Amt. to adjn. Deb. agreed to (N. 23; Y. 54) 3724 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3233 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Lower Cove breakwater) 1004 (i).

Loy, Mr. G. M., *Beauharnois.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Valleyfield channel) 4216 (ii).

Mackinnon, Mr. D. A., *East Queen's, P.E.I.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1480 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3708 (ii).
Marconi System of Wireless Telegraphy, Agreement *re* P.E.I., &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).

Maclaren, Mr. W. S., *Huntingdon.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2045 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2054 (i).
SUPPLY:
Militia (pay and allowance) 2519 (ii).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Transportation Problem (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4361; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 93) 4402 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *East York, Ont.*
Address, on The, 51 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 114 (i).
Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Copies, 797 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 771 (i).
C. P. Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2936 (ii).
Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *McCreary*) 2° m., 2021 (i).
Debates, Official Reporting (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 964 (i).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to take Precedence on Wednesdays, 2720 (ii).
Greek Catholic Church, Pet. *re* Incorporation, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com., 2718 (ii).
Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3736 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) on M. for 1°, 317 (i).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2733, 2942 (ii).
Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1103 (i).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1436 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).
Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 304 (i).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Divorce Court, N.B.) 217; (judges' salaries) 215 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (*Year Book*) 339 (i).
Civil Govt.: Agriculture (clerical assistance) 206; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 207; Labour Dept. (clerical assistance) 213; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 204; Printing and Stationery (clerical assistance) 199 (i).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 980; Ottawa (rentals) 964; (telephones) 986, 988; Yukon (rentals, repairs, &c.) 969; Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Cow Bay wharf) 1001; Que. (Sorel wharf) 1057 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (Clergue's contract, steel rails) 3789; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4877, 4896 (ii).
Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 736 (i).
Telephones and Telephone Co.'s (B. 2) 1° m., 66; 2° m., 625, 786 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 115 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2852 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Amt. (B. 61) 1°*, 1490 (i).
Depew, Geo. M., Patent Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 3725.
Dyment Banking Loan and Savings Co.'s incorp. (B. 51) 1°*, 1204 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*
General Inspection Act (leather) Amt. (B. 111) 1° m., 2849 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3948 (ii).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 2146 (i); in Com., 4424, 4521 (ii).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 1673 (i); in Com., 3131 (ii).
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 3315 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 475 (i); in Com., 3187 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2194 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2835.
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1175 (i).
Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 2064 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1985 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 725; Que. (day labour or contract system) 682; (Montreal examining warehouse) 682 (i).

McCormick, Mr. G., *Muskoka and Parry Sound.*
Ontario James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1490 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Burke's Falls wharf) 4637; (Georgian Bay, dredging) 4640; (Huntsville wharf) 4631; (Orillia wharf) 4641 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F., *Selkirk.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2606, 2608, 2659 (ii).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4575 (ii).
Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3735 (ii).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4507 (ii).
Man. and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 96) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Man. Liquor Act, Constitutionality of Referendum, Letters, &c. from Man. Govt. (Ques.) 1682 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 495 (i).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3971 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (Supreme Court) 221.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 4088 (ii).
Customs (coal oil inspection) 3302 (ii).
Interior: N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy) 3076 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3613; Man. (land purchase) 3618 (ii).

McCreary, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Post Office (electric ry. mail service) 3874; (newspaper postage) 3916; (parcel service) 3913; (Winnipeg P.O.) 3868 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, &c.) 976; (renewals, &c.) 833; Que. (contract or day labour) 699 (i); Dredging—Man. (*Sir Hector*) 3284; (snag boat) 4768 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Andrews Rapids) 605 (i).
Quarantine (Winnipeg hospitals) 406 (i).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 903, 915, 960 (i).
Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 65) 1°*, 1569; on Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii).

McEwen, Mr. G., *South Huron.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—Yukon (official residences) 4545; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1219 (i).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1189 (i).

McGowan, Mr. J., *Centre Wellington.*
Census Commissioners, Atlin District, Amounts paid to, &c. (Ques.) 3155 (ii).
Drainage across Ry. Property B. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. for 2°, 631 (i).
Flax Seed, Importation from U.S., Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 1682 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3376; (experimental farms) 2873; (fruit inspection) 2624.
Customs (linseed oil) 2932, 3299 (ii).
Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3612 (ii).
Militia (properties) 2556; (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2559 (ii).
Quarantine (cattle, &c.) 2919; unorganized districts) 2906 (ii).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1197 (i).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4619 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*
Canso Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 46) 1°*, 1204 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indian Affairs: Ont. and Que. (schools) 3047.
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 526.
Post Office (Inverness mail service) 4939; (country postmasters) 3897 (ii).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Friar's Head harbour) 1002 (i).

Madore, Mr. J. A. C., *Hochelaga.*
Cottons, Bleached and Unbleached, Duty *re* (Ques.) 614 (i).
Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 48) 1°*, 1204 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2059 (i).
Sugar, Refined and Raw, imported into Can. during 1900 and 1901 (M. for ret.*) 809 (i).

Malouin, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Quebec and Huron Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 734 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Canal and Lake Champlain Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1763 (i).

Marcil, Mr. C., *Bonaventure.*
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com., 4656 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3710 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4683 (ii).
Indian River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 14 (Mr. *Beland*) on Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 4438; on M. for 3°, 4461 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3972 (ii).
O'Keefe, Magistrate, Pet. from St. Jean Baptiste Society (Ques.) 2857 (ii).
Paspebiac as an Ocean Port, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).
Printing of Parlt., 4th Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (amt.) 4644 (ii).
Restigouche River, I.C.R. Bridge, on M. for Ways and Means, 5070 (ii).
Royal Marine Insurance Co.'s (B. 167) 1°*, 4568.
SUPPLY:
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 3011 (ii).
Post Office (Magdalen islands) 3907; (outside offices) 3902 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Lévis local service) 4297 (ii).

Matheson, Mr. J., *Richmond, N.S.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3387 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance) 512 (i).
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Grand River channel) 4622 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3469 (ii).

Maxwell, Mr. G. R., *Burrard.*
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4057 (ii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1569 (i).

Monet, Mr. D., *Laprairie and Napierville.*
Colonial Troops and Defence of Empire, Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 785 (i).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3343 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Address, on The, 43 (i).
Alaskan Boundary. *See* 'Bulwer-Clayton.'
Anglo-German Commercial Treaties, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 790; Negatived (Y. 56; N. 107) 804 (i).
Auger, I. A., Contract *re* Spruce Planks, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 2483, 2676 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Ballots for St. James Electoral Division, Montreal, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 157 (i).
—— Laval, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 157 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2399, 2411 (i).
Bull, Charles A., Produce Co., Letter from High Commissioner's Office, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4805 (ii).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.) 747 (i).
—— Order, Question of, Letter of Sir Louis Davies, laid on Table, 761 (i).
—— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Cor., 149 (i).
Cacouna and Ry. Station, Mail Contract, &c. (Ques.) 2225 (i).
Civil Service Act (retirement) Amt. B. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 3775 (ii).
Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army, on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 426 (i).
Commutations for Arson, &c., Number (M. for ret.) 419 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) (amt.) 2469 (i).
Cote St. Luc Rifle Range, Indemnity to J. Larose (M. for cor.) 622 (i).
Customs Tariff (1897) Amt. B. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 3°, 4977 (ii).
Dom. Bank Notes, Number of Sheets issued in 1892 (Ques.) 619 (i).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3711 (ii).
Hay purchased for War Office in Quebec (Ques.) 2223 (i).
Herald, Globe, &c., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 615 (i).
—— *Halifax Chronicle*, &c., (M. for ret.*) 809.
Illumination for Royal Visit, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 615 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, Inquiry by Pub. Accounts Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3250 (ii).
—— St. Octave Station, Tenderer, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2222 (i).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 8) 1°m., 316 (i).
—— (remarks) 1110 (i).
Joint Stock Companies B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5064 (ii).
Judges of County Courts Act Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3310 (ii).
Laprairie Post Office, Dismissal of A. Thomas &c. (M. for cor.*) 2473 (i).
—— (Ques.) 2221 (i).
Larose, Jos., Indemnity to, &c. (M. for cor.) 622.
Longueuil Govt. Farm, Sale, &c. (Ques.) 2455 (i
Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3645.
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1129; in Com., 2479 (i).

Monk. Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2055 (i).
Montreal Harbour Board, Appmnt. of Mr. Doran (Ques.) 3920 (ii).
Montreal Rifle Ranges, Amount expended, Tenderers, &c. (Ques.) 2223 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 484 (i).
Newspapers, Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 158, 615 (i).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3122, 3146 (ii).
N.W.M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 3314 (ii).
Petition of Right Act Amt. B. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 3306 (ii).
Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment (remarks) 3778 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 2457 (i).
Pullman Car Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 2459 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3170, 3200 (ii).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) on M. for 1°, 3305; in Com., 3774 (ii).
Ross Rifles, Manufacture of, Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4974 (ii).
Royal Visit. *See* 'Wales.'
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3338 (ii).
——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3853 (ii).
——— Constabulary, Applications, Selections, &c. (M. for ret.*) 528 (i).
——— (Ques.) 243 (i).
Screl and Montreal Wharf Contracts, Specifications, Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 2473 (i).
Supreme Court Judges, Leave of Absence, &c. (Ques.) 2224 (i).
Supply (remarks) 128 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 357; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 348 (i); (census) 3392; (census investigation *re* 1891) 3393 (ii); (cold storage) 368; (Imperial Institute, Can. exhibits) 367 (i).
Civil Govt.: Post Office (salaries) 4925; Railways and Canals (salaries) 3780 (ii).
Electric Light (inspection) 1202 (i).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1150, 1202; (inspectors' salaries) 1148 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers, &c.) 522 (i).
Militia (Larose, Jos., indemnity) 4947 (ii).
Post Office (Montreal, P.O.) 3869 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 701; (Cote St. Paul, Verdun, &c.) 656; (Drummondville) 643; (Granby) 644; (L'Assomption) 656; (Levis, building) 669; (Levis, cattle quarantine) 668; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 670; (renewals, &c.) 642; (St. Hyacinthe, drill hall) 710; (Thetford Mines) 716; Valleyfield) 717;

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
Dredging—Man. (vessels, repairs, &c.) 4763; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 4763; (plant) 3283; (Jacques Cartier Co.) 3285; Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Gaspé, removal of rock) 1048; (Grande Vallée) 1036: (Hudson wharf) 1046; (Lake Temiscamingue) 1047; (Murray Bay wharf) 1051; (St. Alexis Bay) 1053; (St. Maurice, dredging) 1053; (Sorel wharf) 1060; (title for lands) 1042; (Valleyfield, dredging) 1061 (i); (Yukon) 3283; Miscellaneous (surveys and inspections) 4781; (timber creosoting plant) 4779; Telegraph Lines (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293; (cable system) 4775; (Magdalen Islands extension) 4769 (ii).
Quarantine (organized district, salaries, &c.) 371; (Public Works Health Act) 404 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 3810; (Clergue's contract, steel rails) 3783; (general vote) 3410, 3429; (Levis accommodation) 3811; (locomotives) 3816; (Miramichi bridge spans) 3812; (Moncton engine house) 3830; (Moncton shops) 3828; (Pintsch gas equipment) 3812; (Point Tupper) 3828; (rolling stock) 3816; P.E.I. (bridges) 3828; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4862 (ii).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1195 (i).
Telegraph Lines in B.C. and Ters., Amount expended (Ques.) 157 (i).
Thomas, Alphonse, Postmaster at Laprairie, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2221 (i).
Three Rivers, Inspector Gravel, Amounts paid, collected, &c. (Ques.) 2457 (i).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3630 (ii).
Trackman's Wages. *See* "Govt. Rys."
Transportation *re* St. Lawrence, Amount, &c. (Ques. of Order), 3683 (ii).
Wales, Prince of, Visit, &c., Cost of Illumination, &c. (Ques.) 615 (i).
Yukon Timber Licenses or Leases issued since 1899, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2472 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3509 (ii).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Coté, Jos., Mail Carrier at Ste. Hénédine, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
Doyon, Thos., Postmaster at St. Odilon, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4350 (ii).
Employees of H. of C., Transportation to Homes (remarks) 5056 (ii).
Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3712 (ii).
Ste. Hénédine Mail Carrier, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
St. Odilon, Dorchester Co., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 4350 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census expenses) 4435.
Legislation: H. of C. (French debates, &c.) 4330 (ii).
Post Office (charges *re* postmasters) 4934; (mail contracts) 3881 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings, N.W.T. (Edmonton Jail) 851; Que. (Thetford Mines) 717 (i); Yukon (official residences) 4545 (ii); Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Isle aux Coudres wharf) 1046; (Isle aux Grues wharf) 1047; (Murray

Morin, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

Bay wharf) 1051 (i); (Quebec harbour) 4553; (St. François wharf) 4633 (ii); (Sorel wharf) 1057 (i); Roads and Bridges, Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3290; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3287; (sorting logs) 4218; Telegraph Lines (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 3291 (ii).

Morrison, Mr. A., *New Westminster.*

Bennett Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 17) 1°*, 530.

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1504 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Commission (remarks) 1323 (i).

Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1569 (i).

Oriental Immigration, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 444 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1673 (i).

SUPPLY:

Miscellaneous (Chinese Commission) 4340 (ii).

Telephone Cos. in Can., Total Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 3150 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Wm. (Postmaster General) *North York, Ont.*

Allandale Station, Transfer of Mails (Ans.) 884.

Anten Mills and Hendrie Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 1681 (i).

Bathurst, N.B., Charges against Postmaster H. Bishop (Ans.) 4700 (ii).

Cacouna and Ry. Station Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 2225 (i).

Can. Transatlantic Mails via U.S. (Ans.) 447 (i).

Clinton, David, Postmaster at Wellington, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 613 (i).

Crathie, Postmistress, Resignation, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).

Doyon, Thos., Postmaster at St. Odilon, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 4350 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4684 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2860 (ii).

Holstein, Dismissal of Postmaster (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4927 (ii).

Isle of Orleans Mail Service (Ans.) 246 (i).

Joliette P. O., Dismissal of J. J. Sheppard (Ans.) 2068 (i), 2855 (i).

Kaulbach, Postmaster at Musquodoboit, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).

Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c. (remarks) 4704 (ii).

Labour Dept. Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Laprairie P. O., Dismissal of Alph. Thomas (Ans.) 2221 (i).

McDonald's Corner, N.B., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ans.) 2676 (ii).

Magazines, &c., imported from G.B. and U.S., Quantities, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2679 (ii).

Mulock, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Maple Creek P. O., Change of Location, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

Maranda, Alfred, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 246 (i).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 4449 (ii).

Milton Postmastership, Vacancy, &c. (Ans.) 133.

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4521 (ii).

Morton P.O., Abstraction from registered Letters (Ans.) 1987 (i).

Newcastle, Ont., Resignation of Postmaster (Ans.) 4697 (ii).

Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. (B. 106) 1° m., 2482; in Com., 4036 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes, Settlement (B. 147) 1° m., 3725 (ii).

—— *See* Labour.

Ricketts, T., Postmaster at Gilmour, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2224 (i).

Round Hill to Armstrong's Corners, Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1988 (i).

St. Eugène de Grantham and I.C.R. Station, Mail Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4350, 4351 (ii).

Ste. Hénédine Mail Carrier, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 447 (i).

St. Jerome Postmaster, Interference in political meetings (Ans.) 159 (i).

Samples sent by 'Sample Post,' Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 617 (i).

Seeley's Bay P. O., Abstraction from registered Letters (Ans.) 1987 (i).

Sheppard, J. J., Postmaster at Joliette, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).

Springbank Post Office, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (Burland litigation) 4317; (engraving, &c.) 4317; (redemption) 4324 (ii).

Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (clerical assistance) 211, 213; (salaries) 181 (i); Marine and Fisheries (Tyrwhitt, Mr., salary) 4958 (ii); Post Office Dept. (clerical assistance) 211; (Knauf, promotion) 4313; (salaries) 179 (i), 4313, 4925.

High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4326.

Legislation: House of Commons (debates) 4327; (Library, printing) 4327; (stationery) 4326 (ii).

Post Office: (automobiles) 3872; (Bain, Mr., P.O. inspector) 3871; (Barrie mail service) 3910; (Bates, Mr. E. B., salary) 4940; (Belleville P.O.) 4945; (B.C. mail service) 4314; (charges against postmasters) 4930; (Kehoe, Mr., mail contractor) 4932; (LeSueur, Mr., superannuation) 3904; (letter carriers) 3867, 4940; (mail service) 3911; (outside service, salaries) 3867; (parcel service) 3911; (Peterborough postmaster) 4943; (petitions *re* contracts) 4931; (ry. mail clerks) 4313; (railway mail service) 4940; (salary increases) 4941; (service payments) 4314 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings, Dom. (P.O., rent of boxes) 988 (i).

Williamstown Postmaster, Charges against *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 4353 (ii).

Murray, Mr. T., *Pontiac.*

SUPPLY :

Railways : P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4290 (ii).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren*, Perth) to Com. of Sup., 4393 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2268 (i).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 238 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).

Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1415 (i).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 311 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3213 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Post Office (Belleville P. O.) 4945 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F., *Alberta.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1658 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2615, 2662 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com. (amt.) 3128 (ii).

——— Lands patented up to March, 1902, Acreage, &c. (Ques.) 1988 (i).

——— Land Taxes, Exemption, &c. (Ques.) 1988.

——— Taxation, Test Case (remarks) 5055, 5073 (ii).

Coal Oil Inspection, 5054, 5074 (ii).

——— M. to adjn., 5077 (ii).

Coronation Contingent and Western Contingents (remarks) 4647 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church (B. 140) Pet. *re* Incorporation (M.) to refer back to Com., 2715, 3121, 3303 ; 1°*, 3622 ; M. for 2°, 3866 ; 2° m., 4076 ; in Com., 4676 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N. W. T., Customs Valuation, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1212 (i).

Hudson's Bay and North-west Ry. Co.'s (B. 93) 1°*, 2145 (i).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3738 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2485 (ii).

Pensions granted in British Army *re* wounded (Ques.) 2679 (ii).

Railway Act (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4592 (ii).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3203 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation, 3224, 3227 (ii).

Oliver, Mr. F.—*Con.*

S. A. War—British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3355 (ii).

——— Horses purchased in N. W. Can. (Ques.) 1989 (i), 2679 (ii).

——— Pensions to Canadians, &c. (Ques.) 2459.

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3391 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1152, 1157 (i).

Interior : N. W. T. Govt. (prov. autonomy) 3071 (ii).

Militia (properties) 2551 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton Jail) 854 ; (Red Deer immigration shed) 853.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor , 946, 960 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1385 (i).

Buffalo Ry. and International Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 811 (i).

Cements, Canadian and Foreign, Tests by Govt. (Ques.) 1442, 1444 (i).

Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4415 (ii).

Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3721 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1210 (i).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3760 (ii).

Molsons Bank Pension Fund incorp. (B. 109) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4424 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 497 (i).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3974 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2486, 3314 (ii).

Penny Bank incorp. (B. 95) 1°*, 2146 (i).

Railway Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2445 (i).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3368 (ii).

Charges of Management (printing Dom. Notes) 172 (i).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1159, 1179 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse service) 519 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 507 (i).

Public Works : Buildings—Dom. (policy of Govt.) 666 ; Que. (L'Assomption) 666 ; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1217 ; (Collingwood harbour) 1230 ; (St. Joseph's wharf) 1258 ; (Toronto harbour) 1274 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 390 (i).

Railways : I. C. R. (Clergue's contract) 3781 ; (general vote) 3478 ; (Lévis accommodation) 3810 ; (steel rails, &c.) 3781 ; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4863, 4887 (ii).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3628 (ii).
Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4408, 4412 (ii).
Trackman's Wages : *See* " Govt."
Transportation *re* St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3698 (ii).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s (B. 10) 1°*, 408 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1985 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs) *North Wentworth and Brant.*
American Tugs in Can. Waters, &c. (Ans.) 441.
Bathurst Collector of Customs, P. J. Venoit, Absence from Office, &c. (Ans.) 4125 (ii).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2299 (i).
Cattle Exports to U.S. since 1890, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3153 (ii).
Coal Oil Inspection, on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to adjn., 5079 (ii).
Coasting Trade Act Amt. (B. 165) in Com. on Res., 4246, 1°*, 4361 (ii).
Cottons, Bleached and Unbleached, Duty *re* (Ans.) 614 (i).
Customs Forfeited Goods, Sale of at Sydney, N. S. (Ans.) 783 (i).
Flax Seed imported from U.S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 1682 (i).
Free List, Articles placed on since 1897 (Ans.) 244 (i).
Grain Importations through Western Ports in 1900, Quantity (Ans.) 782 (i).
——— from Ont. Ports in 1901 (Ans.) 246 (i).
McCormick Binder, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 441 (i).
Magazines and Newspapers imported from G.B. and U.S , Value, &c. (Ans.) 2679 (ii).
Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2802 (ii).
Pullman Car Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 2459 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.: Census (remarks) 4342
Civil Govt.: Customs (clerical assistance) 208 (i); (contingencies) 4264 (ii).
Customs (American tugs, &c.) 3298; (appraisers) 2927; (coal oil inspection) 3301; (inspector's salaries) 3295; (laboratory) 2927; (linseed oil importations) 2932, 3300; (printing, &c.) 3296; (salaries, &c.) 2921; (St. Thomas collector) 3295; (sugar testing) 2927 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (locomotives) 3825 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Amount collected during 1901 (Ans.) 134 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rep. (presented) 122 (i).
U.S. Imports for Home Consumption in 1901, Value, &c. (Ans.) 782 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Facilities, on M. for Cor. (Mr. *Douglas*) 895, 899 (i).
Yarn admitted Duty Free, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 4125 (ii).

Pope, Mr. R. H., *Compton.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2414.
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Japan exposition) 4966; (Paris exposition) 4967 (ii).
Geological Survey (maps, engraving, &c.) 4948.
Post Office (Keith P.O., change of location) 4937 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, &c.) 975; (quarantine stations) 985 (i).
Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann, award) 4861 (ii).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Belleville Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 449 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1903 (i).
Cadets, R.M.C., Application *re* Coronation Contingent (Ques.) 3637 (ii).
Coronation Contingent Representatives, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3835 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (Inspector Hurley) 543 (i).

Prefontaine, Mr. R., *Maisonneuve, Terrebonne.*
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4569 (ii).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4517 (ii).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Cornwall and Stormont.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1989 (i).
McPherson, Wm., Charges against, &c. (Ques.) 4353 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3191 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s (B. 153) 1°*, 4121 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Administration of Justice (Exchequer court) 231
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census, 1891) 4111 (ii).
Canals: Cornwall (repairs, &c.) 4311 (ii).
Dominion Police (salaries) 233 (i).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (Cornwall armoury) 863 (i); Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Aultsville wharf) 4217 (ii).
Quarantine (small-pox in N.Y. state) 376 (i).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3627 (ii).
Williamstown Postmaster, Dismissal of Wm. McPherson, &c. (Ques.) 4353 (ii).

Puttee, Mr. A. W., *Winnipeg.*
Alien Labour Law, Cor. between Govt. and C.P.R., &c. (M. for ret*.) 529 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2621 (ii).
Conciliation Act (1900) Amt. (B. 32) 1° m., 881 (i).
'Current Wages' Clause and Govt. Contracts (M. for ret*.) 631 (i).

Puttee, Mr. A. W.—*Con.*
Employees killed, &c. on Canadian Rys. (Ques.) 410 (i).
Govt. Rys., Wages of Trackmen, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3706 (ii).
Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2863 (ii).
Moncton and Charlottetown, Govt. Ry. Shops, Number of Employes, &c. (Ques.) 614 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2062 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4037 (ii).
Prohibition. *See* 'Referendum.'
Ry. Contracts and Current Wages Clause, Number, &c. (M. for ret*.) 631 (i).
Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3728 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3208 (ii).
Referendum Act of 1902, Pet. from Man. Prohibition Alliance (Ques.) 785 (i).
Shoe Workers' Union, Quebec, Pet. to Govt. &c. (M. for copy*) 2473 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3382 (ii).
Civil Govt.: Labour Dept. (salaries) 193 (i).
Customs (coal oil inspection) 3301 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1157 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2989 (ii).
Post Office (branch offices) 3884 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Generally (contract or day labour) 689, 707; Man. (renewals, &c.) 831; Ottawa (royal mint) 560; Harbours and Rivers, Man. (St. Andrew's Rapids) 604 (i).
Railways: I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 3807.
Trackmen's Wages: *See* 'Govt.'
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Ry. Management, &c. (Ques.) 2942 (ii).
Yukon, Employment of Japanese (Ques.) 242 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *South Grenville.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census expenses) 4434.
Canals: Galops (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4021; North Channel (dam) 4034; Rapide Plat (Gilbert Bros.) 4021 (ii).
Fisheries (Noble Bros., award, &c.) 4238 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 2995 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses, repairs) 4222 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Dom. steamers, repairs, &c.) 4221; (Str. *Rothesay*) 4221 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Alexandria reformatory) 4184; (Brockville drill hall) 4182; Ottawa (electric lighting) 4189; (Major's Hill Park) 4181; (Rideau Hall, improvements) 4188; Yukon (employees, &c.) 4198; (rents, &c., judges residences) 4190; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Ecum Secum wharf) 4210; (Ingonish breakwater) 4211; Que. (Valleyfield channel) 4216; Roads and Bridges, N.W.T. (Belly River bridge) 4218; Slides and Booms (Shawinigan boom) 4218; (working expenses) 4220; Telegraphs — Yukon (pole contract) 4169; (supplies) 4159; (Str. *Tyrian*) 4220 (ii).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *Maclaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4400 (ii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Windmill, Battle of, Pensions (Ques.) 238 (i).
——— (M. for pet.*) 3724 (ii).

Richardson, Mr. M. K., *South Grey.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1876 (i).
Holstein, Dismissal of Postmaster, Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4927, 4933 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3966 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3383 (ii).
Post Office (Holstein, postmaster, dismissal) 3875 (ii).

Riley, Mr. G., *Victoria, B.C.*
British Columbia and Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 36) 1°*, 961 (i).

Robinson, Mr. J., *West Elgin.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 107 (i).
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1554 (i).
Butter and Cheese Weighing Commission, Rep., &c. (Ques.) 1684 (i).
Drainage across Ry. Lands (B. 6) 1°m., 238; 2°m., 789 (i).
Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4058 (ii).
Prorogation (remarks) 5082 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 467 (i); in Com., 3176 (ii).
Railway Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2451 (i).
——— Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 131 (i).
S. A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3362 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3389; (experimental farms) 2893; (fruit inspection) 2588, (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 361; (*Patent Record*) 334 (i).
Immigration (agents, salaries, &c.) 3009 (ii).
Indian Affairs: Ont. and Que. (grants to Munceys) 3048 (ii).
Post Office (outside service) 3893 (ii).
Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 696; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Midland harbour) 1238; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 572 (i).
Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4382 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W., *Halifax.*
Financial Situation, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4855 (ii).
S. A. War—Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3856 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Militia (pay and allowance) 2510 (ii).
Public Works: Roads and Bridges (hearing, difficulty, &c.) 4149 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Agricultural Implements exported in 1901, Rebate, &c. (M. for ret.*) 440 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2107 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2620 (ii).

Gilbert Blasting & Dredging Co., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 3155 (ii).

Govt. Business, Private Bills (remarks) 3925 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ques.) 4351 (ii).

McCormick Binder, Customs Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 441 (i).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4495 (ii).

Man. and N.W.T. Timber Limits, Sale by Govt., Names of Purchasers, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1133.

——— (Ques.) 885 (i).

Medical Council in Can. B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1122 (i).

S. A. War—Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3850 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census cheques) 4101.
Dom. Lands (Man. school lands) 4252 (ii).
Excise (coal oil inspection) 1149, 1156 (i) ; (grain standards) 4258 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 547 (i).
Interior : N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, &c.) 3093 (ii).
Justice : Miscellaneous (travelling allowance, Man. Judges) 4265 (ii).
Miscellaneous (miners' relief, &c.) 4257 (ii).
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers, Man. (Mossey river) 1276 (i).
Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1199 (i).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 916 (i).

Roddick, Mr. T. G., *Montreal, St. Antoine's.*

Medical Council in Can. Establishment (B. 11) 1°m., 408 ; 2°m., 1110 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1131 ; in Com., 2474 (i) ; (amt.) 4438 ; 3°m., 4441 ; on Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii).

— — (remarks) 4245 (ii).

Rosamond, Mr. B., *North Lanark.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1964 (i).

North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census expenses) 4434 ; (experimental farms) 2869 (ii).
Canals : Lachine (waste weir) 4308 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 2543 (ii).
Railways : P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4290 (ii).

Yarn admitted Duty Free, Regulations, &c. (Ques.) 4125 (ii).

Ross, Hon. Wm., *Victoria, N.S.*

Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 882 (i).

Ross. Hon. Wm.—*Con.*

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to present Rep. of Com., 4693 (ii).

Divorce Court and Senate Proceedings (remarks) 4122 (ii).

Govt. Rys. Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3714 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2863 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1216 (i).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor., &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4753 (ii).

Market Gardeners, Protection *re* Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3661 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddock*) on M. for 2°, 1132 (i).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Captain Bernier, 3968 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3729 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3385 ; (fruit inspection) 2597 ; (poultry stations) 2650 (ii) ; (*Year-Book*) 338 (i), 2820 (ii).
Customs (coal oil inspection) 3301 (ii).
Indians : N.S. (medical attendance) 3052 (i).
Justice : Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3600 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4227 (ii).
Miscellaneous (conference of Colonial Ministers) 4333 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance, &c.) 510 (i).
Post Office (branch offices) 3888 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings—Dom. (immigration sheds, repairs, &c.) 978 ; N.S. (Iona Wharf) 1002 (i) ; Yukon (official residences) 4546 (ii) ; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Boularderie wharf) 998 (i) ; (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001 ; P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1017 ; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 566 (ii) ; Telegraphs, Yukon (rates, &c.) 4177 (ii).
Quarantine (Stewart, Capt. D. C.) 2917 (ii).
Railways : I.C.R. (general vote) 3465 (ii).

Trackmen's Wages : *See* Govt.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 916, 941 (i).

Yukon Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4468 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W., *South Ontario.*

Immigration to Can., Jan. 1 to May 1, 1902 (Ques.) 4697 (ii).

Judge of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3943 (ii).

North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier (remarks) 3977 (ii).

N.W.M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2494 (ii).

Ross, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2875; (general statistics) 2838; (*Year Book*) 2816 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1169, 1180 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts) 388 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (general vote) 3440 (ii).

Yukon Representation in H. of C., B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4469 (ii).

Russell, Mr. B., *Hants.*

B.N.A. Act. *See* 'Property and Civil Rights.'

Criminal Code (1902) Act Amt. (B. 108) 1° m., 2567 (ii).

Halifax Longshoremen's Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 2859 (ii).

Property and Civil Rights, Uniformity of Law, &c. (prop. Res.) 1067 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*, on M. to ref. back to Com., 3212 (ii).

Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2672 (ii).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Fraudulent Sale Act, Inspection *re* Commercial Commodities (Ques.) 744 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) in Com., 3185, 3194 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (poultry shipments) 2645.

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 691; (Montreal examining warehouse) 691 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2089 (ii).

C.P.Ry. Act Amt. B. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 3129 (ii).

C.P.R. Lands, Taxation, on M. for Ways and Means, 5070 (ii).

——— Test Case (remarks) 5072 (ii).

——— *See* 'Ry. Lands.'

Can. Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 2054.

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., Conc. (M.) 1322 (i).

Govt. Business, Private Bills (remarks) 3923 (ii).

Horses imported into Man. and N.W.T., Customs Valuation, &c., Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1208 (i).

Library of Parlt., 2nd Rep. of Com., Conc. (M). 4644 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4504 (ii).

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1986 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. (B. 42) 1°*, 1063 (i).

——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. (amt. *re* fire guards) 4581, 4594 (ii).

Ry. Lands, N.W.T., Acreage patented, &c. (Ques.) 2677 (ii).

——— *See* 'Town.'

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to refer back to Com., 3216 (ii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

S. A. Contingents, Land Grants to, &c. (Ques.) 1446 (i), 3831 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1160 (i).

Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (prov. autonomy, expenditure, &c.) 3064, 3089, 3116, 4949 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3603, 3615 (ii).

Post Office (N.W.T. postal facilities) 4942 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (western transportation) 4555 (ii).

Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4905 (ii).

Town Sites, N W. Ter., Land Grants and Govt. Policy (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404.

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 919 (i).

Sherritt, Mr. J., *North Middlesex.*

Crathie, Postmaster, Resignation, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).

Crediton P.O., Decease of Postmaster, Notice, &c. (Ques.) 3308 (ii).

London Drill Shed, Allotment of Armouries, &c. (Ques.) 1446 (i).

Springbank Postoffice, Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 2896 (ii).

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 1222; (St. Joseph wharf) 1247, 1256 (i).

Sifton, Hon. Clifford (Minister of the Interior) *Brandon.*

Boundary Line through Detroit River (Ans.) 242.

C.P.Ry. Act (tolls) Amt. B. 116 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 2938 (ii).

C. P. Ry. Lands patented, Acreage, &c. up to 1902 (Ans.) 1988 (i).

——— Taxes, Exemption, &c. (Ans.) 1988 (i).

——— (remarks) 5055, 5072 (ii).

——— *See* 'Town.'

Dom. Lands Act Amt. (B. 120) 1° m., 3127; in Com., 3769, 3832 (ii).

Eilbeck, R. J., Appnmt. as Sheriff (Ans.) 411.

Game Preservation Act (unorganized Ters.) Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 2941; in Com., 3769 (ii).

Geological Survey Rep. (presented) 2659 (ii).

Govt. Business, Private Bills (remarks) 3924 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. Pet. to Sel. Com., 2717, 3123; in Com., 4684 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. (B. 112) 1° m., 2850; in Com., 3734, 3748; 3° m., 3927, 3929; on Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii).

Immigration during 1892 (Ans.) 244 (i).

——— to Can., Jan. 1 to May 1, 1902 (Ans.) 4698 (ii).

——— General Statement, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2966 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Interior, Deptl. Rep., Illustrations, &c. (Ans.) 4352 (ii).

——— Rep. (presented) 160 (i).

Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5056 (ii).

Labour needed in Man. *re* Crops, Cable *re* (Ans.) 247 (i).

Land Titles Act (registration) Amt. (B. 149) 1° m., 3919; in Com., 4357 (ii).

Longueuil Govt. Farm, Sale, &c. (Ans.) 2456 (ii).

Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4496 (ii).

Man. School Lands Fund, &c. (Ans.) 2942 (ii).

——— Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3035 (ii).

Miller Creek Concessions (remarks) 4427, 4465 (ii).

North-west Ter. Act Amt. (B. 121) 1° m., 3127; in Com., 3773 (ii).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4346 (ii).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).

Ry. Act (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4583, 4588 (ii).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. (B. 133) 1° m., 3305; in Com., 3774 (ii).

Roseau River Indian Reserve (Ans.) 247 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 180 (i); Indian Affairs (clerical assistance) 3037; (salaries) 3035; Interior (clerical assistance) 3062; (salaries) 3061 (ii).

Dom. Lands (L. E. Fontaine, allowance, &c.) 4256; (Man. school lands) 4252; (salaries, &c.) 4117; (surveys) 4953 (ii).

Geological Survey (director, &c.) 4116; (international boundary survey) 4250; (map engraving) 4948 (ii).

Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2988; (contingencies, printing, &c.) 3029, 4248 (ii).

Indians: B.C. (industrial schools) 3059; (medical attendance) 3058, 4247; Generally (half-breed commission) 4954; (inspectors) 3060; (legal expenses *re* liquor traffic) 3061; (printing, &c.) 3060; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 3054; (destitute, &c.) 3056; (grist and saw mills) 3057; (seeds, &c.) 3056; (Sioux) 3056; (treaty expenses) 3057; N.B. (medical attendance) 3052; N.S. (seed grain) 3050; Ont., &c. (grants to agricultural societies) 3048; (liquor traffic suppression) 3049; (medical attendance) 3038; (Munceys, grant, &c.) 3048; (St. Regis) 3038; (schools) 3043; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3053 (ii).

Interior: Miscellaneous (Banff museum) 4953; (boundary surveys) 4953; (maps, &c.) 4954; N.W.T. Govt. (provincial autonomy, &c.) 3084, 3097, 4251, 4948; (registrars) 4251 (ii).

Miscellaneous (assay office, Vancouver) 4117; (Banff park) 4118; (gratuity to Mrs. White) 4256; (litigation expenses, Interior) 4119; (miners, Dease and Liard, relief, &c.) 4257; (Saskatchewan settlers, relief) 4257 (ii).

Quarantine (Porter, A. E., claim) conc., 5034.

Railways: Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4877 (ii).

Yukon (Treadgold concessions) 4950 (ii).

Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4410 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia (Ans.) 241, 243 (i).

Yukon Territory Act Amt. (B. 119) 1° m., 3126; in Com., 3832, 4484, 4529 (ii).

——— Representation in House of Commons (B. 134) 1° m., 3306; in Com., 3774, 4466, 4579; on Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii).

——— Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2069 (i).

——— Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4986 (ii).

——— (Ans.) 241 (i).

——— interpretation of O. Cs., &c. (Ans.) 2456.

Smith, Mr. E. D., *South Wentworth.*

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1459.

Cooling Fans for Steamships, &c. (Ques.) 616, 882 (i).

Hamilton and Guelph Mail Contract, Tenders, &c. (M. for copy*) 3724 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings—N.W.T. (day labour or contract system) 846; Ont. (Dundas, armoury) 716; (Dundas, P.O.) 720; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte harbour) 1226; (Burlington, channel) 846; (Burlington, pier) 1226; (Goderich harbour) 1233; (Port Colborne) 610; (St. Mary's river) 603; Que. (Montreal harbour) 608; (St. Lawrence transportation) 598 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1200 (i).

Transatlantic, Transpacific or W. Indian Trade, Contracts with Govt. *re* Subsidies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 632 (i).

VanWagner, Lt.-Col., Investigation *re* Removal (Ques.) 616 (i).

Smith, Mr. R., *Vancouver.*

Alien Restriction Act Amt. (B. 122) 1° m., 3127.

B. C. Legislation, Disallowance of Acts, &c., on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for copies of Cor., 138 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1569 (i).

Ry. Act (safety of employees) Amt. (B. 92) 1°*, 2064 (i).

Ry. Labour Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3731 (ii).

Rossland Miners' Union and Alien Labour Act, Letters, &c. *re* (M. for copies*) 2471 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Buildings—Que. (contract or day labour) 690 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. L. P. Brodeur) *Rouville.*

Addington Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).

Adjournments of Hse. (remarks) 157 (i).

Aliens Restriction Act Amt. B. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) on M. for 1°, 882 (i).

Beauce Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).

Beauharnois Electoral District, Judge's Certificate (presented) 610 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty, on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Monk*) *re* Letter of Sir Louis Davies (ruling) 761, 762 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Haggart*) *re* Letters being read (ruling) 812, 825, 827 (i).
——— ref. to past Debate (ruling) 753, 756 (i).
Budget, The, Order, Ques. of (ruling) 1919 (i).
Cabinet Changes (remarks) 414 (i).
Chicoutimi Electoral District, Dismissal of Petition, 2219 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection, Remarks checked, 5077 (ii).
Elections, Controverted, Beauharnois, Burrard, Victoria, B.C., Two Mountains, Terrebonne, Judges Certificates (presented) 2 (i).
——— Durham, York and Lisgar, Judges Certificates (presented) 1 (i).
——— Ottawa City, Cornwall, Charlotte, Ontario, Bruce, Judges Certificates (presented) 2 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (ruling) 1204 (i).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 1489 (i).
Dismissals of Govt. Employees for political Reasons (ruling) 429 (i).
Employees of H. of C., Transportation to Homes (remarks) 5056 (ii).
Financial Situation, &c., Members' Remarks checked, 4854 (ii).
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) on M. for Com. (irregularity of debate) 4656 (ii).
——— Members' Remarks checked, 4665 (ii).
Greek Catholic Orthodox Church, Pet. *re* incorp., on M. (Mr. *Oliver*) to ref. back to Com. (ruling) 3125 (ii).
——— on M. for 2° (remarks) 3866 (ii).
——— (ruling) 3304 (ii).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditures, on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup. (ruling) 3236 (ii).
Kamouraska Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Kingston, Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Laval Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Library of Parliament, Report (presented) 7 (i).
Lisgar Electoral District, Certificate (presented) 881 (i).
L'Islet Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).
Market Gardeners, &c. (ruling) 3652 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Members addressing the Chair (ruling) 113 (i).
——— Introduced, 3, 68, 121 (i).
——— Remarks checked, 3924 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex. (read) 121, 154, 785 (i), 3918, 4354, 5030 (ii).
Montreal (St. James) Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 2 (i).
Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4569 (ii).
Oxford Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bell*) Ques. of Order, ref. to past Deb. (ruling) 2731 (ii).
Petitions, Irregularity of (ruling) 2145, 2218 (i).
Preferential Trade, &c., Ques. of Order (ruling) 2807, 2809 (ii).
——— Ref. to previous Deb. (ruling) 2946 (ii).
Procedure *re* Bills, 611 (i).
Prorogation, Comn. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 5032 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 1st and 2nd Rep., on M. to conc., 810 (i).
Quebec Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Queens, W. (P.E.I.) Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. B. 86, Ques. of Order (ruling) 3224 (ii).
S. A. War, British Supremacy, Members' remarks checked, 3358 (ii).
——— Canadian Soldiers, Conduct *re* Par. in *Daily News*, Ques. of Order, 2070 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 4 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals: Trent (remarks checked) 5047; (remarks) conc., 5035 (ii).
Legislation: H. of C. (debates) 4341 (ii); (salaries) 234; (sessional clerks) 235 (i); Library of Parlt. (statutes of Can.) 4966 (ii).
Two Mountains Electoral District, Certificates received, 1323 (i).
Vacancies, Notification, 2 (i).
Victoria, B.C., Certificate of Election (notification) 65 (i).
York, W. (Ont.) Electoral Division (notification of vacancy) 3 (i).
Speaker, Mr. Deputy (Mr. Peter Macdonald) *East Huron.*
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2195, 2219 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection, in Com. of Sup., Ques. of Order (ruling) 1170 (i).
Man. Grain Act Amt. B. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com. (amts. read) 4355 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 2°, 1118; in Com., 2475 (i).
——— (M.) to employ Stenographer, 1672 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4569 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. *Belcourt*) ruling, 4523 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 470 (i); (amt. read) 3176 (ii).
——— (ruling) 3177 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co's. incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com. (amt.) read, 1678.

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Public Works: (members called to order) 689 (i), 4149 ; Dredging (members' remarks checked) 4767 ; Harbours and Rivers (members' remarks checked) 4561 (ii).

Railways : I. C. R., Members' remarks checked, 3559 (ii).

Transportation on St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on Ques. of Order (ruling) 3684 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 96 (i).

Auditor General's Rep., Publication in Parts, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 775 (i).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) 1737 (i).

Buffalo and International Ry. Co's. B. 31 (Mr *Osler*) in Com., 1623 (i).

Cabinet Changes (remarks) 416 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co's. B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2610 (ii).

Canada Southern Ry. Co's. B. 7 (Mr. *Ingram*) in Com., 1279 (i).

Cattle Embargo by G. B., on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 3986 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. *Bourassa*) for Ret., 141 (i).

Canso Strait Bridge Co. incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2194 (i).

Census Enumeration, 1891 and 1901, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4572 (ii).

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 830 (i).

Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c. (remarks) 2298 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt, of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2462 (i).

Crown Bank of Canada incorp. B. 79 (Mr. *Guthrie*) in Com., 2607 (ii).

Dom. Bank Notes, Circulation, &c. from 1892 to 1901 (Ques.) 615 (i).

Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden*, Halifax) to Com. of Sup. 4847 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal Co's. B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4414 (ii).

Grain Importations through Western Ports in 1901, Number of Bushels, &c. (Ques.) 246, 782 (i).

Greek Catholic Church, Incorporation B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. to ref. Pet. to Com., 2718; in Com., 4672 (ii).

Holstein Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).

Immigration, on M. for Com. of Sup., (remarks) 2972 (ii).

Immigration Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3762; on M. for 3°, 3930 ; on Sen. Amts., 4802 (ii).

Intercolonial Conference with Imp. Govt., Cor. &c., on M. for Com. of Sup., 4748 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditures, Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3235, 3257 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act. (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3309 ; in Com. on B., 3943 (ii).

Labour (Ry.) Disputes Settlement B. 146 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 3728 (ii).

Land Titles Act Amt. B. 149 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 4357 (ii).

Leeds and Grenville, Jr. Judge, Appnmt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4701 (ii).

Library of Parlt., 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. *Scott*) to conc., 4646 (ii).

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com., 4358 (ii).

Longshoremen's Strike at Halifax (remarks) 2861 (ii).

McDougall, Capt., Award for Life Saving (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 962 (i).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2475 (i), 4438 ; on Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co's. incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4424, 4522 (ii).

N. W. M. Police Act. (ass't. commissioner) Amt. B. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com. on Res., 3511 (ii).

——— Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) on prop. Res., 808 (i) ; in Com., 2484, 3314 (i).

Ottawa City Improvement B. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) on M. for 1°, 4344 ; in Com., 4606 (ii).

Personal Explanation, Report of Speech (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 962 (i).

Post Office Act Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) on M. for 1°, 2482 ; in Com., 4037, 4055 (ii).

Precedence in Can. at Official Functions, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria) 436 (i).

Preferential Trade with the Empire, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2743 (ii).

Private Bills, Extension of Time (remarks) 780 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3922 (ii).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment (remarks) 3778 (ii).

Ry. Act (cattle-guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 457 (i).

——— Commission and Consolidation Amt. B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2438, 2446 (i).

——— (expropriation) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. *Blair*) in Com., 4597 (ii).

Railway Companies incorp. B. 110 (Mr. *Guthrie*) on M. for 1°, 2848 (ii).

Reciprocity in Trade, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 289 (i).

Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co's. B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3207, 3209 (ii).

Rocky Mountain Park Act (extension) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3774 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Issue of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 888 (i).

St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Burcau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

Sessional Clerks employed in Civil Service (Ques.) 619 (i).

S.A. War, British Supremacy and Terms of Peace, on Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) to Com. of Sup., 3340 (ii).

——— Canadian Beef excluded from Imp. Contracts, on Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3846 (ii).

——— Commissions on Outlay, &c. (Ques.) 1063 (i).

Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1676 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice (Exchequer court) 231 (i) ; (Leeds and Grenville, jr. judge) 4966 ; Supreme Court (O'Regan, Jas., salary) 4965 (ii) ; (Supreme court) 218 (i).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i) ; (census) 3368, 4093, 4430 ; (cold storage) 2575 ; (experimental farms) 2867, 2891 ; (fruit inspection) 2587, 2603, 2624 (ii) ; (general statistics) 340 (i) ; 2828 (ii) ; (Japan exposition) 4966 (ii) ; (Pan-American exposition) 360 (i) ; (St. Louis exposition) 4966 ; (*Year-Book*) 2815, 2826 (ii).

Canals : Carillon (guide piers) 4281 ; (Culbute (damages, &c.) 4282 ; Galops (deepening, &c.) 4024, 4301 ; (Gilbert Dredging Co.) 4024 ; (revotes, &c.) 4281, 4282 ; Sault Ste. Marie (entrances, &c.) 4003 ; Soulanges (construction, &c.) 4019 ; Trent (dredging, &c.) 4271 (ii).

Charges of Management (clerical assistance) 4324 (ii) ; (printing Dom. Notes) 172 (i), 4533 ; (redemption) 4324 ; conc., 4342 (ii).

Civil Govt. : Agriculture (clerical assistance) 205 ; (salaries) 177 ; Aud. General (clerical assistance) 204 ; (salaries) 175 (i) ; Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 4317 ; (Civil Service Examiners) 4315 (ii) ; Customs (clerical assistance) 208 ; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 172 ; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 180 ; House of Commons (additional rooms) 214 (i) ; Indian Affairs (clerical assistance) 3037 ; (salaries, &c.) 3036 (ii) ; Inland Revenue (clerical assistance) 207 ; (salaries) 176 ; Interior Dept. (clerical assistance) 203 (i) ; (salaries) 3061-2 (ii) ; Labour Dept. (clerical assistance) 213 ; (salaries) 183, 194 ; Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 204 ; (salaries) 177 ; N.W.M. Police (clerical assistance) 212 ; (salaries) 174 ; Post Office Dept. (clerical assistance) 211 ; (salaries) 179 ; Printing and Stationery (clerical assistance) 200 ; (Privy Council (salaries) 173 ; Public Works (printing, &c.) 209 ; (salaries) 179 ; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 530 (i).

Dom. Lands (surveys) 4953 (ii).

Excise : Weights and Measures (metric system) 4962 (ii).

Fisheries (bounty cheques) 555 ; (hatcheries, &c.) 550 (i), 4959 ; (Noble Bros.' claim) 4957 (ii) ; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 534 ; (protection service) 552 (i).

High Commissioner's Office (contingencies) 4326 (ii).

Hydrographic Surveys (Lake Huron, &c.) 528.

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians : Generally (legal expenses *re* liquor traffic) 3061 ; Man., &c. (agricultural implements) 3054 ; (saw mills, &c.) 3057 ; Ont. and Que. (Cornwall) 3038 ; (liquor traffic suppression) 3049 ; (Manitoulin) 3041 ; (medical attendance) 3037 ; (schools) 3043 ; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3054 (ii).

Interior : Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 4953 ; (maps, &c.) 4954 (ii).

Justice : Miscellaneous (Farewell, J. C., payments to) 4269 ; (witness fees) 4267 ; Penitentiaries (inspector Dawson) 4267 (ii).

Legislation : House of Commons (debates) 4327, 4342 (ii) ; (general printing) 237 (i) ; (paper, binding, &c.) conc., 4343 (ii) ; (printing laws, &c.) 237 ; (salaries) 234 ; (sessional clerks) 235 (i) ; (stationery) 4326 (ii) ; (voters' lists) 237 ; Library (books) 237 (i) ; (printing) 4327 (ii) ; (salaries) 236 (i) ; (sessional messengers) 4966 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers' salaries) 517 ; (scientific institutions) 527 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and France) 4332 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 2533 ; (Coronation contingent) 4263 ; (Esquimalt defences) 2565 ; (pay and allowance) 2516, 2524 ; (rifle ranges) 2566 ; (Royal Military College) 2562 ; (supplies, remounts, &c.) 2559 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese commission) 4340 ; (Coronation expenses of Ministers) 4332 ; (Eastern Extension arbitration) 4340 ; (Imp. conference of Ministers) 4332 ; (law books) 4267 ; (Marconi construction) 4338 ; (Nipissing election expenses) 4339 ; (Printing Bureau plant) 4956 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection expenses) 517 ; (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 506 ; (life-saving rewards) 514 (i) ; (Str. *Newfield*) 4958 (ii) ; (tidal service) 515 (i).

Post Office (automobiles) 3872 ; Outside Service (salaries) 3867 (ii).

Public Works : Buildings—B. C. (William's Head station) 4614 (ii) ; Dom. (clerks of Works, &c.) 876 ; (experimental farms, renewals) 875 ; (quarantine stations) 980 ; Man. (renewals, &c.) 833 ; N. W. T. (Carnduff court-house) 836 ; (Edmonton jail) 850, 856 ; (Macleod court-house) 852 (i) ; (Red Deer, court-house) 852 (i), 4613 (ii) ; Red Deer, immigrant shed) 853 (i) ; (Saskatoon immigrant shed) 4614 ; (Yorkton court-house) 4613 (ii) ; Ont. (armouries) 868 ; (Clinton) 719 ; (Cobourg armoury) 721 ; (Fort William) 728 ; Ottawa (additional rooms, H. of C.) 561 (i) ; (eastern block repairs) 4565 (ii) ; Ont. (Royal Military College) 729 ; (Toronto Junction) 734 (i) ; (Toronto Junction P.O.) 4566 ; (Toronto P.O., alterations) 4566 (ii) ; (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 733 ; Que. (contract or day labour) 683 ; (Lévis cattle quarantine) 667 ; (Montreal, examining warehouse) 683 (i) ; (Montreal, P.O.) 4564 (ii) ; (Que., immigrant building, Louise Embankment) 709 ; (military building, Que.) 709 (i) ; (St. Hyacinthe) 711 (i), 4564 (ii) ; (Valleyfield) 718 (i), 4564 (ii) ; Yukon (official residences, &c.) 4539 (ii) ; (rents, repairs, &c.) 967 (i) ; (supplies, wood, &c.) 4539 ; Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 4768 ; (vessels, repairs, &c.) 4763 (ii) ; Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia river dredging) 1276 ; (Skeena river) 1277 (i) ; Man. (Lake St. Francis piers) 4642 ; Winnipegosis, dredging) 4642 ; N.S. (Amagandus wharf) 4616 ; (Big Pond wharf) 4621 ; (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 ; (Glace Bay) 4622 (ii) ;

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Con.

(Larry's River breakwater) 1002 (i); Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 4637; (Big Bay wharf) 4637; (Burlington channel) 4637; (Collingwood, dredging) 4638; (Goderich harbour) 4640; (Hilton wharf) 4640; (Kaministiquia dredging) 4563 (ii); (Meaford harbour) 1236 (i); (Orillia wharf) 4641; (Penetanguishene, dredging) 4641; (Port Colborne) 4557; (Port Elgin pier) 4641 (ii); (St. Joseph wharf) 1249, 1255; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1243; (Southampton harbour) 1245 (i); (South Nation river) 4642 (ii); (Wolfe Island channel) 1242 (i); Que. (Batiscan, dredging) 4629; (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; (Cross Point) 4630; (Quebec harbour) 4549; (Rivière aux Renards pier) 4632; (St. Laurent wharf) 4634 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 465 (i); Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3290; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4776 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 373; (Public Works Health Act) 404 (i); (slaughter compensation) 4968; (unorganized districts) 2904 (ii).

Railways (Drummond County) 3515; Generally (Ry. commission) 4305; I.C.R. (operation and maintenance) 4310; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 4287, 4292; Yukon (Mackenzie & Mann award) 4897 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 527; (meteorological service) 527 (i).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 4963; (iron and steel bounties) 4331 (ii).

Weights and Measures (binder twine inspection) 4963 (ii).

Supreme Court (assistant judges) B. 77 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 1674 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) on M. for 1°, 736 (i).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4383 (ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff (beet root sugar machinery) in Com. on Res., 4973 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 928 (i).

Windsor and Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1621 (i).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) on Sen. Amts., 4571 (ii).

Yukon (police magistrates) Act Amt. B. 137 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com. on Res., 3309 (ii).

——— Representation in H. of C. B. 134 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3775 (ii).

——— Ter. Act. (council) Amt. B. 119 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3832 (ii).

Stephens, Mr. G., *Kent, Ont.*

British American Life Ins. Co.'s incorp. (B. 90) 1°*, 2064 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 465 (i).

SUPPLY:

Customs (salaries, &c., Dresden Port) 2925 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1177 (i).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c. 399 (i).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1188 (i).

Stewart, Mr. D. A., *Lisgar.*

SUPPLY:

Justice: Penitentiaries — Kingston (binder twine) 3611 (ii).

Sutherland, Hon. James (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) *North Oxford.*

Belleville Harbour Commissioners, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 450 (i).

B.C. Fisheries, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) 3308 (ii).

Bronte Harbour Lighthouse, Erection, &c. (Ans.) 134 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) in Com., 2612, 2664 (ii).

Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) in Com., 2888 (ii).

Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. for 2°, 4571 (ii).

Commodities Packing and Sale B. 141 (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Crediton P. O., Decease of Postmaster, Notice, &c. (Ans.) 3308 (ii).

Dismissals of Govt. Employees for Political Reasons, on M. (Mr. *Bell*) for Ret., 428 (i).

Employees killed, &c., on Canadian Rys. (Ans.) 410 (i).

Fish Canners, B.C., and Prof. Prince's Remarks (Ans.) 449, 613 (i).

Fishing Gear, P.E.I., Confiscation, &c. (Ans.) 1440 (i).

Fishery Regulations (1893) Modification by Govt. (Ans.) 3307 (ii).

Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) in Com., 4570 (ii).

Greek Catholic Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) on M. for 2°, 3866; in Com., 4689 (ii).

Hurley, Mr. J. M., Charges *re* West Hastings Election (stmnt. read) 4968 (ii).

I. C. R., Locomotives, Construction, Steaming Qualities, &c. (Ans.) 445 (i).

——— Moncton, and P.E.I. Ry. Shops, Number of Employees, &c (Ans.) 615 (i).

——— Ties and Sleepers, Quantity purchased (Ans.) 445 (i).

Joint Stock Co.'s B. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 5062 (ii).

Kemp, Mr. Ernest, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 135 (i).

Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 129, 408 (i).

North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3131 (ii).

Oyster Culture in Shediac Harbour, &c. (Ans.) 746, 1444 (i).

Oyster Fishing Protection, Regulations, &c. (Ans.) 135 (i).

Picton Public Buildings, Delay in Opening, &c. (Ans.) 1490 (i).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Wharfage collected (Ans.) 132 (i).

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*
Prince County Fishing Licenses, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 1065 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) for Ret., 167 (i).
Prince, Prof., Remarks *re* Fish Canners (Ans.) 449, 613 (i).
Private Bills, Suspension of Rules (remarks) 4465 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., Absence of Chairman (remarks) 3920 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 457 ; agreed to (Y. 90 ; N. 50) 480 (i).
Ry. Freight Rates, Prof. McLean's Rep. (Ans.) 448 (i).
Ry. Lands, N.W.T., Acreage patented, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3215 (ii).
Red Horse Shoal Light, Keeper's Salary, &c. (Ans.) 443 (i).
Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. B. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) in Com., 2671 (ii).
——— Manufacture, &c., Remarks in Com. on Ways and Means, 4975 (ii).
St. John and Halifax Govt. Elevators (Ans.) 612.
St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Issue of Commission, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 888 (i).
Sandhills, P.E.I., Range Lights, Removal, &c. (Ans.) 1064 (i).
Smallpox on Schr. *Jeanie Myrtle*, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5019 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 2021 (i).
Subsidies to Rys. since 1901 (Ans.) 448 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt. : Marine and Fisheries (clerical assistance) 205 ; (salaries) 177 (i) ; (Tyrwhitt, Mr., salary) 4958 (ii) ; Public Works (salaries) 179 (i).
Fisheries (bounty cheques) 553 ; (breeding establishments) 550 ; (Can. exhibit) 553 ; (cold storage, deep sea) 558 ; (hatcheries) 550 (i) ; (hatcheries, B.C.) 4225 ; (hatcheries, Georgian Bay) 4959 ; (herring slaughter) 4224 ; (inspectors' salaries) 4228 (ii) ; (McDougall, Capt., life-saving reward) 533 (i) ; (Noble Bros. award, &c.) 4234 (ii) ; (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 535 ; (oyster culture) 555 ; (protection service, B.C.) 552 (i) ; (salmon and lobster hatchery) 4223 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys : (Lake Huron, &c.) 528, 533 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Halifax harbour) 4227 (ii) ; (lighthouse repairs) 526 (i), 4222 (ii) ; (lightkeepers, salaries) 518, 521 (i) ; (St. Lawrence navigation) 5024 (ii) ; (Traverse light) 527 (i).
Ocean and River Service (biological station) 516 ; (cattle inspection, &c.) 517 (i) ; (Dom. steamers, repairs, &c.) 506 (i), 4221 ; (furnishing crew for new strs. built in Scotland) 4958 (ii) ; (life-saving rewards) 514, 515 ; (McDougall, Capt., reward) 533 ; (masters and mates, examination) 513 (i) ; (Str. *Newfield*)

Sutherland, Hon. James—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service—Con. 4958 ; (Str. *Rothesay*) 4222 (ii) ; (winter mail service) 516 (i).
Public Works : Buildings—Ont. (St. Catharines drill hall) 716 ; Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Ottawa river) 1240 (i) ; Que. (wharf charges) 4636 (ii).
Quarantine (smallpox) 4968 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 527 ; (meteorological service) 527 (i).
Tiverton SS., Grounding, &c., Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 2856 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3626 (ii).
Trent Valley and Rice Lake Canals, Rep. of Engineer (Ans.) 411 (i).
Welland Canal, Water Privileges (Ans.) 409 (i).
Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) in Com., 1621 (i).
Yukon—Treadgold Concession, on M. for Com. of Sup., 4984 (ii).

Sutherland, Mr. R. F., *North Essex.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1807 (i).
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. (B. 55) 1°*, 1323 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works : Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (St. Mary's river) 603 ; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 591 (i).
Quarantine (organized districts, salaries, &c.) 390 (i).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2146 (i).
Market Gardeners, Protection against Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3654 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (general statistics) 2837 ; (*Year-Book*) 2821 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 3027 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (light buoys) 525.
Post Office (charges *re* postmasters) 4940 (ii).
Public Works : Buildings, Que. (Grosse Isle station) 650 ; (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 712.
Railways : I.C.R. (locomotives) 3825 (ii).
Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. for Cor., 912 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I., (Minister of Public Works) *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Address, on Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 90 (i).
Alberton Ry. Station, Location, &c. (Ans.) 1441.
Bronte Harbour, Improvements, Amount expended (Ans.) 133 (i).
Canoe Cove (P.E.I.) Breakwater, Amount expended (Ans.) 3831 (ii).
Cements, Canadian and Foreign, Tests made by Govt. (Ans.) 1442, 1444 (i).
Clegg, Samuel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4699.
Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, &c., Harbours, Improvements (Ans.) 747 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

Debates, Official Reporting (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 964 (i).

Financial Situation, Review, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4840 (ii).

Georgian Bay Canal B. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) in Com., 4412 (ii).

Govt. Rys., Trackmen's Wages, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3713 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) in Com., 4671, 4686 (ii).

Hawbold's Cove, Cost of Breakwater (Ans.) 132.

Hopewell Cape Pier, Date of Completion, &c. (Ans.) 1444 (i).

House of Commons, Central Block, Cost of additional Rooms (Ans.) 1442 (i).

I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Expenditure, &c. on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3270.

——— Shims purchased in 1901, Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 1439 (ii).

——— Steel Rails, Quantity purchased, Clergue's Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1440 (i).

Market Gardeners, Protection from Foreign Competition, on prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3642 (ii).

Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) on M. for 3°, 4457 (ii).

Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4423, 4516 (ii).

North Bay Pier, N.S., Cost, Amount of Work done, &c. (Ans.) 1443 (i).

North Head Breakwater, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1441 (i).

Oakville Harbour, Construction of Docks, &c. 135 (i).

Port Dufferin Wharf, Cost of Shed, Amount collected, &c. (Ans.) 132 (i).

Portland Cements, Tests by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 1442, 1444 (i).

P.E.I., Telegraphic Communication with Mainland, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2730 (ii).

——— Winter Communication, Pets., &c., on M. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) for Ret., 166 (i).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payments, (remarks) 3777 (ii).

———(Ans.) 2457 (i).

Public Works, Rep. (presented) 121 (i).

Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour Works, on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).

Richibucto Pier, Tenderers, &c. (Ans.) 1439 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Expenditure *re* Improvements (Ans.) 248 (i).

Ste. Anne River Works, Timber used, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2858-9 (ii).

St. Lawrence and Great Lakes Waterways, Issue of Commission, prop. Res., on M. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 887 (i).

Scotia, Str., Contract Price, &c. (Ans.) 1440 (i).

Shewen, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 449 (i).

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Public Works (contingencies) 4136; (Desrochers, Mr., increase) 4535 (ii); (printing, &c.) 209; (salaries) 178 (i); (S.E. O'Brien, salary) 4525 (ii).

Customs (American tugs) 3297 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (St. Lawrence navigation) 5029 (ii).

Post Office (Magdalen Islands) 3907 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (Kamloops) 4185 (ii); (Nelson post office) 860 (i); (New Westminster) 4185 (ii); (ren wals, &c.) 857; (Rossland) 861; (Vancouver, drill shed) 876 (i), 4186 (ii); (Vancouver, post office) 857 (i); (Williams Head quarantine) 4614 (ii); Generally (armouries, &c.) 861; (caretakers, engineers, &c.) 987; (clerks of works, &c.) 876 (i); (engineers' salaries, &c.) 4186 (ii); (experimental farms, renewals) 875; (immigrant, repairs, &c.) 975 (i), 4616; (lighting, &c.) 4189, 4615 (ii); (P.O. caretakers) 988; (quarantine stations) 980 (i); (rents) 4615; (repairs, &c.) 4182 (ii); (telephones) 986, 989 (i); (Winnipeg, furnaces, &c.) 4616 (ii); Man. (Winnipeg immigration shed) 834 (i), 4613 (ii); (renewals, &c.) 831; Mar. Provs. (renewals, &c.) 642; N.B. (Marysville) 636; (Richibucto) 641; (St. John) 641; (St. John immigrant shed) 641 (i), 4178 (ii); N.W.T. (Carnduff court-house) 835; (Edmonton jail) 849, 854 (i); (Lethbridge immigrant shed) 4185 (ii); (Macleod court-house) 852; (Red Deer, court-house) 852 (i), 4613 (ii); (immigrant shed) 853; (repairs) 849 (i); (Saskatoon immigrant shed) 4614 (ii); (Yorkton court-house, &c.) 859 (i), 4613 (ii); N. S. (Arichat, repairs) 635; Baddeck armoury) 861; (Halifax custom-house) 635; Ont. (Alexandria reformatory) 4184 (ii); (architects' fees) 730; (Bothwell, &c.) 659; (Clinton) 719; (Cobourg armoury) 721; (Cornwall armoury) 865; (Deseronto) 728; (Dundas post office) 720; (Fort William) 728; (Hamilton warehouse) 4567 (ii); (London drill hall) 729 (i); Ottawa (additional room, H. of C.) 561 (i), 4137 (ii); (astronomical observatory) 560 (1); (eastern block wall) 4565; (electric lighting) 4189, 4616; (elevators, H. of C.) 4137, 4615; (gas, electric lighting) 4616 (ii); (grounds, &c.) 987 (i); (heating, &c.) 4138, 4189; (Major's Hill Park) 4180; (P.O.) 4565 (ii); (rentals, &c.) 964 (i), 4139; (Rideau Hall, drain) 4566; (Rideau Hall, improvements) 4188 (ii); (royal mint) 560 (i); (ventilation, H. of C.) 4140 (ii); (Victoria memorial museum) 564; Ont. (renewals, &c.) 728; (Royal Military College) 729 (i); (St. Catharines drill hall) 4567 (ii); (Sault Ste. Marie) 732; (Toronto, drill shed) 869 (i); (Toronto P. O., alterations) 4566; (Toronto P. O., branch office) 4182, 4565 (ii); (Toronto, renewals, &c.) 733; (Toronto Junction) 733 (i); (Toronto Junction P. O.) 4566 (ii); (Wentworth armoury) 863; P. E. I. (armouries) 874 (i); Que. (cartridge factory) 4180 (ii); (contract or day labour) 693 (i); (Drummondville) 643 (i), 4180 (ii); (Granby) 644; (Grosse Isle station) 644 (i); Lake St. John District) 4179 (ii); (L'Assomption) 656; (Levis, building) 669; (Levis, cattle quarantine) 667; (military buildings—Que.) 709 (i); (Montreal, branch P. O.) 4564 (ii); (Montreal, examining warehouse) 670; (plans, specifications, &c.) 666; (renewals, &c.) 642 (i); (Roberval immigrant shed) 4180 (ii); (St. Hyacinthe drill hall) 710; (St. Laurent) 656; (Thetford Mines) 716; (Valleyfield) 717 (i), 4564; Yukon (Collinet, Mrs., memo.

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Con.
read) 4536; (dismissal of matron, &c.) 4195; (official residences) 4536 (ii); (rentals, repairs, &c.) 967 (i); (rents, &c., judges' residences) 4144, 4190; (wood supply, &c.) 4540; Dredging—B. C. (Victoria harbour) 3286; (plant) 3283; Man. (Lake Manitoba) 3284; (snag boat) 4768; (vessels, repairs, &c.) 4763; N. S. (LaHave River) 3285; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie) 4764 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Columbia River dredging) 1276 (i); (Hardy Bay wharf) 4643; B.C. (Kennedy'sLake outlet) 4642 (ii); (Skeena River) 1277; Man. (Mossey River 1275; (St. Andrews Rapids) 604 (i); (St. Francis outlet pier) 4642; (Winnipegosis, dredging) 4642; Mar. Provs. (generally) 4213; (La Have) 4213; (Oromocto River) 4213; (repairs) 4142 (ii); N. B. (Alma pier) 1031 (i); (Andrews Hollow) 4626 (ii); (Black Brook wharf) 1023 (i); (Campbellton wharf) 4626; (Campobello breakwater) 4626; (Cape Tormentine, creosoted timber) 4627 (ii); (Caraquet wharf) 1023; (Chance Harbour) 1024; (Dipper Harbour breakwater) 1025; (Grand Anse breakwater) 1025; (lumber, price, &c.) 1027; (Negro Point) 1031; (Oromocto wharf) 1030 (i), 4628; (Partridge Island pier) 4628 (ii); (Point Wolfe breakwater) 1026; (Richibucto pier) 1026; (St. John River works) 1030 (i); (Salmon River) 4628; (tidal water wharfs) 4629; N.S. (Amagandus Pond wharf) 4616 (ii); (Arnold's breakwater) 990 (i); (Bailey's Brook wharf) 4620; (Big Pond wharf) 4621 (ii); (Black Point canal) 990; (Boularderie wharf) 997; (Burlington wharf) 999 (i); (Cape Cove breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Cape Tormentine, repairs) 1023 (i); (Charlesville breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Cheticamp Point wharf) 1000 (i); (Cheverie breakwater) 4621; (Church Point breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Clark's Harbour) 994 (i); (Comeau's Hill breakwater) 4621 (ii); (Cow Bay breakwater) 1001 (i); (Cribbon's Point wharf) 4621 (ii); (Drumhead breakwater) 1001 (i), 4622; (Ecum Secum wharf) 4210, 4211 (ii); (Friar's Head harbour) 1002 (i); (Glace Bay) 4622; (Grand River channel) 4622 (ii); (HerringCove breakwater) 1002 (i); (Ingonish breakwater) 4211 (ii); (Iona wharf) 1002; (Larry's River breakwater) 1003; (Lingan Beach) 1004; (Little Bras d'Or wharf) 1004; (Livingstone's Cove wharf) 1004; (Lower Cove breakwater) 1004 (i); (Lunenburg dredging) 4622 (ii); (Mill Cove breakwater) 1008; (Minudie wharf) 1004; (Neil's Harbour) 1004; (New Harbour breakwater) 1005; (Parker's Cove pier) 1006 (i); (Petit Rivière breakwater) 4210 (ii); (Pictou Island) 1009 (i); (Porter's Lake outlet) 4623; (Windsor dams) 4624; Ont. (Amherstburg, dredging) 4637 (ii); (Barrie wharf) 1217; (Bayfield pier) 1217 (i); (Big Bay wharf) 4637 (ii); (Blind River wharf) 1223 (i); (Brockville drill hall) 4182 (ii); (Bronte Harbour) 1226 (i); (Burke's Falls) 4637 (ii); (Burlington Channel) 847 (i), 4637 (ii); (Burlington pier) 1226 (i); (Callendar wharf) 4638; (Cobourg, dredging) 4638 (ii); (Collingwood harbour) 1227 (i), 4638 (ii); (Depot Harbour) 1231 (i); (Georgian Bay, dredging) 4640 (ii); (Goderich harbour) 1232 (i), 4640; (Hilton wharf) 4640; Ont. (Kaministiquia) 4563 (ii); (Kingsville pier) 1236; (Meaford harbour) 1236; (Midland, harbour) 1237 (i); (Midland, wharf) 4641 (ii); (Oakville pier) 1239; (Orillia wharf) 1241 (i), 4641 (ii); (Ottawa River) 1239; (Owen Sound harbour) 1239 (i); (Pelee wharf) 4217; (Penetanguishene wharf) 4641 (ii); (Petewawa Narrows) 1239; (Port Arthur) 599; (Port Colborne) 609 (i), 4557, 4616; (Port Elgin pier) 4641 (ii); (Port Hope) 1239; (Presqu'Isle wharf) 1239; (St. Joseph wharf) 1247; (St. Mary's River) 600; (Sault Ste. Marie) 1242; (Sarnia dredging) 1224; (Southampton harbour) 1246 (i); (South Nation River) 4642 (ii); (Tobermory harbour) 1247; (Toronto harbour) 1275; (Wolfe Island channel) 1242 (i); P.E.I. (Atkins' wharf) 4626 (ii); (Bay du Vin) 1022 (i); (Brae breakwater) 4625 (ii); (Canoe Cove) 1012; (Cape Tormentine, &c., memorial *re*) 1020; (Cascumpec harbour) 1014 (i); (Chapel Point) 4625 (ii); (creosoted timber) 1015 (i); (New London breakwater) 4212 (ii); (Souris Knight's Point) 1017; (Summerside breakwater) 1017 (i); (Tignish breakwater) 4212, 4626; (West Point pier) 4211; Que. (Batiscan, dredging) 4629; (charges *re* wharfs) 4636; (Crane Island wharf) 4630; (Cross Point) 4630 (ii); (Gaspé, removal of rocks) 1048; (Grande Vallée pier) 1031; (Hudson wharf) 1046; (Isle au Coudre wharf) 1046; (Isle au Grues) 1047; (Lake Temiscamingue) 1047 (i); (Magdalen Island breakwater) 4630; (Maria wharf) 4630 (ii); (Montreal harbour) 608; (Murray Bay wharf) 1051 (i); (Peribonka) 4179; (Point Fortune wharf) 4631; (Point St. Pierre breakwater) 4631; (Quebec harbour) 4549; (Rivière aux Renards pier) 4631 (ii); (St. Alexis Bay) 1053 (i); (St. Francois wharf) 4633; (Ste. Genevieve) 4216; (St. Irenée wharf) 4634; (St. Jerome, repairs, &c.) 4180; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 4634; (St. Laurent wharf) 4634 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 565-599; (St. Maurice, dredging) 1053; (Sorel wharf) 1054; (titles for lands) 1042; (Valleyfield channel) 1061 (i), 4216; (Yukon) 3283; Miscellaneous (engineers,&c., salaries) 4219; (National Art Gallery) 3292; (Percival River survey) 3292; (surveys and inspections) 4780; (timber creosoting plant) 4779; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Belly River bridge) 4219; Ont. (Des Joachims bridge) 4219; Ottawa (Maria St. bridge) 3289; Yukon (wagon roads, &c.) 4147; Slides and Booms (Gatineau) 4782; (repairs) 4142; (St. Maurice) 3287, 4782; (Shawinigan wharf) 4218; (sorting logs) 4218; (working expenses) 4220; Telegraph Lines—B.C. (Ashcroft to Dawson) 3293, 4781; (Port Simpson-Hazleton) 4779; (Quesnel Forks) 4779; (Skeena, &c.) 3292; Ont. (Anticosti to Bryon Island) 4769; (cable service, Gulf of St. Lawrence) 4143; (Govt. system) 4771; (Gulf of St. Lawrence) 3291; (Mabou to Hawkesbury) 4770; (Magdalen Islands extension) 4769; (Marconi system) 3908, 4773; (St. Peter's to Sydney) 4770; (Str. *Tyrian*) 4143, 4220; Yukon (Atlin to Quesnelle) 4150; (operators' pay) 4178; (pole contract) 4155; (Port Simpson) 4178; (Yukon system) 4781; (revenue, &c.) 4771; (supplies) 4157 (ii).
Railways: I.C.R. (Ouelle River spur line) 4797 (ii).

Telegraph Lines in B.C. and Ters., Amount expended (Ans.) 158 (i).

Toronto Govt. Buildings, Appnmt. of Mechanical Engineer (Ans.) 885 (i).

Trackmen's Wages: *See* 'Govt. Rys.'

Tarte, Hon. J. I.—*Con.*

Transportation Distances, &c., Cost, &c. (Ans.) 136 (i).

Transportation Problem, on Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4389 (ii).

Transportation *re* St. Lawrence, Amount spent, &c., on M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3687 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C.P.R. Transportation Facilities, &c., on M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 933 (i).

Yukon Telegraph Lines, Construction, &c. (remarks) 2859 (ii).

Taylor, Mr. G., *South Leeds.*

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2053, 2070 (i).

Census, 1881, 1891, 1901, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2222 (i).

Chickens purchased by Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 3408 (ii).

Commodities, Packing and Sale B. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) in Com., 4246 (ii).

Grapes purchased by Dept. of Agriculture, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 3151 (ii).

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s (B. 129) 1°*, 3304 (ii).

I.C.R., Passes, Inquiry for Ret., 4120 (ii).

Jackson, Lighthouse Keeper at Gananoque, Dismissal, &c. (M. for O.Cs.*, &c.) 809 (i).

——— *See* 'Red Horse.'

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) in Com. 4359 (ii).

Montreal Turnpike Trusts Commission, Revenue received, on M. (Mr. *Leonard*) for Ret., 494 (i).

Morton P.O., Abstraction from registered Letters

Mutch, W. (Ques.) 3152 (ii).

(Ques.) 1986 (i).

Post Office Act (letter carriers) Amt. B. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) in Com., 4045 (ii).

Prorogation (remarks) 5081 (ii).

Pub. Accounts Com., Inquiry for Papers, &c., 3995 (ii).

Public Works Employees, Delay in Payment (remarks) 3777 (ii).

Ry. Labour Disputes B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).

Red Horse Shoal Light, Keeper's Salary, &c. (Ques.) 442 (i).

Seeley's Bay P.O., Abstraction from registered Letters (Ques.) 1986 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice: Yukon (judges' living allowance) 3584; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3586.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Acadian historical data) 357; (archives) 325; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 345 (i); (census, 1891) 4082; (census) 3365, 3389, 4076; (census, cheques) 4099, 4429, 4431; (census, Mr. Drouin's absence) 4430 (ii); (classifying patents) 352 (i); (cold storage) 2578; (creameries) 2654; (fruit inspection) 2623 (ii); (general statistics) 341 (i), 2827 (ii); (Pan-American exposition) 364; (*Patent Record*) 329, 352 (i); (poultry shipments) 2640 (ii); (*Year-Book*) 336 (i).

D

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals: Generally (extra services) 4312 (ii).

Charges of Management: Dom. Notes (engraving, &c.) 4317 (ii).

Civil Govt. (civil service examiners) 4316; Post Office (salaries) 4313 (ii).

Excise (coal oil inspection) 1160, 1166 (i).

Immigration (agents' salaries, &c.) 2994 (ii).

Indians: Man., &c. (destitute, &c.) 3056; (general, &c., treaty expenses) 3057; N.B. (medical attendance) 3052; N.S. (medical attendance) 3050; Ont. (Manitoulin) 3043; (medical attendance) 3040; (schools) 3046; P.E.I. (medical attendance) 3053 (ii).

Justice: Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 4266; Penitentiaries, Kingston (binder twine) 3593 (ii).

Legislation: H. of C. (Franchise Act) 4329 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (repairs, &c.) 4222 (ii).

Militia (annual camps) 4260; (Coronation contingent) 4263; (Esquimalt defences) 4261; (Royal Military College) 2564 (ii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese commission) 4340; (Coronation expenses) 4332; (Dom. and Provl. arbitration) 4119; (gratuity to Mrs. White) 4257; Labour Dept. (salaries) 4119; (litigation, Interior) 4119; (Nipissing election expenses) 4339; Printing Bureau (plant, &c.) 4119 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs, &c.) 508 (i).

Post Office (Marble Rock P.O.) 3880; (Newboro' postmaster) 3908; (parcel service) 3913; (rental allowance) 3897; (superannuations) 3906 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (immigrant sheds, repairs, &c.) 975; (quarantine stations) 983; N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 855; Ont. (armouries) 867; (Gananoque armoury) 867; (Marysville) 640 (i); Ottawa (Major's Hill Park) 4181; Que. (St. Hyacinthe) 4564; Yukon (judges' residences) 4201; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Ecum Secum wharf) 4210 (ii); Ont. (Barrie wharf) 1217; (Presqu'Isle wharf) 1239; Que. (St. Lawrence ship channel) 567 (i); Miscellaneous (engineers, &c., salaries) 4219; Slides and Booms (working expenses) 4220 (ii).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 381, 387 (i).

Railways: I.C.R. (expenditure, &c.) 3583; (operation, maintenance) 4310; P.E.I. (Murray Harbour branch) 3863 (ii).

Weights and Measures (grain testers) 1193; (metrical instruments) 1201 (i).

Wellington Mutch, Eldon, P. E. I., Purchases from by Dept. of Agriculture (Ques.) 3152 (ii).

Yukon Concessions, Leases, &c., Applications, O.Cs., &c. (M. for ret.*) 154 (i).

Thompson, Mr. A. T., *Haldimand and Monck.*

Companies Act Amt. (B. 45) 1°*, 1108 (i).

Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2466 (i).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1673 (i).

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 461 (i); in Com., 3164 (ii).

Ross Rifle Co.'s incorp. (B. 70) 1°*, 1673 (i).

SUPPLY:

Militia (permanent forces) 1146 (i).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *South Norfolk.*
Cabinet Changes (remarks) 417 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2194 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2465 (i).
Dyment Banking Co.'s incorp. B. 51 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4124 (ii).
Judges of County Courts, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) 418 (i).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 2058 (i).
N. W. M. Police Pension B. 40 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) in Com., 2492 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep., on M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back, Instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1427 (i).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 465 (i).
——— Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2444 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Com., 3214 (ii).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 52) 1°*, 1278 (i).
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) in Com., 2193 (i).

SUPPLY:
Militia (pay and allowance) 1134 (i), 2498 (ii); (promotions) 1134 (i).

Tolton, Mr. E., *North Wellington.*
Collingwood, Meaford, Owen Sound, &c., Harbour Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 747 (i).

Tucker, Mr. J. J., *St. John, N.B., City and County.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works: Harbours and Rivers (St. Lawrence transportation) 597 (i).

Tupper, Hon. Sir Charles Hibbert, K.C.M.G., *Pictou.*
B.C. Chief Justiceship, Inquiry, 611 (i).
Bulwer-Clayton Treaty and Alaskan Boundary, on M. (Mr. *Monk*) for Cor., 761, 763 (i).
Hopewell Cape Pier, Date of Completion, c&. (Ques.) 1444 (i).

SUPPLY:
Public Works: Buildings—B. C. (armouries) 874; (renewals, &c.) 857; (Rossland) 861; (Vancouver drill shed) 876; (Vancouver post office) 857; Generally (armouries) 861; (clerks of works, &c.) 880; (policy of Govt.) 665; Man. (renewals, &c.) 831; N.W.T. (Carnduff court-house) 835; (Edmonton jail) 850, 854; (Macleod court-house) 852; (Nelson post office) 860; (repairs, &c.) 849; (Red Deer court-house) 852; (Yorkton court-house) 859 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2009, 2024 (i).

SUPPLY:
Railways: I.C.R. (expenditure, &c.) 3578 (ii).

Vrooman, Mr. A. E., *South Victoria, Ont.*
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2475 (i).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 3378; (poultry stations) 2649 (ii).

Wade, Mr. F. B., *Annapolis.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2246 (i).
Canso Strait Bridge Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) in Com., 2194; (in amt.) 2219 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Emplymt. of S. A. Men, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2468 (i).
Cosmos Cotton Co.'s incorp B. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) in Com., 2671 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) in Com., 4132 (ii).
I. C. R. and P. E. I. Rys., Expenditures, &c., on Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) to Com. of Sup., 3253 (ii).
Medical Council in Can. Establishment B. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) in Com., 2478 (i).
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 4426 (ii).
Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) on M. for 2°, 463 (i); in Com., 3180 (ii).
——— Commission and Consolidation B. 104 (Mr. *Blair*) on M. for 1°, 2446 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) on M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3228 (ii).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s incorp. B. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) in Com., 1677 (i).

SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice (judges' salaries) 215.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (cold storage) 2632; (fruit inspection) 2586, 2632 (ii).
Fisheries (overseers, inspectors, &c.) 536; oyster culture) 555 (i).
Public Works: Dredging—N.S. (LaHave River) 3285; Harbours and Rivers—Mar. Provs. (La Have River) 4215 (ii).
Toronto and Niagara Falls Power Co.'s incorp. B. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) in Com., 3632 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *East Durham.*
Budget, The, on Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2284 (i).
Clegg, Samuel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4699.
Eilbeck, R. J., Appnmt. as Sheriff (Ques.) 411 (i).
——— Leave of Absence from Yukon (Ques.) 745.
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (retiring allowance) Amt. B. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) in Com., 3941 (ii).
Newcastle, Ont., Resignation of Postmaster (Ques.) 4697 (ii).
North Pole Expedition, Assistance to Capt. Bernier, 3976 (ii).
North Shore Power Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 69 (Mr. *McCarthy*) in Com., 3137 (ii).
Rickard, Mr., Resignation as Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 4697 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Canals: Trent (dredging, &c.) 4277 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Ont. (Cobourg armoury) 723; Yukon (rents, maintenance, &c.) 974 (i).

Trent Valley and Rice Lake Canals, Rep. of Engineer (Ques.) 411 (i).

Yukon, Sheriff Eilbeck's Leave of Absence (Ques.) 745 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*

Bathurst Collector of Customs, Absence from Office (Ques.) 4124 (ii).

McDonald's Corner, N.B., Dismissal of Postmaster (Ques.) 2676 (ii).

Shewen, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 449 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works: Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, creosoted timber) 4627 (ii); (Oromocto wharf) 1030 (i), 4213, 4628; (Partridge Island pier) 4628; (St. John immigrant shed) 4179 (ii); (St. John River works) 1030.

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox.*

Belleville Post Office, Names, Dismissals, Superannuations, &c. (M. for ret.*) 153 (i).

Boer Immigration, &c., Par. in *Mail and Empire* (Ques.) 3407 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. C. R., Interview in Montreal *Witness* (Ques.) 619 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Letters, making Statements against Members (M. for copies*) 154 (i).

——— inquiry for ret., 451, 635, 1204 (i).

——— *See* 'Immigration.'

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Number of Employees, &c. (M. for ret.) 152 (i).

Immigrant Act (medical treatment) Amt. B. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) in Com., 3734 (ii).

Immigration, Amount spent from 1891 to 1901, Agents employed, &c. (M. for ret.*) 155 (i).

——— Devlin, Mr., Interview, &c.,' on M. for Com. of Sup., 2946 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

Labour needed in Man. *re* Crops, Cable *re* (Ques.) 247 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 3922 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (aids to societies) 344 (i); (census, expenses, &c.) 4434 (ii); (classifying patents) 351; (cold storage) 369; (general statistics) 341; (*Year-Book*) 338 (i).

Charges of Management (Dom. notes) 4533 (ii).

Civil Govt.: High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 181 (i).

Customs (Perry, C. B.) 2923 (ii).

Geological Survey (International boundary) 4251 (ii).

Immigration (printing, advertising, &c.) 4248.

Interior: N.W.T. Govt. (subsidy) 4252 (ii).

Justice: Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 3598; Yukon (judges' living allowance) 3584; (judges' salary) 3584; (Sheriff Eilbeck) 3587; (surgeon's salary) 3588; (witness fees) 3590 (ii).

Legislation: House of Commons (sessional clerks) 236 (i).

Militia (armouries, &c.) 4260; (R.M.C., electric lighting) 4261; (Valleyfield riots) 4261 (ii).

Miscellaneous (miners, relief, &c.) 4257; (Saskatchewan settlers relief) 4257 (ii).

N. W. M. Police (service, &c.) 4247 (ii).

Public Works: Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 988; (immigrant accommodation, &c.) 979; (P. O., rent of boxes) 988; Man. (Winnipeg, immigrant shed) 4613 (ii); N.S. (Halifax, custom-house) 635; Ont. (Deseronto) 728; Ottawa (rentals, &c.) 964 (i); Yukon (official residences) 4191, 4536; Dredging (plant) 3283 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine, repairs) 1023; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 571 (i); Miscellaneous (creosoting plant) 4779; Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 3287; Telegraphs (Marconi system) 4775; (Yukon, revenue, &c.) 4771 (ii).

Railways: I. C. R. (bridges) 4792; (Halifax accommodation) 4791; (Moncton accommodation) 4797; (St. John increased accommodation) 4787; (Stellarton accommodation) 4789; P. E. I. (expenditure) 3583 (ii).

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia (Ques.) 240.

INDEX—PART II

SUBJECTS

ABRAHAM, PLAINS OF, RIGHTS RESERVED BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3409 (ii).

ACADIAN HISTORICAL DATA : in Com. of Sup., 356.

ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK, I.C.R., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 883 (i).

Accountants: *See* 'Chartered.'

ACCOUNTS, VOUCHERS, I.C.R. AND P.E.I. RYS., &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.

ADDINGTON ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ADDITIONAL ROOMS, HOUSE OF COMMONS, COST, &C.; in Com. of Sup., 214, (i) 4137 (ii)

——— *See* 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c.

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, ACCOMMODATION, &C., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 3811 ; conc., 5037 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.'

ADDRESS, THE, IN ANS. TO HIS EX.'S SPEECH : moved (Mr. *Campbell*) 7 ; seconded (Mr. *Beland*) 16 (i).

Debate : (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 23 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 35 ; (Mr. *Monk*) 43 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 51, 114 ; (Mr. *Bourassa*) Amt. 65, 68 ; Amt. wtdn., 119 ; (Mr. *Tarte*) 90 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 104 ; (Mr. *Clarke*) 95 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 96 ; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 107 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 119 (i).

AD HOC JUDGES, SUPREME COURT : in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

——— *See* 'Justice,' &c.

ADJOURNMENT FOR ASCENSION DAY : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4353 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS OF HSE. : Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 157 (i).

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 214 (i), 3583 (ii).

——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1**, 4 ; *pro formâ*.

AGENTS OF CAN. IN ENG., INCOME TAX : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5054 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND MINERAL PRODUCTS OF CAN., AGGREGATE AMOUNT : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 747 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS :

ACADIAN HISTORICAL DATA : in Com. of Sup., 356 (i).

AGRICULTURE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 177, 321 (i), 2568, 2814, 2867, 3365, 4076, 4429 (ii).

——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE'S REPS., DISTRIBUTION : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).

——— IMPLEMENTS EXPORTED IN 1901, REBATE, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 440.

——— SOCIETIES, N.W.T., AID TO : in Com. of Sup., 343 (i).

APPLE GRAFTING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 2653.

ARCHIVES : in Com. of Sup., 321 (i).

BEEF, CANNED, SENT TO S. AFRICA, QUANTITY, INSPECTION, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 746 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3410 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3840 ; Neg. (Y. 51 ; N. 98) 3857 (ii).

BONUSES TO PROMOTE DAIRYING INTERESTS : in Com. of Sup., 2657 (ii).

——— *See* 'Creameries,' &c.

BULL, CHAS. A., PRODUCE CO., LETTER FROM HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE : Read (Mr. *Monk*) 4805 (ii).

BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING COMMISSION, REP., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1684.

CANADIAN CATTLE, EMBARGO BY G.B. : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 138 (i).

——— Amt. to Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3980 (ii).

——— notice of amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3858 (ii).

CASSIAR, B. C., APPNMT. OF J. W. MCFARLANE *re* CENSUS : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

CATTLE INSPECTION, EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 517 (i).

——— QUARANTINE : in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

CENSUS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN LIVERY HIRE : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2069 (i).

CENSUS, 1881, 1891, 1901, TOTAL COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2222 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 4342 (ii).

——— CHEQUES ISSUED, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4099, 4113, 4429-31 (ii).

——— CLASSIFYING HALF-BREEDS AS INDIANS : Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1902 (i).

——— COMMISSIONERS, ATLIN DISTRICT : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

——— COMMISSIONER, SOUTH WATERLOO, NAME AND AMOUNTS PAID TO : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1861.

——— MR. COTÉ'S CIRCULAR : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 133 (i).

——— COUTTS, MR., AMOUNTS PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

——— DROUIN, MR., ABSENCE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).

——— ENUMERATION, 1891 AND 1901, COST, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1064 (i).

——— ENUMERATORS, PAYMENTS TO, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4076, 4430 (ii).

——— ENUMERATORS, S. WATERLOO, NAMES, AMOUNT PAID, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1066 (i).

——— EXODUS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4435.

——— EXPENDITURE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*

CENSUS, EXPENDITURE TO DATE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129, 612 (i).
——— IRREGULARITIES *re* CENSUS OF 1891: in Com. of Sup., 4077, 4430, 4435 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) in Com. of Sup., 4080 (ii).
——— MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
——— SIMCOE N. AND E., COST IN 1891-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2224 (i).
——— *See* 'Census.'
CHEESE STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2634, 2647.
CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, LOCATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
CHICKENS PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408, 3409 (ii).
CHITTICK, F. C., PROMOTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
COLD STORAGE ON STEAMSHIPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 368 (i), 2568 (ii).
——— DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
COOLING FANS ON STEAMSHIPS, NAMES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616, 882 (i).
CREAMERIES, BONUSES TO, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bonuses,' &c.
CRIMINAL STATISTICS, COMPILATION: in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).
DAIRYING BRANCH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2568.
DOUGLAS, GEO. C., P.E.I., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 2867, 2889, 4966 (ii).
——— BULLETINS, PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 345 (i).
——— FARM, OTTAWA, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson, Lennox*) 152 (i).
FRUIT INSPECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2585, 2622 (ii).
FUMIGATING STATIONS FOR NURSERY STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
GLASGOW EXHIBITION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 357 (i).
GRAPES PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, AMOUNTS RECEIVED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3151 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).
HAY PURCHASED FOR WAR OFFICE IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
HOGS AND SHEEP SLAUGHTERED, COMPENSATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4968 (ii).
JAPAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— CAN. REPRESENTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2225 (i).
MCFARLANE, W. J., APPNMT. AS CENSUS COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
MCKINNON, MR. W. A., FRUIT INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2587, 2622 (ii).
MEAT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
MINERAL PRODUCTS OF CAN. AGGREGATE AMOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 747 (i).
'MONITOR,' SS., QUARANTINE, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
MUTCH, WELLINGTON: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3152.
MUTTON SHIPMENTS BY SS. 'HALIFAX' INDEMNITY TO MR. WHEATLEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).
PAN-AMERICAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).
——— SALE OF CAN. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 358 (i).
PARIS EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).
'PATENT RECORD': in Com. of Sup., 329 (i).
PATENTS, CLASSIFYING CAN., AND EXCHANGE WITH U.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3949 (i).
POLLY, MR., AMOUNT PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
PORTER, DR. ANDREW, CLAIM: in Com. of Sup., conc., 5033 (ii).
POULTRY, FATTENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2640 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS HEALTH ACT: in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
——— PHYSICIANS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 372.
——— PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i), 4967 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i); conc., 5033 (ii).
——— UNORGANIZED DISTRICT: in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
REPRESENTATION IN HOUSE OF COMMONS BY PROVS. *re* CENSUS 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2677 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2854 (ii).
ST. LOUIS AND JAPAN EXPOSITIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
SMALL-POX ON SCHR. 'JEANIE MRTYLE': Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 339 (i), 2827 (ii).
STEWART, CAPT. D. C., QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
TUBERCULAR TEST, RES. BY SHORTHORN BREEDERS ASSN.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 130 (i).
VEGETABLES IMPORTED INTO THE U.S., QUANTITY, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 171 (i).
WASHINGTON, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 339 (i).
WINNIPEG HOSPITALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

AID TO AGRICULTURE SOCIETIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 343 (i).

AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5024 (ii).

AIR BRAKES, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).

'ALADDIN' STR., QUANTITY OF COAL CARRIED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 884 (i).

ALASKA BOUNDARY: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 785 (i).
——— *See* 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.

ALBERTON, P.E.I., P.O., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER KEITH: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (ii).
——— RY. STATION, LOCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1441 (i).

ALEXANDER GIBSON RY. AND MFG. CO.: M. to ref. Pet. to Com. on Standing Orders (Mr. *Fraser*) 2846 (ii).
——— *See* 'Can. Eastern Bill.'

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4184.

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 130 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (*2 Edward VII, c.* 38.)

ALIEN LABOUR LAW, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND C.P.R., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 529 (i).

Alien Restriction Act (1897) Amt. B. No. 34 (Mr. *Charlton*) 1° m., 882 (i).
——— **B. No. 122** (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1° m., 3127 (ii).

ALLANDALE STATION, MAIL TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 884 (i).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
AMAGANDUS POND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4616.
'AMELIA,' STR., TONNAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).
AMERICAN TUGS IN CAN. WATERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 441 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) in Com. of Sup., 3297.
AMHERSTBURG, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4637.
AMNESTY TO BOERS: *See* 'S. A. War—British Supremacy.'
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626.
ANDERSON LAKE, OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
ANGLO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL TREATIES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 790; Neg. (Y. 56; N. 107) 804 (i).
——— TREATY *re* TARIFF, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617.
——— *See* 'Trade and Commerce,' &c., 'German,' &c.
ANNUAL CAMPS, DRILLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2532, 4260 (ii).
ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1681 (i).
ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
APPLE GRAFTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2653 (ii).
APPRAISERS OF CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
ARCHIBALD, P. S.: *See* 'Public Accounts Com., 3rd Rep.'
ARCHITECTS, FEES, PLANS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
ARCHIVES: in Com. of Sup., 321 (i).
ARICHAT, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
ARMOURIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 872 (i).
——— CLOTHING, MUSKETRY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4259 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).
——— DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
ARMS AND AMMUNITION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2532.
ARNOLD'S BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989.
ARSENALS IN THE DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 2565 (i).
——— REPAIRS TO BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4261.
ASHCROFT TO DAWSON TELEGRAPH LINES, COST, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4151, 4781 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1986 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Yukon,' &c.
ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
ATKINS WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
ATLANTIC COMBINE: *See* 'Shipping Combine.'
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s B. No. 128 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 175, 204 (i); 4535 (ii).
AUDITOR GENERAL'S REP., PUBLICATION IN PARTS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 773; Neg. (Y. 52; N. 96) 777 (i).
AUGER, I. A., CONTRACT *re* SPRUCE PLANKS, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2483, 2676 (ii).
AULTSVILLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
AUSTRALIA, CAN. AND NEW ZEALAND, COR. *re* TRADE TRANSPORTATION: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Campbell*) 154 (i).
AUTOMOBILES *re* POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3872, 4186 (ii).
BADDECK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
BAILEY'S BROOK, BREAKWATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4620 (ii).
BAIN, MR., P. O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3872.
BALLOT, GRATUITIES: in Com. of Sup., 4330 (ii).
——— LAVAL, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157.
——— ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION, MONTREAL, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
BANFF NATIONAL PARK, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
BANKING AND COMMERCE COM.: M. to add Names (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2482 (ii).
BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMMISSION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
BANK NOTES, DOM.: *See* 'Dom.' &c.
BARBOUR, JOHN, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2853 (ii).
BARRIE, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).
——— WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1217.
BATES, MR. E. B., ASST POSTMASTER, OTTAWA, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
BATHURST, N.B., COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, ABSENCE FROM OFFICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, CHARGES *re* NEGLIGENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).
BATISCAN CHANNEL, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 39.)
BAXTER, GEO. E., ANDOVER, N.B., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i).
BAYFIELD PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. *Harty*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 40.)
BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTION, PIERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BEAUCE ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BEAUCHAMP, OSCAR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 610 (i).
BEDFORD RIFLE RANGE: conc., 5032 (ii).
BEEF, CANNED, SENT TO S. AFRICA, QUANTITY, INSPECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 746 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3410 (ii).

BEET ROOT SUGAR MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4972 (ii).

BELLEVILLE, HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 449 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, NAMES, SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).

—— POST OFFICE, REDUCTION OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).

Bell Telephone Co.'s B. No. 143 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 41.)

BELLY RIVER BRIDGE, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

Bennett Lake Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 17 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779 (i).

BERNIER, CAPT.: *See* 'North Pole.'

BIG BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).

BIG POND, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

BILLS ASSENTED TO, 5083 (ii).

Bills of Exchange Act Amt. B. No. 105 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2455 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 2.)

BILLS ON ORDER PAPER, PROCEDURE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2481 (i).

—— WITHDRAWN: Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4970 (ii).

BILLS:

BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*.)
1°*, 4; *pro formâ*.

BILL (No. 2) Respecting Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Maclean*.)
1° m., 66; On order for 2°, 625; 2° m., 786 (i).

BILL (No. 3) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Lancaster*.)
1° m, 68; 2° m., 451; ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., agreed to (Y. 90; N. 50) 481 (i); M. for Com., 3158; in Com., 3164 (ii).

BILL (No. 4) Respecting Drainage on and across the Property of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Cowan*.)
1°*, 121; 2° m., 626 (ii).

BILL (No. 5) To amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Northrup*.)
1° m., 238 (i).

BILL (No. 6) To amend the Railway Act with respect to Drainage.—(Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*.)
1° m., 238; 2° m., 789 (i).

BILL (No. 7) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)
1°*, 316; 2°*, 570; in Com., 1279; 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)

BILL (No. 8) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. *Monk*.)
1° m., 316; On order for 2°, 1110 (i).

BILL (No. 9) Respecting the United Gold Fields of British Columbia, L't'd.—(Mr. *Galliher*.)
1°*, 408; 2°*, 611 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 110.)

BILL (No. 10) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. *Parmelee*.)
1°*, 408; 2°*, 570; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 87.)

BILL (No. 11) To provide for the establishment of a Medical Council in Canada.—(Mr. *Roddick*).
1° m., 408; 2° m., 1110; ref. to Sel. Com., 1131; in Com. of the Whole, 2474 (i); (remarks) 4245; in Com., 4438; 3° m., 4441; agreed to (Y. 76; N. 16) 4463; Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 20.)

BILL (No. 12) Respecting the Edmonton and Slave Lake Railway Company.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
1°*, 529; 2°, 612; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 61.)

BILL (No. 13) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Cowan*.)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 44.)

BILL (No. 14) To incorporate the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Béland*.)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1624 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 64.)

BILL (No. 15) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. *Ingram*.)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 95.)

BILL (No. 16) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Douglas*.)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 851 (i); in Com., 2667; 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 71.)

BILL (No. 17) To incorporate the Lake Bennett Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell*.)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779 (i).

BILL (No. 18) To incorporate the Velvet (Rossland) Mine Railway Company.—(Mr. *Galliher*.)
1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 112.)

BILL (No. 19) Relating to the Regina Law Library.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*.)
1°*, 530; 2° m., 1205; in Com., and 3°*, 1205 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 30.)

BILL (No. 20) To incorporate the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert*.)
1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 39.)

BILL (No. 21) Respecting the Port Dover, Brantford, Berlin and Goderich Railway Company and to change its name to 'The Grand Valley Traction Company.'—(Mr. *Heyd*.)
1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1619; 3°*, 1620 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 91.)

BILL (No. 22) To incorporate the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. *Fraser*.)
1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 92.)

BILL (No. 23) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment*.
1°*, 632; 2°*, 851 (i).

BILL (No. 24) Respecting the Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1620; 3°*, 1622 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 114.)

BILL (No. 25) In further amendment of the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1° m., 632 (i).

BILL (No. 26) Respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. *Malouin.*)
1°*, 734; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1622; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 93.)

BILL (No. 27) To further amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Clancy.*)
1°*, 734; 2° m., 1132 (i).

BILL (No. 28) Respecting Telegraph and Telephone Companies.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 734; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 1206 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 29) To incorporate the Sovereign Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 781; 2°*, 882; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 102.)

BILL (No. 30) To incorporate the Sydney Land and Loan Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Kendall.*)
1°*, 781; 2°*, 882 (i).

BILL (No. 31) Respecting the Buffalo Railway Company and International Railway Company.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 811; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1623; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 43.)

BILL (No. 32) To amend the Conciliation Act, 1900.—(Mr. *Puttee.*)
1° m., 881 (i).

BILL (No. 33) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 882 (i).

BILL (No. 34) To amend the Act to restrict the Importation and Employment of Aliens, chapter 11 of the Statutes of 1897.—(Mr. *Charlton.*)
1° m., 882 (i).

BILL (No. 35) To incorporate the Nipissing and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241; in Com., and 3°*, 2473 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 84.)

BILL (No. 36) To incorporate the British Columbia and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Riley.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241 (i).

BILL (No. 37) To incorporate the Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Company (Limited).—(Mr. *Emmerson.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 1675, 2021, 2192; 3°*, 2193 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 103.)

BILL (No. 38) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2054; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 85) 2064 (i).

BILL (No. 39) To incorporate the St. Lawrence and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bureau.*)
1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 2193; 3°*, 2194 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 99.)

BILL (No. 40) Respecting Pensions to Officers of the North-west Mounted Police.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
Prop. Res., 779; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 962 (i); 2°*, 2484; in Com., 2484, 3311; 3°*, 3410 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 22.)

BILL (No. 41) In amendment of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville.*)
1° m., 1063 (i).

BILL (No. 42) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 1063 (i).

BILL (No. 43) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 111.)

BILL (No. 44) Respecting the Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 105.)

BILL (No. 45) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1108 (i).

BILL (No. 46) To incorporate the Strait of Canso Bridge Company.—(Mr. *McLennan.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1438; in Com., 2194, 2219; 3°*, 2220 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 104.)

BILL (No. 47) To incorporate the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)

BILL (No. 48) To incorporate the Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Madore.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i).

BILL (No. 49) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of John Westren.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2221 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

BILL (No. 50) An Act respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 83.)

BILL (No. 51) To incorporate the Dyment Banking, Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., 4123; 3°*, 4124. (2 *Edward VII, c.* 60.)

BILL (No. 52) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Tisdale.*)
1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1438; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 98.)

BILL (No. 53) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1428 (i); in Com., 2608, 2659; 3°*, 2667 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 50.)

BILL (No. 54) To incorporate the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 62.)

BILL (No. 55) Respecting the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. *Sutherland, Essex.*)
1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 69.)

BILL (No. 56) Respecting damage by fires caused by Railways.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville.*)
1°*, 1323 (i).

BILL (No. 57) Respecting the Ontario Power Company of Niagara Falls.—(Mr. *German.*)
1°*, 1438; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 86.)

BILL (No. 58) In amendment of the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1438 (i).

BILL (No. 59) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCormick*).
1°*, 1490; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 65.)

BILL (No. 60) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°*, 1490 (i).

BILL (No. 61) To amend the Criminal Code.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1490 (i).

BILL (No. 62) Respecting the Klondike Mines Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 66.)

BILL (No. 63) To incorporate the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

BILL (No. 64) To incorporate the Cosmos Cotton Company.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., 2670; 3° m., 2887 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 56.)

BILL (No. 65) To incorporate the Yukon Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343; Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 115.)

BILL (No. 66) Respecting the Northern Colonisation Railway Company.—(Mr. *Lemieux.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 55.)

BILL (No. 67) To incorporate the Coast Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Maxwell.*)
1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i).

BILL (No. 68) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Edwards.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2888; 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 53.)

BILL (No. 69) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3128; 3°*, 3130 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 52.)

BILL (No. 70) To incorporate the Ross Rifle Company.—(Mr. *Thompson.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2671; 3°*, 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 96.)

BILL (No. 71) Respecting the Dominion Cotton Mills Company, Limited.—(Mr. *Prefontaine.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 59.)

BILL (No. 72) To incorporate the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Morrison.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2669; 3°*, 2670 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 90.)

BILL (No. 73) To incorporate the North Shore Power Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 85.)

BILL (No. 74) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. *Logan.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 88.)

BILL (No. 75) To incorporate the Knapp Tubular Steamship Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2607; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 67.)

BILL (No. 76) Further to amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 1673 (i); 2°*, 2495; in Com., 2495; 3°*, 3309 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 27.)

BILL (No. 77) To provide for the appointment of Assistant Judges of the Supreme Court of Canada in certain cases.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 1673 (i); wthdn., 5064 (ii).

BILL (No. 78) Respecting the Trans-Canada Railway Company.—(Mr. *Talbot.*)
1°*, 1763; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 108.)

BILL (No. 79) To incorporate the Crown Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1°*, 1860; 2° m, 2021 (i); in Com., 2607; 3°*, 2608 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 57.)

BILL (No. 80) To incorporate the Huron and Erie Canal Company.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 1902 (i) 2°*, 2676 (ii).

BILL (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 51.)

BILL (No. 82) To incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 1985 (i).

BILL (No. 83) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Express Company.—(Mr. *Davis.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 49.)

BILL (No. 84) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. *Harty.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 40.)

BILL (No. 85) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2473 (i); in Com., 4569; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 101.)

BILL (No. 86) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 3202; (agreed to, Y. 87; N. 53) 3234 (ii.)

BILL (No. 87) Respecting the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 94.)

BILL (No. 88) Respecting the Medicine Hat Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 75.)

BILL (No. 89) To incorporate the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. *Scott.*)
1°*, 2054 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 45.)

BILL (No. 90) To incorporate the British America Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike*).
1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2473 (i).

BILL (No. 91) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 106.)

BILL (No. 92) To amend the Railway Act so as to promote the safety of Railway Employees.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver.*)
1°*, 2064 (i).

BILL (No. 93) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and North-west Railway Company.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
1°*, 2145; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii) (2 *Edward VII*, c. 63.)

BILL (No. 94) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. *Barker.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i).

BILL (No. 95) To incorporate the Penny Bank.—(Mr. *Osler.*)
1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2676 (ii).

BILL (No. 96) To incorporate the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCreary.*)
1°*, 2146 (i) 2°*, 2676; in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 70.)

BILL (No. 97) To incorporate the Dominion Railway and Power Company.—(Mr. *Cowan.*)
1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889 (ii).

BILL (No. 98) To incorporate the Montreal Subway Company.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*. 2146 (i); 2°*, 2676; in Com., 4423, 4515, 4568; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)

BILL (No. 99) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 78.)

BILL (No. 100) To incorporate the Toronto and Niagara Power Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3623; 3° m., 3636; agreed to Y. 74; N. 18) 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 107.)

BILL (No. 101) To incorporate the Nepigon Railway Company.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*. 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3865 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 82.)

BILL (No. 102) To incorporate the Gaspé and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. *Gauvreau.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); M. for Com., 4569, 4647; in Com., 4667; 3°*, 4667 (ii).

BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. *Geoffrion.*)
1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3131 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 68.)

BILL (No. 104) To amend and consolidate the law respecting Railways.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1° m., 2431 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 105) To amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 2455 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 3511 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 2.)

BILL (No. 106) To amend the Post Office Act.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1° m., 2482; 2°*, 4036; in Com., 4036; 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 28.)

BILL (No. 107, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1° m., 2714; 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3342; recom., 4412; 3°*, 4423 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 79.)

BILL (No. 108) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892. (Mr. *Russell.*)
1° m., 2567 (ii).

BILL (No. 109, from the Senate) Incorporating the Molsons Bank Pension Fund.—(Mr. *Osler*).
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3547; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 77.)

BILL (No. 110) Respecting the incorporation of Railway Companies.—(Mr. *Guthrie.*)
1° m., 2847 (ii).

BILL (No. 111) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1° m., 2849 (ii).

BILL (No. 112) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 2850; 2°*, 3734; in Com., 3734; 3° m., 3927; Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 14.)

BILL (No. 113) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act and the Acts in amendment thereof.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3776; in Com., 3776; 3°*, 3777 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 35.)

BILL (No. 114) To amend the Exchequer Court Act. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3511; in Com., 3511; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 8.)

BILL (No. 115) Further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 2852; 2°*, 3513; in Com., 3513; 3°*, 3513 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)

BILL (No. 116) To amend the provision with respect to Tolls of Chapter 1 of the Statutes of 1881 respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick*).
1° m., 2933; 2°*, 3934; in Com., 3934; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 4.)

BILL (No. 117) Further to amend the Unorganized Territories Game Preservation Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 2941; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769; 3°*, 3769 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 12.)

BILL (No. 118, from the Senate) For the relief of James Brown.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°, 4121 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)

BILL (No. 119) Further to amend the Yukon Territory Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3126; 2°*, 3832; in Com., 3832, 4484, 4529; 3°*, 4533 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 34.)

BILL (No. 120) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769, 3832; 3°*, 3832; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 121) Further to amend the Acts respecting the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3773; in Com., 3773; 3°*, 3773 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 24.)

BILL (No. 122) Further to amend the Act to restrict the importation and employment of Aliens.—(Mr. *Smith, Vancouver.*)
1° m., 3127 (ii).

BILL (No. 123) To incorporate the Canada Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Fraser.*)
M. to receive Pet., 2846; 1°* of B., 3202; 2°*, 3343; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 46.)

BILL (No. 124) To amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, 1898.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 3236; 2°*, 3775; in Com., 3775; 3°*, 3776 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)

BILL (No. 125, from the Senate) To amend the Acts relating to the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway.—(Mr. *Champagne.*)
1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 89.)

BILL (No. 126, from the Senate) To incorporate the Bishop of Moosonee.—(Mr. *Clarke.*)
1°*, 3407; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4124 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 81.)

BILL (No. 127, from the Senate) To confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of George Depew.—(Mr. *McCarthy.*)
1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; wthdn., 4692 (ii).

BILL (No. 128, from the Senate) Respecting the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).

BILL (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting the Great Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. *Taylor.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).

BILL (No. 130, from the Senate) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 38.)

BILL (No. 131, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. *Dyment.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 72.)

BILL (No. 132, from the Senate) To amend the Act respecting the incorporation of Boards of Trade.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1°*, 3304; 2°*, 4136; in Com., 4136; 3°*, 4136 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BILL (No. 133) To amend the Rocky Mountains Park Act, 1887.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3305; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774; 3°*, 3774 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 31.)

BILL (No. 134) Respecting the representation of the Yukon Territory in the House of Commons.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1°* m., 3306; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774, 4466, 4578; 3°*, 4579; Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 37.)

BILL (No. 135) To amend the Petition of Right Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°* m., 3306; 2°*, 3935; in Com., 3936; 3°*, 3939 (ii).

BILL (No. 136) To amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1° m., 3307; 2°*, 4129; in Com., 4129; 3°*, 4136; Sen. Amts., 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 10.)

BILL (No. 137) To amend Chapter 41 of the Statutes of 1901 respecting the Administration of Justice in the Yukon Territory.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
M. to introduce, 2850; Res. prop., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3509; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3°*, 3939 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 36.)

BILL (No. 138) To amend the Act respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3510; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3°*, 3951 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 16.)

BILL (No. 139) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 3239; in Com. on Res., 3311; 1°* of B., 3510; wthdn., 4579 (ii).

BILL (No. 140) To incorporate the Bishop of the Orthodox Russo-Greek Catholic Church for North America and Aleutian Islands, and each of the parishes and missions of the said Church in Manitoba and the North-west Territories.—(Mr. *Oliver.*)
M. to ref. rep. back to Sel. Com., 2715, 3121; M. to introduce B., 3303; 1°*, 3622; on Order for 2°, 3866; 2° m., 4076; in Com., 4667; 3° m., 4690 (ii).

BILL (No. 141) To amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4246; in Com., 4246, 4354; 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)

BILL (No. 142) Further to amend the General Inspection Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1° m., 3623; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 11.)

BILL (No. 143, from the Senate) Respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 41.)

BILL (No. 144, from the Senate) To incorporate the Metropolitan Bank.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 76.)

BILL (No. 145, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. *Copp.*)
2°*, 4075 (ii).

BILL (No. 146) For the settlement of Railway Labour Disputes.—(Mr. *Mulock.*)
1° m., 3725; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

BILL (No. 147) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
Res. prop., 3308; in Com. on Res., 3510; 1°* of B., 3734; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4247 (ii). (2 *Edward VII. c.* 21.)

BILL (No. 148, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company.—(Mr. *Bickerdike.*)
1°*, 3919; 2°*, 4578 (ii).

BILL (No. 149) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. *Sifton.*)
1° m., 3919; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4357 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 17.)

BILL (No. 150) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. *Campbell.*)
1°*, 4036 (ii).

BILL (No. 151) Respecting the remission of penalties. (Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1°*, 4036; 2°*, 4579; in Com., 4579; 3°*, 4579 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 26.)

BILL (No. 152) Further to amend the provisions of Chapter 183 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the Halifax Industrial School and St. Patrick's Home at Halifax.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
1° m., 4036; 2°*, 4701; in Com., 4701; 3°*, 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 13.)

BILL (No. 153, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Lawrence and Adirondack Railway Company.—(Mr. *Pringle.*)
1°*, 4121 (ii).

BILL (No. 154, from the Senate) To amend the Naturalization Act.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 4121; 2°*, 4484; in Com., 4484; 3°*, 4484 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 23.)

BILL (No. 155) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. *Blair.*)
1° m., 4126; 2°*, 4580; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4604 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 29.)

BILL (No. 156) To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
On M. to introduce, 3623; Res. prop., 3832; in Com. on Res., 3933; 1°* of B., 4127; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 5.)

BILL (No. 157) To authorize the raising by way of loan of certain sums of money for the public service.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
Res. prop., 3925; in Com., on Res., 4127; 1°* of B., 4129; 2°*, 4357; in Com., 4357; 3°*, 4361 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 18.)

BILL (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate the Union Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. *Ingram.*)
1°*, 4241; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii) (2 *Edward VII, c.* 109.)

BILL (No. 159, from the Senate) To incorporate the Maritime Stock Breeders' Association.—(Mr. *Fisher.*)
1°*, 4344; 2° m., 4612; in Com., 4612; 3°*, 4612 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 73.)

BILL (No. 160, from the Senate) To incorporate the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants.—(Mr. *Belcourt.*)
1°*, 4241; 2° m., 4571; M. for Com., 4694; in Com., 4694; 3°*, 4695 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 58.)

BILL (No. 161, from the Senate) Respecting the incorporation of Joint Stock Companies by Letters Patent.—(Sir *Wilfrid Laurier.*)
1°*, 4245; 2°*, 4803; in Com., 4803, 5056; 3°*, 5064 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 15.)

BILL (No. 162) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Sir *Richard Cartwright.*)
1° m., 4245; 2° m., 4354; in Com., 4355, 4486; 3 m., 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 19.)

BILL (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Samuel Nelson Chipman.—(Mr. *Flint.*)
1°*, 4344; 2°*, 4578; in Com., 4692; 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 54.)

BILL (No. 164) To amend the Act of 1899 respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m, 4344; 2°*, 4604; in Com., 4604; 3°*, 4607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 25.)

BILL (No. 165) Respecting the coasting trade of Canada.—(Mr. *Fitzpatrick.*)
Res. prop., 4126; in Com. on Res., 4246; 1°* of B., 4361; 2°*, and in Com., 4607; 3° m., 4612, 4701 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)

BILL (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Securities Bank of Canada.—(Mr. *Calvert.*)
1°*, 4464; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 100.)

BILL (No. 167, from the Senate) Respecting the Royal Marine Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure.*)
1°*, 4568; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 97.)

BILL (No. 168) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1902, and 30th June, 1903.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
1° m., 5073; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5074 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 1.)

BILL (No. 169) To amend the Customs Tariff.—(Mr. *Fielding.*)
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4972; in Com., 4972; 1° m., 4977; 2°*, and in Com., 4977; 3° m., 4977 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 33.)

BINDER TWINE, INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4963.

—— KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).

—— SALE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 410, 618, 885, 1439 (i).

BIOLOGICAL MARINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 516.

BISHOP, HENRY, POSTMASTER AT BATHURST, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).

BLACK BROOK WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).

BLACK POINT CANAL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).

BLIND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1222 (i).

BLUE BOOKS, PUBLICATION, RELIABILITY, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Bell*) 2731 (ii).

Boards of Trade Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 4136; in Com., 4136; 3°*, 4136 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 3.)

BOARDS OF TRADE RES.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Kemp*) 4404 (ii).

BOER IMMIGRATION TO CANADA, PAR. IN "Mail and Empire": Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3407 (ii).

BONUSES TO PROMOTE DAIRYING INTERESTS: in Com. of Sup., 2657 (ii).

—— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

BOUILLON, DR. ALFRED, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).

BOULARDERIE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 997 (i).

BOUNDARIES, CANALS, QUEBEC, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).

BOUNDARY LINE THROUGH DETROIT RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 242 (i).

BOUNDARY SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).

BOUNTY CHEQUES FOR FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 553 (i).

BRAE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii),

BRANCH AND DISTRICT POST OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (ii).

BRIDGES, I.C.R., STRENGTHENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4792 (ii).

—— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

British America Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 90 (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2473 (i).

British Columbia and Yukon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 36 (Mr. *Riley*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA:
ANDERSON LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642.
ARMOURIES: in Com. of Sup., 872 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*
ASHCROFT TO DAWSON, &C., TEL. LINES, TOTAL LENGTH, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1986 (i).
—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
BUILDINGS, RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
BURRARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
CASSIAR, APPNMT. OF J. W. MCFARLANE *re* CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CENSUS COMMISSIONERS, ATLIN DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CHIEF JUSTICESHIP, APPNMT., &C.: Inquiry (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 611 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i).
DEASE AND LIARD, MINERS, RELIEF TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
DISALLOWANCE OF ACTS, B.C. LEGISLATION, &C.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
ESQUIMALT DEFENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).
FISH CANNERS IN B.C., REMARKS OF PROF. PRINCE: Ques. (Mr. *Beland*) 449, 613 (i).
FISHERIES INVESTIGATION *re* REP. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 3308 (ii).
FISH HATCHERY: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i), 4642 (ii).
HARDY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4643 (ii).
INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).
—— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3059 (ii).
—— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3058, 4247 (ii).
KAMLOOPS, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
KENNEDY LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642.
MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
NAVIGATION, AIDS TO: in Com. of Sup., 5024 (ii).
NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 860 (i).
NEW WESTMINSTER, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3619 (ii).
PORT SIMPSON TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4178, 4779 (ii).
QUESNELLE TO ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
QUESNELLE FORKS AND HORSE FLY TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
ROSSLAND MINERS' UNION AND ALIEN LABOUR ACT, LETTERS, &C., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 2471 (i).
ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
SEINE LICENSES ISSUED IN B.C., NUMBER, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Earle*) 2680 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER, DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
—— B. C. AND TERS., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
VANCOUVER, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
VICTORIA, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
—— CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 65 (i).
—— HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER STEAM SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4964.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—*Con.*
WILLIAM'S HEAD QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4614 (ii).
B.N.A. ACT *re* PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, &C.: (Ques.) (Mr. *Lemieux*) 441 (i).
BRITISH SUPREMACY IN S. A., TERMS OF PEACE, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3239, 3316; M. to wthdrw. Res., 3342; Neg., 3365 (ii).
BROCKVILLE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4182 (ii).
BRONTE, HARBOUR IMPOVEMENTS, AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
—— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
—— LIGHTHOUSE, ERECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).
Brown, James Relief B. No. 118 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°, 4121 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 42.)
BRUCE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BRYON ISLAND TO ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
—— *See* "Pub. Works".
BUDGET SPEECH, IMP. PARLT.: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
BUDGET, THE (Mr. *Fielding*) 1279 (i);
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Amt., 1310, 1323; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1342; (Mr. *Osler*) 1385; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1447; (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 1459; (Mr. *Mackinnon*) 1480; (Mr. *Blain*) 1490; (Mr. *Morrison*) 1504; (Mr. *Charlton*) 1523; (Mr. *Edwards*) 1545; (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1554; (Mr. *Brock*) 1559; (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1569; (Mr. *Clarke*) 1604, 1625; (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) 1647; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 1651; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1658; (Mr. *Bell*) 1685; (Mr. *Johnston, Cape Breton*) 1724; (Mr. *Sproule*) 1737; (Mr. *Davis*) 1759, 1766; (Mr. *Kemp*) 1788; (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1807; (Mr. *Hackett*) 1823; (Mr. *Bourassa*) 1837, 1862; (Mr. *Richardson*) 1876; (Mr. *Fraser*) 1884; (Mr. *Porter*) 1903; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order, 1919; (Mr. *Kendall*) 1930; (Mr. *Rosamond*) 1964; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1974; (Mr. *Pringle*) 1989; (Mr. *Turgeon*) 2009, 2024; (Mr. *Lavell*) 2030; (Mr. *Maclaren, Huntingdon*) 2045; (Mr. *Taylor*) 2053, 2070; (Mr. *Scott*) 2089; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2107; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2126; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 2136; (Mr. *Fisher*) 2147; (Mr. *Brodeur*) 2184, 2201; (Mr. *Lennox*) 2207, 2226; (Mr. *Wade*) 2246; (Mr. *Northrup*) 2268; (Mr. *Ward*) 2284; (Mr. *Kendrey*) 2290; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2299; (Mr. *Clancy*) 2339; (Mr. *Henderson*) 2367; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2398; (Mr. *Monk*) 2399, 2411; (Mr. *Pope*) 2414; (Mr. *Ganong*) 2425; Amt. neg. (Y. 61; N. 117) 2430 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 962 (i).
—— FINANCIAL SITUATION, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Neg. (Y. 41; N. 84) 4859 (ii).
Buffalo Ry. Co. and International Ry. Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 811; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1623; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 43.)
BUILDINGS, B.C., RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
—— DOM., GENERAL REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4181, 4186 (ii).
—— RENTAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i).
—— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 4613 (ii).
—— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i), 4178 (ii).
BUILDINGS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4185, 4613 (ii).
—— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i), 4182 (ii).
—— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i), 4179 (ii).
—— YUKON, RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4536, 4542 (ii).
—— *See* 'Dom. Buildings,' &c.
BULL, CHAS. A., PRODUCE CO., LETTER FROM HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: Read (Mr. *Monk*) 4805.
BULLETINS, FARM, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 345 (i).
BULWER TREATY. *See* 'Clayton.'
BURKE'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BURLAND BANK NOTE CO., &C., LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
—— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
BURRARD, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BUSINESS OF THE HSE. *re* PRIVATE BILLS: Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4567-8 (ii).
—— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
BUTTER AND CHEESE WEIGHING COMMISSION. REP., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1684 (i).
CABINET CHANGES: Explanation (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 412 (i).
CACOUNA AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTEACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2225 (i).
CADETS, R.M.C., APPLICATION *re* CORONATION CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 3637 (ii).
—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. 94 (Mr. *Barker*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i).
CALLENDAR, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4638.
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4626.
—— *See* 'Wilson's Beach.'
CANADA AND FRANCE SS. SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 2054 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 45.)
Canada Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 123 (Mr. *Fraser*) M. to receive Pet., 2846; 1°* of B., 3202; 2°*, 3343; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 46.)
Canada Evidence Act (1893) Amt. B. No. 115 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2852; 2°*, 3513; in Com., 3513; 3°*, 3513 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 9.)
Canadian Manufacturers' Association incorp. B. No. 47 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°* 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 48.)
Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 44.)

Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 7 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 316; 2°*, 570; in Com., 1279; 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 47.)

Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 60 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°*, 1496 (i).

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, NAMES OF COUNTIES, &c., UNDER OPERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Flint*) 1682 (i).

——— RES. FROM MAR. BAPTISTS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1109 (i).

CANADIAN CATTLE, EMBARGO BY G.B.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 138 (i).

——— *See* 'Cattle,' &c.

CANADIAN CATTLE COMDEMNED BY IMP. GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3410 (ii).

——— Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) Neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857 (ii).

——— *See* 'S.A. War.'

CAN. IMPERIAL INSTITUTE: in Com, of Sup., 364 (i).

Canadian Northern Express Co.'s incorp. B. No. 83 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 49.)

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1438 (i); in Com., 2608, 2659; 3°*, 2667 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 50.)

Canadian Northern Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 81 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2221; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 51.)

C. P. R., B. No. 69 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3128; 3°*, 3130 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 52.)

——— **(tolls) Amt. B. No. 116** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2933; 2°*, 3934; inCom., 3934; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 4.)

C.P.R., INCREASE IN CAPITAL STOCK: Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 129 (i).

——— LANDS PATENTED TO MARCH, 1902, ACREAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).

——— LAND TAXES, EXEMPTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 5055 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 5070 (ii),

C.P.R. *vs.* ROY, PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT: M. for Copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 499 (i).

CAN. RAILWAYS, CASUALTIES, &c., OF EMPLOYEES, CATTLE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Erb*) 2472 (i).

——— EMPLOYEES KILLED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 410 (i).

CAN. TRANSATLANTIC MAILS *via* U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 447 (i).

CANALS:

CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 4001, 4269, 4294, 4298.

——— DOM. EXPENDITURE, &c., SINCE CONFEDERATION: Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 784 (i).

——— *See* 'Transportation,' &c.

——— EXTRA PAYMENTS FOR OVERTIME: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4312 (ii).

——— REVOTES, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4281-2 (ii).

CARILLON, GUIDE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (ii).

CORNWALL, REPAIRS, LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4310 (ii).

CANALS—*Con.*

CORRY & LAVERDURE, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).

——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.

CULBUTE, DAMAGES BY FLOODING: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4309 (ii).

FARRAN'S POINT, ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

GALOPS, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4021, 4300 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 5020 (ii).

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4298 (ii).

GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 4021.

——— PAYMENTS TO FROM MAY TO DEC., 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 3155 (ii).

LACHINE, ELECTRIC PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4299 (ii).

——— LOCK REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4035.

——— MILL ST. PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).

——— WASTE WEIR: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).

NORTH CHANNEL, DAM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4034, 4300 (ii).

OVERTIME: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4312 (ii).

QUEBEC CANALS, BOUNDARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).

RAPIDE PLAT, ENLARGEMENT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).

——— GILBERT BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4021.

——— *See* 'Galops,' 'North Channel,' &c.

RIDEAU, POONAMALIE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).

ST. LAWRENCE CANAL EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &c., 1896-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2222 (i).

SAULT STE. MARIE, ENTRANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4001, 4298 (ii).

SOULANGES, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4304 (ii).

——— WATER POWERS, &c., REPS. OF ENGINEERS, LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 631 (i).

SUNDAY SERVICES: *See* 'Overtime,' &c.

TAY CANAL, 1896 TO 1901. AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 2047 (i).

TRENT VALLEY, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4004 (i); conc., 5047 (ii).

——— DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).

——— LINDSAY AND FENELON FALLS, ROAD BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270 (ii).

——— PETERBOROUGH DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).

——— TRENT AND RICE LAKE CANALS, REP. OF ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).

WELLAND: in Com. of Sup., 4306, 4798 (ii).

——— LOCKS WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

——— PORT COLBORNE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4306 (ii).

——— PORT DALHOUSIE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

——— ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY, O. C. GRANTING POWER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 883, 1683, 1860 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 409, 745 (i).

CANNERS OF B.C. AND PROF. PRINCE'S REMARKS: Ques. (Mr. *Beland*) 613 (i).

——— *See* 'B.C.', &c.

CANOE COVE, P.E.I., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup,, 1010 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3831 (ii).

CANSO FERRY SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4294 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.

CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

CAPE TORMENTINE, CREOSOTED TIMBER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— MEMORIAL *re* COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CAPE TRAVERSE, MEMORIAL *re* DAILY COMMUNICATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).
CARAQUET WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CAR COUPLERS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
CARILLON CANAL, GUIDE PIER, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (ii).
CARLETON POINT WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (i).
CARNDUFF COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 835 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4180.
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1013.
——— RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
CASSIAR, B.C., APPNMT. OF J. W. MCFARLANE *re* CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CASUALTIES OF, CANS. IN S. A.: Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 2191 (i).
CATTLE EMBARGO BY G. B., AMT. TO COM. OF SUP. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3980 (ii).
——— BY G.B., PROTEST, &C.: Notice of Amt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 3858 (ii).
——— *See* 'Can. Cattle.'
CATTLE EXPORTED TO U.S., FROM 1890, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 3153 (ii).
CATTLE INSPECTION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 517 (i).
CATTLE QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
CEMENTS, CAN. AND FOREIGN, TESTS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1442, 1444 (i).
CENSUS, AMOUNT EXPENDED IN LIVERY HIRE: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 2069 (i).
——— CHEQUES ISSUED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4099, 4429 (ii).
——— CIRCULAR, MR. COTÉ'S: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 133.
——— CLASSIFYING HALF-BREEDS AS INDIANS: Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1902 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *La Rivière*) 1674 (i).
——— COMMISSIONERS, ATLIN DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
——— COMMISSIONER, SOUTH WATERLOO, NAME AND AMOUNTS PAID TO: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1861 (i).
——— ENUMERATION, 1881, 1891, 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 2222 (i).
——— ENUMERATION, 1891 and 1901, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1064 (i).
——— ENUMERATORS, PAYMENTS TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4076, 4430 (ii).
——— ENUMERATORS, SOUTH WATERLOO, NAMES, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1066 (i).
——— EXODUS, REMARKS: in Com. of Sup., 4435 (ii).
——— EXPENDITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129, 612 (i).
CENSUS, FIGURES QUOTED IN SPEECH: Personal Explanation (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1763 (i).
——— INVESTIGATION, 1891: in Com. of Sup., 4077, 4435 (ii).
——— LISGAR, CHEQUES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4429.
——— MACPHERSON, D. F.: in Com. of Sup., 3398.
——— MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4111 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Paterson*) 4342 (ii).
——— SIMCOE, N. AND E., COST IN 1891-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2224 (i),
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 68 (Mr. *Edwards*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2888; 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 53.)
CHADWICK, MR.: *See* 'Jackson, Mr.'
CHAMBLY CANAL, WHARF, MAINTENANCE BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2068 (i).
CHANCE HARBOUR, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
CHAPEL POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT, DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 171 (i), 4317, 4533; conc., 4342 (ii).
CHARLESVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CHARLOTTE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
CHARLOTTETOWN, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).
——— INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
Chartered Accountants, Dom. Association, incorp. B. No. 160 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 4241; 2° m., 4571; M. for Com., 4694; in Com., 4694; 3°*, 4695 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 58.)
CHARTERED BANKS, LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).
CHAUDIÈRE JUNCTION, ENGINE-HOUSE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
CHEESE STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2634, 2647 (ii).
CHETICAMP POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, LOCATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
CHICKENS PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTORAL DISTRICT: Dismissal of Pet. (Mr *Speaker*) 2219 (i).
CHIEF JUSTICESHIP, B.C., APPNMT., &C.: Remarks (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 611 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) on M. to introduce, 3623; Res. prop., 3832; in Com. on Res., 3933; 1°* of B., 4127; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 5.)
CHINESE IMMIGRATION COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
——— REP. OF COM., FIRST PART: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451 (i).
——— *See* 'Japanese,' 'Oriental.'

Chipman, S. Nelson. Relief B. No. 163 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°*, 4344; 2°*, 4578; in Com., 4692; 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 54.)
Chittick, F. C., Promotion, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
Church Point, Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
Circular issued by P. Landry: Ques. (Mr. *Béland*) 2458 (i).
Circular *re* Public Works, issued by Mr. Mulock: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 843 (i).
Civil Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 172, 199, 530 (i).
Civil Service Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 4315.
Civil Service List: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 129.
Civil Service Retirement Act Amt. B. No. 124 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 3236; 2°.* 3775; in Com., 3775; 3°*, 3776 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 6.)
Clark's Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty and Alaskan Boundary: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 143 (i).
——— M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Monk*) 747 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 753, 756, 812, 825 (i).
——— Letter from Sir Louis Davies: Personal Explanation, on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 785, 811 (i).
Clegg, Samuel, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4699 (ii).
Clergue's Contract, Steel Rails, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3781 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.
Clerkships, Additional, P.O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
Clerks of Works, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
Clinton, David, Dismissal from Wellington P.O.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).
Clinton, Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 719.
Coal carried by Chartered Steamers, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 884 (i).
Coal purchased in Can., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 883 (i).
Coal Oil Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1203 (i), 2931, 3300 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) Ruling, 1170 (i).
——— *re* N.W. Ter. and Man.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5055 (ii).
——— Memorandum read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5074 (ii).
——— at Port Arthur: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2931, 3300 (ii).
Coasting Trade of Can. B. No. 165 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 4126; in Com. on Res., 4246; 1°* of B., 4361; 2°*, and in Com., 4607; 3° m., 4612, 4701 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 7.)
Coasting Trade: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
Cobourg, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 721 (i).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
Colchester Regiment, Pets. *re* Medals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4699 (ii).
Cold Storage, Deep Sea Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
Cold Storage on Steamships and Rys.: in Com. of Sup., 368 (i), 2568 (ii).
Collegiate Institute, Cadet Corps: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 240 (i).
Collinet, Mrs., Matron of Yukon Court House: Letter *re* Allowance, in Com, of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— Memo. (Mr. *Tarte*) read, 4536 (ii).
Collingwood Harbour, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (i), 4638 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
Colonial Appeals to Imp. Privy Council: M. (Mr. *Lemieux*) for Cor., 3668 (ii).
Colonial Ministers: *See* 'Intercolonial Conference.'
Colonial Troops in Defence of the Empire, Par. in *Ottawa Citizen*: Remarks (Mr. *Monet*) 785 (i).
Columbia River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 1276.
Comeaus Hill Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
Commercial Agencies, *re* Treaties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
Commercial Travellers and Tax by Jamaica: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622 (i).
——— Tax, &c. in P.E.I., Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).
Commissions to Can. Officers in British Army: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 419 (i).
Commissions on Disbursements for Imp. Authorities: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1065 (i).
——— S.A. War, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1063 (i).
Committees of the House, Accommodation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2298 (i).
Committee, Joint, on Printing: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 128 (i).
——— Sel. Standing: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
——— Lists Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 122 (i).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Names, 1063 (i), 2482, 2568 (ii).
Commodities Packing and Sale Act Amt. B. No. 141 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1° m., 3622; 2°*, 4246; in Com., 4246, 4354; 3°*, 4354 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 32.)
Commutations for Arson, Number, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 419 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 45 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1108 (i).
Conciliation Act Amt. B. No. 32 (Mr. *Puttee*) 1° m., 881 (i).
Constabulary, S. A., Applications, Selections, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 243 (i).
——— *See* 'S.A. War,' &c.
Consular Agencies, Flags, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 132 (i).
Contract *vs.* Day Labour: *See* 'Day Labour.'
Controverted Elections, Judges' Certificates: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancies (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— *See* 'H. of C.' &c.

COOLING FANS, STEAMERS FITTED WITH, NUMBER, NAMES, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616, 882 (i).
COPPER CROWN WORKS AND I.C.R., CONTRACTS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).
CORN LAWS, REPEAL, AND IMP. BUDGET SPEECH : *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
CORNWALL, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
——— CANAL, REPAIRS, LIGHTING, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4310 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3038 (ii).
CORONATION CONTINGENT, EMPLYMT. OF S.A. MEN, &c. : prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2459 ; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2469 (i).
——— *re* MILITIA : in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 4647 (ii).
——— REPRESENTATIVES, &c. : on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Porter*) 3835 (ii).
CORONATION DAY, PUBLIC HOLIDAY : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 747 (i).
CORONATION EXPENSES OF MINISTERS : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
CORONATION OF HIS MAJESTY, APPNMT. OF CAN. DELEGATES : M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 153 (i).
——— *See* 'Intercolonial Conference.'
CORRY & LAVERDURE, CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* TRENT CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
Cosmos Cotton Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. *Flint*) 1°*, 1569 ; 2°*, 1680 (i) ; in Com., 2670 ; 3° m., 2887 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 56.)
COTÉ, JOS., MAIL CARRIER AT STE. HENEDINE, CONTRACT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).
COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, INDEMNITY TO J. LAROSE : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
COTTON, BLEACHED AND UNBLEACHED, DUTY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Madore*) 614 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, AGE LIMIT, &c. : Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 418 (i).
——— COMPULSORY RETIREMENT : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
——— *See* 'Judges.'
COURT HOUSE, N.W.T., POLICE ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 849 (i).
COURT HOUSE, YUKON, ALLOWANCE TO MATRON, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
COURTS-MARTIAL IN CAN. MILITIA, NUMBER, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 740 (i).
COUTTS, MR., AMOUNTS PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
COW BAY BREAKWATER, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CRAIG, JUDGE, INTERVIEW *re* YUKON IRREGULARITIES : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 972 (i).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CRATHIE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
CREAMERIES, BONUSES TO, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 2653.
CREDITON P.O., DECEASE OF POSTMASTER, VACANCY, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 3308 (ii).
CREOSOTED TIMBER IN WHARFS, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
——— TIMBER PLANT : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
CRIBBON'S POINT WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
Criminal Code (1892) Act Amt. B. No. 33 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 882 (i).
——— **B. No. 58** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1438 (i).
——— **B. No. 61** (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1490 (i).
——— **B. No. 108** (Mr. *Russell*) 1° m., 2567 (ii).
CRIMINAL STATISTICS, COMPILATION : in Com. of Sup., 335 (i).
CROSSEN MFG. CO. : *See* 'I.C.R. Trucks,' &c.
CROSS POINT ISOLATED PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4630.
Crown Bank of Canada incorp, B. No. 79 (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1°*, 1860 ; 2° m., 2021 (i) ; in Com., 2607 ; 3°*, 2608 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 57.)
CROWN PROSECUTOR IN YUKON : in Com. of Sup., 3590.
CROW'S NEST COAL FIELDS, COR. WITH U. S. A. GOVT., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 2471 (i).
CULBUTE CANAL, DAMAGES BY FLOODING : in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4309 (ii).
CURRENT WAGES CLAUSE AND GOVT. CONTRACTS, NUMBER AWARDED, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 631.
CURRY, MR., CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 2924 (i).
Customs Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Mr. *Fielding*) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 4972 ; in Com., 4972 ; 1° m., 4977 ; 2°*, and in Com., 4977 ; 3° m., 4977 (ii). (2 *Edward VII., c.* 33.)
CUSTOMS :
AMERICAN TUGS IN CAN. WATERS, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 441 (i).
APPRAISERS : in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
ARICHAT CUSTOM HOUSE : in Com. of Sup. 635.
BATHURST COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, ABSENCE FROM OFFICE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124.
BEET ROOT SUGAR MACHINERY, FREE ENTRY : in Com. on Ways and Means, 4972 (ii).
CATTLE EXPORTED TO U. S. FROM 1890, VALUE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 3153 (ii).
CHARLOTTETOWN PORT : in Com. of Sup., 2932.
COTTON, BLEACHED AND UNBLEACHED, DUTY RATE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Madore*) 614 (i).
CURRY, MR., CUSTOMS OFFICER : in Com. of Sup., 2924 (ii).
CUSTOMS DEPT., CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 208 (i).
——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 3303 (ii).
——— LABORATORY : in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2921, 4264 (ii).
——— FORFEITED GOODS, SYDNEY, N.S., SALE, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 783 (i).
DRESDEN PORT : in Com. of Sup., 2925 (ii).
FLAX SEED IMPORTED FROM U.S., AMOUNT, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1682 (i).
FREE LIST, ARTICLES PLACED ON SINCE 1897 : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 244 (i).
GERMAN DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS : Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 156 (i).
GRAIN SHIPMENTS FROM ONT. PORTS IN 1901 : Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246 (i).
IMPORTS FROM U. S. FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL VALUE : Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).
INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2921, 3294 (ii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
LINSEED OIL, IMPORTATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2932, 3299 (ii).
'McCORMICK' BINDER, CUSTOMS VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 441 (i).
MAGAZINES, &c., IMPORTED FROM G. B. and U. S., VALUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2679.
NICKEL EXPORTATIONS, &c.: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3030 (ii).
PERRY, MR. C. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 2923 (ii).
PORTER, Dr., Claim: in Com, of Sup.. 5033 (ii).
PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3297 (ii).
ST. THOMAS, COLLECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2930, 3295 (ii).
SUGAR, REFINED, IMPORTED INTO CAN. FROM 1900 TO 1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Madore*) 809 (i).
——— TESTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
TOBACCO DUTY, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).
U. S. IMPORTS FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, 1901, TOTAL VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).
WINDSOR, ONT., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
YARN ADMITTED DUTY FREE, REGULATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 4125 (ii).

CYR, MR., CLERK OF WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 876 (i).

DAIRYING BRANCH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2568 (ii).

DAVIES, SIR LOUIS, LETTER *re* CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) 811 (i).
——— *See* 'Clayton-Bulwer,' &c.

DAWSON AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

DAWSON, MR., INSPECTOR OF PENITENTIARIES, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).

DAY LABOUR AND CONTRACT SYSTEM ON PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 674–708, 836–880 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL: in Com. of Sup., 4327, 4342 (ii).
——— 1ST REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Holmes*) 440 (i).
——— 2ND REP.: Presented (Mr. *Charlton*) 1204; conc., M. (Mr. *Scott*) 1322 (i).
——— 3RD REP. OF COM.: Presented (Mr. *Champagne*) 1489; conc., 1673 (i).
——— TRANSLATORS, 4TH REP.: M. (Mr. *Champagne*) to conc., 4121, 4241 (ii).

DEPTL. BUILDINGS, CLEANING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Ottawa,' &c.

Depew, Geo., Patent Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4075; wthdn, 4692 (ii).

DEPOT HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).

DESCARY, DR. C. A., VET. SURGEON AT ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).

DESERONTO PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 728.

DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).

DESROCHERS, R. C., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4535.

DESTITUTE INDIANS, RELIEF, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).

DEVLIN, MR. C. R., IMMIGRATION AGENT, PAR IN *Witness*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 619 (i).
——— COR. *re* LETTERS MAKING STATEMENTS AGAINST MEMBERS: M. for Copies * (Mr. *Wilson*) 154 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 451, 634, 1204 (i).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' &c.

DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).

DISMISSALS OF GOVT. EMPLOYEES FOR POLITICAL REASONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bell*) 428 (i).
——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 429 (i).

DISTILLERY, DUTY, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

DITCHING ALONG FARM LANDS IN TEMISCOUATA, DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr, *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).

Divorce: *See* 'Brown, Jas., Relief B.'
——— *See* 'Chipman, S. N.'

DIVORCE COURT, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

DIVORCE, PROTEST *re* PRESENT METHOD: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 4121, 4692 (ii).

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4534, 4782 (ii).

DOM. BANK NOTES, CIRCULATION FROM 1892 TO 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 615 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 619 (i).
——— *See* 'Charges of Management,' &c.

DOM. BUILDINGS, CARETAKERS, ENGINEERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).
——— GENERALLY, RENEWALS: in Com. of Sup., 728.
——— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (il).
——— MAN., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 831.
——— MAR. PROVS., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
——— QUE., RENEWALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
——— RENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
——— *See* 'Buildings,' &c.

Dom. Cotton Mills Co.'s B. No. 71 (Mr. *Prefontaine*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII., c.* 59.)

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. *Northrup*) 1° m., 238 (i).
——— **B. No. 27** (Mr. *Clancy*) 1°*, 734; 2° m., 1132 (i).

DOM. IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS, FURNITURE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i), 4616 (ii).

Dom. Lands Act Amt. B. No. 120 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769, 3832; 3°*, 3832; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

DOM. LANDS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4117.
——— SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4252, 4953 (ii).

DOMINION POLICE, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 233 (i).

DOM. AND PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

Dom. Ry. and Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 97 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889 (ii).

DOM. SECURITIES CO., PAR. IN N. Y. PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4428 (ii).
——— PROSPECTUS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3466, 3533 (ii).

DOM. ST AMERS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 422,
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
DORCHESTER COUNTY, QUE., POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4934 (ii).
DORCHESTER, N.B., PENITENTIARY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
DOUGLAS, GEO. C., P.E.I., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
DOYON, THOS., POSTMASTER AT ST. ODILON, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4350 (ii).
Drainage across Ry. Lands B. No. 4 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 121; 2° m., 626 (i).
——— **B. No. 6** (*Mr. Robinson, Elgin*) 1°m., 238; 2° m., 789 (i).
DREDGES BUILT AND OWNED BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3284, 4763 (ii).
——— PLANT, GENERAL VOTE: in Com. of Sup., 3283.
——— ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565.
DRESDEN PORT, *re* CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2925.
DROUIN, MR., ABSENCE FROM CENSUS STAFF: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
DRUM HEAD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RECEIPTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
DRUMMONDVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i), 4180 (ii).
DUGAS, JUDGE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST [FROM MRS. COLLINET: Remarks in Com. of Sup, 4193 (ii).
——— MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536.
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
DUNDAS, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716, 863 (i).
DURHAM CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
Dyment Banking Loan and Savings Co.'s incorp. B. No. 51 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4123 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 60.)
EASTER ADJOURNMENT: M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1569 (i).
EASTERN EXTENSION, ARBITRATION, &c.: in Com. of Sup, 4340 (ii).
——— REFUNDS FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 781 (i).
EASTERN PARLIAMENT BUILDING, REPAIRS TO WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ECUM SECUM WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4210
EDMONTON JAIL, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 849, 853.
Edmonton and Slave Lake Ry. Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. *Costigan*) 1°*, 529; 2°*, 612; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 61.)
EEL RIVER STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
EILBECK, R. J., APPNMT. AS SHERIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
——— ABSENCE FROM YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745.
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1202.
ELEVATOR ATTENDANTS, DEPTL. BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
——— HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4137 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
EMPLOYEES, GOVT., AND FEDERAL ELECTIONS, GOVT. ACTION: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 618 (i).
——— HOUSE OF COMMONS, TRANSPORTATION TO HOMES: Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) 5056 (ii).
——— I.C.R., SALARIES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bell*) 440 (i).
——— PUBLIC WORKS DEPT., NONPAYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
——— Remarks (*Mr. Taylor*) 3777 (ii).
——— SALARIES, P.O. DEPT., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
——— YUKON, ALLOWANCES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4196 (ii).
——— MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536.
ENGINEERS, &c., I.C.R., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
——— PUBLIC WORKS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ENGLISH BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
ENUMERATORS *re* CENSUS: in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
——— *See* 'Census,' &c.
ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 54 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 62.)
ESTIMATES, COMPARISONS WITH FORMER YEAR, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 507.
ESTIMATES, THE: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 120 (i).
——— SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 785 (i).
——— FURTHER SUPPL. (1902): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3918 (ii).
——— SUPPL. (1903): Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 4353.
——— FURTHER SUPPL.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 5030.
'EUREKA,' TUG, FURNISHING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 567 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
Exchequer Court Act Amt B. No. 114 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3511; in Com., 3511; 3°*, 3935 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.*8.)
——— **B. No. 139** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) Res. prop., 3239; in Com. on Res., 3311; 1°* of B., 3510; wthdn., 4579 (ii).
EXCISE, INSPECTORS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1147 (i), 4528 (ii).
——— *See* 'Inland Revenues,' &c.
EXPERIMENTAL FARMS: in Com. of Sup., 344 (i), 2867, 2889, 4966 (ii).
——— BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 875 (i).
——— OTTAWA, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson, Lennox*) 152 (i).
EXTRA PAYMENTS, CANALS, FOR OVERTIME: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4312 (ii).

FAREWELL, J. C., ACCOUNT *re* NORTH ONTARIO ELECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
FARM BULLETINS, PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 345 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
FARM HANDS, MAN.: *See* 'Labour in Man.'
FARRAN'S POINT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
FENIAN RAID MEDALS, ISSUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1109 (i).
——— *See* "Militia", &c.

FINANCE:
BANK OF COMMERCE, YUKON, COMMISSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (i).
B.N.A. ACT *re* PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES, &C: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 441 (i).
BUDGET, THE: Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1279 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 962 (i).
BURLAND BANK NOTE CO., LITIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 4317 (ii).
CHARGES OF MANAGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 171 (i), 4317, 4533; conc., 4342 (ii).
CHARTERED BANKS, LIST OF SHAREHOLDERS: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS AND TAX BY JAMAICA, &C Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622, 781 (i).
DOM. BANK NOTES, CIRCULATION FROM 1892 TO 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 615 (i).
——— NUMBER OF SHEETS ISSUED SINCE 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 619 (i).
——— REDEMPTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4533.
EASTERN EXTENSION, ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
ESTIMATES, COMPARISONS WITH FORMER YEAR, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 507 (i).
ESTIMATES, THE: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 120, 785 (i), 3918, 4353, 5030 (ii).
FINANCE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
FINANCIAL SITUATION, REVIEW, &C.: Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) to Com. of Sup., 4810; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 84) 4859 (ii).
FINANCIAL STATEMENT: *See* 'Budget.'
HICKS-BEACH, SIR MICHAEL, BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'
IMPERIAL INSTITUTE FOR CAN. IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 364 (i).
INSURANCE, GENERAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
INTERAL ECONOMY COM., MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 154 (i).
IRON AND STEEL BOUNTIES: in Com. of Sup., 4331 (ii).
JAMAICA, REPEAL OF TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622 (i).
MAN. SCHOOL LANDS FUND, REDUCTION OF INTEREST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2941 (ii).
——— REP. *re* INVESTIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3035 (ii).
MINT: *See* 'Royal.'
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Henderson*) 2473 (i).
PAPER COMBINE, REP. OF COMMISSION: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).
PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 2733, 2942 (ii).
——— RES. FROM BOARDS OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3153 (ii).
PROVINCIAL ARBITRATION ACCOUNTS: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
ROYAL MINT BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
ST. VINCENT, W. I., RELIEF TO SUFFERERS: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).

FINANCE—*Con.*
SHOE WORKERS UNION, QUEBEC, PET. TO GOVT., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Puttee*) 2473 (i).
TREASURY BOARD: in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
WAYS AND MEANS: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 120, 1279 (i); 4972, 5064 (ii).

FIRE INSURANCE, &C., I.C.R., LOCOMOTIVES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).

FISHERIES:
BOUNTY CHEQUES FOR FISHERMEN: in Com. of Sup., 553 (i).
B.C. FISHERIES, INVESTIGATION *re* REP. OF COMMISSION: Remarks (Mr. *Earle*) 3308 (ii).
COLD STORAGE FOR DEEP SEA FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
EXHIBITS AT OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 553 (i).
FISHERIES DEPT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 177 (i), 4222 (ii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 129, 408 (i).
FISHERY AWARDS AND P.E.I. PREMIER'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 3859 (ii).
FISHERY AWARD: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY, FISH HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 551 (i), 4959 (ii).
HATCHERIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4222, 4959.
——— MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).
——— B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
HERRINGS SLAUGHTERED, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4223 (ii).
HURLEY, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR, INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).
——— Statement read (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 4968 (ii).
INSPECTORS, OVERSEERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 533 (i), 4228 (ii).
KEMP, ERNEST, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).
MARGAREE FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).
MUSSEL MUD *re* FISHERY REGULATIONS, 1893: Ques. (Mr. *Farquharson*) 3307 (ii).
NOBLE BROS., AWARD *re* FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4228, 4957 (ii).
——— PAPERS, *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 3926.
OYSTER CULTURE: in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).
——— FISHING IN P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 540.
——— PROTECTION REGULATIONS, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).
——— SHEDIAC BAY, LICENSES ISSUED, NAMES, DATES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 746, 1444 (i).
P.E.I., SALMON AND LOBSTER HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).
——— FISHING GEAR, CONFISCATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1440 (i).
——— PRINCE COUNTY FISHING LICENSES, NUMBER ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).
PRINCE, PROF., AND B.C. FISH CANNERS IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Beland*) 449, 613 (i).
PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, PRIVY COUNCIL, JUDGMENT, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 534, 548 (i).
SEINE LICENSES ISSUED IN B. C., NUMBER, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Earle*) 2680 (i).
SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).

FLAX SEED IMPORTED FROM U. S., AMOUNT, VALUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 1682 (i).

FONTAINE, L. E., ALLOWANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).
FORT WILLIAM, INSPECTION OF COAL OIL: in Com. of Sup., 1148 (i).
——— *See* 'Coal Oil,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
FRANCHISE ACT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4329 (ii).
FRAUDULENT SALES ACT, INSPECTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Schell*) 744 (i).
FREE LIST, ARTICLES PLACED ON SINCE 1897: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 244 (i).
FREIGHT RATES ON RYS., REP. OF PROF. MCLEAN: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 448 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Kemp*) 1205 (i).
FRENCH LANGUAGE IN COURT: *See* 'O'Keefe.'
FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 574, 578 (i).
FRENCH TRANSLATION OF ENGLISH DEBATES: Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) in Com. of Sup., 4330 (ii).
FRIAR'S HEAD HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002.
FRUIT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 2585, 2622 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. No. 136 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1° m., 3307; 2°*, 4129; in Com., 4129; 3°*, 4136; Sen. Amts., 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 10.)
FRUIT TRANSPORTATION, &c., EXCESSIVE CHARGES, RES. OF GEORGIAN BAY FRUIT GROWERS' ASS'N.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1109 (i).
FUMIGATING STATIONS FOR NURSERY STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 353 (i).
GALOPS CANAL, DEEPENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4021, 4300 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 5020 (ii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized territories) Amt. B. No. 117 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 2941; 2°*, 3769; in Com., 3769; 3°*, 3769 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 12.)
GANANOQUE, DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 867 (i).
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
GARDENERS, PROTECTION: *See* 'Market.'
GAS INSPECTION: in Com of Sup., 1201 (i).
——— *See* 'Inland Revenue.'
Gaspé and Western Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 102 (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); M. for Com., 4569, 4647; in Com., 4667; 3°*, 4667.
——— Ques. of Order: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 4656, 4665 (ii).
GASPÉ AS AN OCEAN PORT: *See* 'Paspebiac.'
GASPÉ PENINSULA, REMOVAL OF ROCK IN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 4782 (ii).
GAUDET, MR., COMPILING HISTORICAL DATA FOR ACADIANS: in Com. of Sup., 356 (i).
General Inspection Act (hides) Amt. B. No. 111 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1° m., 2849 (ii).
——— **(binder twine) B. No. 142** (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1° m., 3623; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4246 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 11.)
G. O. C., INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes Victoria*) 614 (i).
——— RIGHT TO REP. TO IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY: in Com. of Sup., 4250 (ii).
——— DIRECTOR, APPNMT., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
——— GEOLOGIST TO INT. BOUNDARY SURVEY, SALARY: in Com of Sup., 4250, 4948 (ii).
——— MAPS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
——— REP.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 2659 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY CANAL, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4298 (ii).
GEORGIAN BAY, FISH HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup. 4959 (ii).
——— POINTE AU BARIL ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
GERMAN DUTIES ON CAN. IMPORTS: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 156 (i).
——— TARIFF *re* NATIONS AND DEPENDENCIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617 (i).
——— *See* 'Anglo-German,' &c.
GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
——— PAYMENTS TO FROM MAY TO DEC., 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 2155 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
GILMOUR P. O., DISMISSAL OF T. RICKETTS: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
GLACE BAY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
GLASGOW EXPOSITION, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 357 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
GOVT. BUILDINGS, &c., CONTRACT OR DAY LABOUR SYSTEM: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 670-734, 836-880 (i).
GOVT. BUSINESS, MORNING SESSIONS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3920 (ii).
——— PRECEDENCE ON MONDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 961 (i).
——— PRECEDENCE ON WEDNESDAYS: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1278 (i), 2720 (ii).
——— *See* 'Business of the House,' 'Bills,' 'Procedure,' &c.
GOVT. CONTRACTS AND CURRENT WAGES CLAUSE, NUMBER AWARDED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Puttee*) 631 (i).
GOVT. EMPLOYEES, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 132 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bell*) 428 (i).
GOVT. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 636-733, 836-880 (i).
GOVT. RY. EMPLOYEES, WAGES OF TRACKMEN, &c., prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) Neg. (Y. 33; N. 54) 3824 (ii).
GOVT. RYS., RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
——— *See* 'Railways,' 'I. C. R.'

GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i).

GOV. GEN.'S SEC.'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 172 (i).

GOW, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).

GRAIN, &c. IN ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612 (i).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

——— IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN PORTS, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246, 782 (i).

Grain Bill: *See* 'Man. Grain Bill.'

GRAIN INSPECTION ACT AMT. B.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3623 (ii).

GRAIN INSPECTION AT MONTREAL, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 450 (i).

——— INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 532, 1184 (i).

——— INSPECTION IN MAN., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2857 (ii).

——— SHIPMENTS FROM ONT. PORTS IN 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246, 782 (i).

——— STANDARDS: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).

——— TESTERS: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).

GRAND ANSE BREAKWATER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).

GRAND RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup. 4622 (ii).

G. T. RY. CO., RENTALS BY I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

GRAND VALLEE PIER, QUE.: in Com of Sup., 1031 (i).

Grand Valley Traction Co.'s Change of Name B. No. 21 (Mr. *Heyd*) 1°*, 611; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1619; 3°*, 1620 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 91.)

GRAPES PURCHASED BY DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, AMOUNTS RECEIVED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3151 (ii).

GRATUITY TO MRS. N. WHITE: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).

GRAVING DOCKS, LEVIS, KINGSTON AND ESQUIMALT, WORKING EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4220 (ii).

Great Eastern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 129 (Mr. *Taylor*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637 (ii).

Greek Catholic Orthodox Church incorp. B. No. 140 (Mr. *Oliver*) M. to ref. Pet. back to Sel. Com., 2715, 3121; M. to introduce B., 3303; 1°*, 3622; on Order for 2°, 3866; 2° m., 4076; in Com., 4667; 3° m., 4690 (ii).

——— Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 3125 (ii).

GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).

GROSSE ISLE QUARANTINE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 644, 982 (i).

GUNNING COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 991.

HALF-BREED COMMISSION EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).

HALIFAX AND S. WESTERN RY. EXTENSION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5064 (ii).

HALIFAX, BRANCH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).

——— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).

——— HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

Halifax Industrial School Act Amt. B. No. 152 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 4036; 2°*, 4701; 3°*, 4702 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 13.)

HALIFAX, LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, SETTLEMENT, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2859 (ii).

——— PROVISIONAL GARRISON: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

HAMILTON AND GUELPH MAIL CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &c.: M. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) for Copy,* 3724 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465.

HAMILTON WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i), 4642 (ii).

——— DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).

——— FOREMEN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).

——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 604, 1275 (i), 4642 (ii).

——— MAR. PROVS., GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 4142, 4213 (ii).

——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i), 4626 (ii).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 4210, 4616 (ii).

——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217, (i), 4217, 4637 (ii).

——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i), 4211, 4625.

——— QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031, (i), 4213, 4629 (ii).

——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).

HARDY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4643 (ii).

HAWBOLD'S COVE, COST OF BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).

HAY PURCHASED FOR WAR OFFICE IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).

HEATING, LIGHTING, &c., DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4189 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

'HERALD,' 'GLOBE,' &c., AMOUNT PAID BY GOVT.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 810 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 615 (i).

HERRING COVE BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).

HERRINGS SLAUGHTERED, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4223 (ii).

HICKS-BEACH, SIR MICHAEL, BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'

HIGH COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 180 (i).

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i), 4326 (ii).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 5039 (ii).

HILLHOUSE, A. P., CHICKENS PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3409 (ii).

HILTON, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

HOGS AND SHEEP SLAUGHTERED, COMPENSATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4968 (ii).

HOLSTEIN, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3875, 4925, 4933 (ii).

HOPEWELL CAPE PIER, DATE OF COMPLETION, &C. : Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1444 (i).

HORNE, MR. R. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2068 (i).

HORSES IMPORTED IN MAN. AND N.W.T., CUSTOMS DUTY : Remarks on M. for Com. of Sup., 1206

Debate : (Mr. *Charlton*) 1207 ; (Mr. *Scott*) 1208 ; (Mr. *Gilmour*) 1209 ; (Mr. *Osler*) 1210 ; (Mr. *Holmes*) 1211 ; (Mr. *Oliver*) 1212 ; (Mr. *Heyd*) 1212 ; (Mr. *Davis*) 1214 ; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 1216 ; (Mr. *Johnston, Cardwell*) 1216 (i).

HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W.T. FOR FOURTH CONTINGENT : Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1989 (i), 2679 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

ADDINGTON ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION : in Com. of Sup., 214, 560 (i), 4137 (ii).

BEAUCE ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 610 (i).

BILLS, assented to, 5083 (ii).

——— PROCEDURE, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 2481 (i).

——— remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 611 (i).

——— WITHDRAWN : Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4970 (ii).

BRUCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

BURRARD CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

CHARLOTTE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFCATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

CHICOUTIMI ELECTORAL DISTRICT, DISMISSAL OF PET. : (Mr. *Speaker*) 2219 (i).

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE, ACCOMMODATION, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) 2293 (i).

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' CERTIFICATES : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification of Vacancies (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

CORNWALL CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

DURHAM CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

ELEVATORS, HOUSE OF COMMONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4137 (ii).

EMPLOYEES OF HOUSE OF COMMONS : Remarks (Mr. *Morin*) 5056 (ii).

INTERNAL ECONOMY COM. : Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 154 (i).

KINGSTON ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

LAVAL ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

LEGISLATION : in Com. of Sup., 234 (i), 4326 (ii).

LIBRARY, BOOKS, &C., RETENTION BY MEMBRS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 4644 (ii).

——— 2ND REP. OF COM. : M. (Mr. *Scott*) to conc., 4644 (ii).

——— MESSENGERS' SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).

——— PRINTING, &C., H. OF C. : in Com. of Sup., 4327 (i).

——— REPORT : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

LISGAR CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 881 (i).

——— REVISING OFFICER, DATE OF APPNMT., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 3152 (ii).

L'ISLET ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

MEMBERS ADDRESSING THE CHAIR : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 113 (i).

——— intruduced, 3, 4, 68, 121, 610 (i).

——— NEW, CERTIFICATE OF ELECTIONS : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

MESS. FROM HIS EX. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 785 (i), 3918, 4354, 5030 (ii).

MONTREAL (ST. JAMES) ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

OTTAWA CITY, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

OXFORD ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

PETITIONS, IRREGULARITY OF : Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 2145, 2218 (i)

PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. *Flint*) 780 (i), 4464 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Fielding*) 4567-8 (ii).

PROROGATION, LETTERS FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC. : Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5032 (ii).

——— Remarks, 4968, 5081 (ii).

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., MEETINGS, &C. : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 439 (i).

——— M. to print Evidence *re* Gaudry (Mr. *Kemp*) 4343 (ii).

——— WITNESSES *re* YUKON CHARGES : in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

QUEEN'S (P.E.I.) ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

RAILWAY COM. : M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) to add Name, 1278 (i).

SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED AS CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 619 (i).

STATIONERY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4326 (ii).

TERREBONNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

TWO MOUNTAINS CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1323 (i).

VACANCIES : Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

VENTILATION OF HOUSE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).

VICTORIA, B.C , CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 65 (i).

YORK, N. B., CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.

Hudson's Bay and North-west Ry. Co.'s B. No. 93 (Mr. *Oliver*) 1°*, 2145 ; 2°*, 2474 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 63.)

HUDSON WHARF, QUE. : in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).

HUMPHREY, HIRAM, POSTMASTER AT MCDONALD'S CORNERS, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).

HUNTSVILLE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

HURDMAN, MAJ., ALLOWANCE *re* S. A. WAR: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).

HURLEY, MR., FISHERY INSPECTOR, INTERFERENCE IN ELECTIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).

——— Statement read (Mr. *Sutherland*, Oxford) 4968 (ii).

Huron and Erie Canal Co's. incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1902 (i); 2°*, 2676 (ii).

HUTTON-HUGHES, RET. ORDERED BY HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, Victoria, 446 (i).

HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS ON THE LAKES: in Com. of Sup., 527, 533 (i).

Immigration Act (medical attendance) Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 2850; 2°*, 3734; in Com., 3734; 3° m., 3927; Sen. Amts., 4801 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 14.)

IMMIGRATION:
AGENTS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2988
AMOUNT SPENT FROM 1891 TO 1901, AGENTS EMPLOYED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153.
BOER IMMIGRATION, PAR. IN *Mail and Empire*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 3407 (i).
BUILDINGS, DOM., FURNITURE, MAINTENANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION, REP. OF COM., FIRST PART: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451.
CONTINGENCIES, PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4248 (ii).
DEVLIN, C. R., COR. *re* LETTERS MAKING STATEMENTS AGAINST MEMBERS: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Wilson*) 154 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 451, 635, 1204 (i).
——— On M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Wilson*) 2946 (ii).
——— PAR. IN *Witness*: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 619 (i).
IMMIGRATION, AMOUNT SPENT FROM 1891 TO 1901, AGENTS EMPLOYED, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).
——— DURING 1892: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 244 (i).
——— DURING 1902, JAN. 1 TO MAY 1: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*, Ontario) 4697 (ii).
——— MR. PEDLEY'S EXAMINATION BEFORE COM.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 369 (i).
——— ITALIAN IMMIGRATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3927 (ii).
JAPANESE IMMIGRATION, REP. OF ROYAL COMMISSION: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2658 (ii).
ORIENTAL, REP. OF COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 444 (i).
——— Rep. presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451 (i).
PEDLEY: *See* 'Immigration.'
WELSH IMMIGRATION FROM PATAGONIA, MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S REMARKS *re* CLIMATE OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Ont.*) 1441 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 242 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 240 (i).
——— *See* 'Interior.'

IMPERIAL BUDGET SPEECH: *See* 'Preferential Trade.'

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
——— *See* 'Intercolonial Conference,' &c.

IMPERIAL INSTITUTE FOR CAN. IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 364 (i).
——— PRIVY COUNCIL APPEALS. *See* 'Colonial.'

IMPLEMENTS, AGRICULTURAL, N.W.T. INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (i).
——— *See* 'Indians,' &c.

IMPORTS FROM U. S. FOR HOME CONSUMPTION, TOTAL VALUE: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).

Indian River Railway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 14 (Mr. *Béland*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1624 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edwar*

INDIANS:
AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, GRANTS TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3048 (ii).
B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).
——— INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3059 (ii).
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3058, 4247 (ii).
CORNWALL: in Com. of Sup., 3038 (ii).
DESTITUTE, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3056.
GOW, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1155 (i).
HALF-BREED COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
INDIAN DEPT.: in Com of Sup., 3035 (ii).
——— INSPECTORS: in Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
——— PRINTING, STATIONERY: in Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).
——— TREATY NO. 3, AMOUNT CLAIMED BY DOM. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clancy*) 1681 (i).
LEDUC, MR. J. D., INSPECTOR *re* LIQUOR LICENSES AND INDIANS; in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061.
LIQUOR TRAFFIC, SUPPESSION, LEGAL EXPENSES *re* INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061 (ii).
MAN. AND N. W. T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (ii).
——— GRIST AND SAW MILLS: in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).
MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3041 (ii).
MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST COMMISSION, REVENUE RECEIVED, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 481 (i).
MUNCEY, GRANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3048 (ii).
N. B., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
N. W. T., AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (ii).
N. S., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3050, 3081 (ii).
ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3037, 3043.
——— MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
——— SCHOOLS, &C.: in Com of Sup., 3045 (ii).
P. E. I., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3053 (ii).
RESTIGOUCHE, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS, REP. OF INSPECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fowler*) 2473 (i).
ROSEAU RIVER RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
SEED GRAIN FOR INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3050 (ii).
——— N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
SIOUX: in Com of Sup., 3056 (ii).
TREATY, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).

INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES, PRESERVATION TREATY, &C.: Par. in Newspapers (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 2146 (i).

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS. B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3059.

INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (ii).

INLAND REVENUE:
COAL OIL INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1148, 1203 (i).
——— QUES. OF ORDER (Mr. *Dep. Speaker*): Ruling, 1170 (i).
——— *re* N. W. T. AND MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5055 (ii).
——— Memorandum read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5074 (ii).
——— PORT ARTHUR, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2931, 3300 (ii).
DISTILLERY, DUTY, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
ELECTRIC LIGHT INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1202 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*
EXCISE, INSPECTORS, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1147 (i), 4258, 4961 (ii).
GAS INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i).
GRAIN INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 532, 1184 (i).
——— MAN.. &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2857 (ii).
——— MONTREAL, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 450 (i).
GRAIN STANDARDS: in Com. of Sup., 4258 (ii).
——— TESTERS: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
INLAND REVENUE: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Bernier*) 121 (i).
INSPECTORS OF WEIGHTS AND MEASURES, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SALE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
METRICAL INSTRUMENTS: in Com.of Sup., 1201 (i).
METRIC SYSTEM, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i), 4961 (ii).
THREE RIVERS, INSPECTOR GRAVEL, AMOUNTS PAID, COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, EXCISE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4961 (ii).
WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 1184.
INSURANCE, GENERAL EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE WITH IMP. GOVT., COR., &c.; on M. for Com. of Sup., 4704 (ii).
Debate: (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4794; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4724; (Mr. *Brock*) 4731; (Mr. *Charlton*) 4735; (Mr. *Haggart*) 4741; (Mr. *Fisher*) 4744; (Mr. *Sproule*) 4748; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 4753; (Mr. *Lennox*) 4756 (ii).
INTERCOLONIAL CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS IN LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
——— DESPATCHES, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426-7 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:
ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 883 (i).
ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3811, 4792; conc., 5037 (ii).
AIR BRAKES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).
BARBOUR, JOHN, DISMISSAL, CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2853 (ii).
BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4792 (ii).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4294 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mulgrave,' &c.
CAR COUPLERS: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).
CHAUDIERE JUNCTION ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
CLASSIFYING OF EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
CLERGUE'S CONTRACT, STEEL RAILS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3781 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rails,' &c.
COAL PURCHASED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 883 (i).
DITCHING ALONG FARM LANDS IN TEMISCOUATA, DAMAGES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677.
ENGINEERS, &c., SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
EXPENDITURE, INQUIRY BY PUB. ACCTS. COM.: Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3251 (ii).
FIRE INSURANCE, &c., ON LOCOMOTIVES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).
FREIGHT RATES ON PIG IRON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 782 (i).
GENERAL STATEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3411 (ii).
HALIFAX, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
HORNE, MR. R. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2068 (i).
JOUGHINS, MR., REP. *re* LOCOMOTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3416 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mechanical Supt.', &c.
KING BROS., CLAIM *re* DAMAGES: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3307 (ii).
LEVIS, ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3810.
——— LOCAL TRAIN SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
LOCOMOTIVES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3426, 3816.
——— CONSTRUCTION, STEAMING QUALITIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 445 (i).
——— AND RY. CARS PURCHASED FROM 1896 TO 1902: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rolling Stock,' &c.
MCMANUS, MR., LETTER *re* PURCHASE OF TIES, &c.: Remarks in Com., of Sup., 3502, 3568.
——— *See* 'Ties,' &c.
MACHINERY, TOOLS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4297 (ii).
MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT, REPORTS, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3813 (ii).
——— *See* 'Joughins,' &c.
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE, NEW SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4797 (ii).
——— SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 614 (i).
MULGRAVE IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1683 (i).
——— *See* 'Canso,' &c.
NORTH SYDNEY IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— *See* 'Sydney,' 'I. C. R.', &c.
OFFICIALS, NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 132 (i).
OPERATING EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4310 (ii).
ORIGINAL CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 3809.
PASSES ISSUED, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 810.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Clarke*) 4403 (ii).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3812.
POINT TUPPER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
P. E. I. AND I. C. R. RYS., ACCOUNTS, VOUCHERS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
——— REVENUE AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT FOR 1901, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
PRIVATE CARS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
RAILS: in Com. of Sup., 3781; conc., 5035 (ii).
RAILS DELIVERED BY MR. F. H. CLERGUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781, 1439 (i).
RAILS, ROLLING STOCK, &c., PURCHASED IN 1901, O. Cs., CONTRACTS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 885 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Barker*) 886 (i).
——— *See* 'Locomotives.'
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, AID TO: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 5070 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
ROCKINGHAM, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
ROLLING STOCK: in Com. of Sup., 3813, 4297, 4783; conc., 5037 (ii).
——— CONDITION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 3724 (ii).
ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

St. John and Halifax Elevators. Amount of Grain handled, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612, 883 (i).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
Ste. Monique Station, Accounts unpaid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 744 (i).
St. Octave Station, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).
Shims purchased in 1901, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1438 (i).
Station Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
Sussex Engine House: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (ii).
Sydney, Additional Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 4789 (ii).
Tantramar Marsh Washout, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1108 (i).
Temiscouata Ry., Traffic Facilities, 1900-1: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).
Ties, Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 444, 2065 (i).
Trackmen's Wages, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3702; Neg. (Y. 54; N. 23) 3824 (ii).
Trucks of Cars, &c., purchased: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2852 (ii).
Truro Roundhouse, Rebuilding, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
——— Station, Rebuilding: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
——— *See* 'Railways,' &c.

INTERIOR:

Banff, N.W.T., Museum Building: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
——— National Park, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
C. P. R., Lands patented to March, 1902, Acreage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).
——— Taxes, Exemption, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1988 (i).
Dease and Liard Miners, Relief to, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4953 (ii).
Fontaine, L. E., Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).
Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 4250 (ii).
——— Director, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4116 (ii).
——— Maps, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 2659 (i).
Interior Dept., Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
——— Deptl. Officials, Date of Appnmt., Salaries, &c., 1896-1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3061.
——— Dept.: Rep. presented (Mr. *Sifton*) 100.
——— illustrations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 4351 (ii).
International Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 4250 (ii).
Litigation Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
Man. School Lands: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
——— Sales, &c., Cor., O. Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 154 (i).
Maps, Engraving, Lithographing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
Miller Creek Concessions: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).
——— Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426-7 (ii).
N. W. T. Govt., Registrars: in Com. of Sup., 4251 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

N.W.T. Govt., Prov. Autonomy, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3064-3118 (i).
——— Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 4251, 4948 (ii).
Porter, Dr., Claim: conc., 5033 (ii).
Railway Lands, N. W. Ters., Acreage patented, unpatented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2677 (i).
Saskatchewan Settlers, Relief to: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
Schools, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4948.
Surveys and Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii)
Timber Limits, Sale by Govt., Names of Purchasers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1133 (i).
Town Sites, N.W.T., Land Grants and Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
Yukon—Concessions, Leases, &c., Applications, O. Cs.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 154.
——— Timber Licenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2472 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 3509 (ii).
——— Treadgold Concessions: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4977 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 241 (i).
——— O. Cs., Plans, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2472 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2456 (i).
——— *See* 'Immigration,' 'Man.,' 'N. W. T.' &c.

Internal Economy Com.: Rep. presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 154 (i).
International Boundary Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 4250, 4948 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. *Monk*) 1° m., 316; on Order for 2°, 1110 (i).
Iona Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties: in Com. of Sup., 4331.
Irregularities *re* Census of 1891: in Com. of Sup., 4430 (ii).
Isle au Coudre Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 3409 (ii).
Isle aux Grues Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 1047.
Isle of Orleans Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
Italian Immigration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) 3927 (ii).
Jackson, Mr. Wm., Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Red Horse.'
Jacques Cartier Co., Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
Jamaica, Repeal of Tax on Commercial Travellers: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 622 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 59 (Mr. *McCormick*) 1°*, 1490; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 65.)
Japanese Employment, Yukon: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 242 (i).
Japanese Immigration, Rep. of Royal Commission: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2658 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Morrison*) 1323 (i).
——— *See* 'Chinese,' 'Oriental.'

JAPAN EXPOSITION: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— CAN. REPRESENTATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 2225 (i).
Joint Stock Companies incorp. B. No. 161 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4245; 2°*, 4803; in Com., 4803, 5056; 3°*, 5064 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 15.)
JOLIETTE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c., CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2856 (ii).
JOUGHINS, MR., REP. *re* I. C. R. LOCOMOTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3416 (ii).
'JOUGHINS TRUCK:' *See* 'I. C. R. Trucks.'
JUDGES, MAN., TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4265 (ii).
JUDGES OF COUNTY COURTS, AGE LIMIT, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 418 (i).
——— LEGISLATION *re* COMPULSORY RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt B. No. 138 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) prop. Res., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3510; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3951; 3°*, 3951 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 16.)
JUDGES' RESIDENCES, YUKON, RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4190 (ii).
JUDGES' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214.
Judges' Supreme Court: *See* 'Supreme Court.'
JUSTICE:
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i), 3583 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).
BEAUCHAMP, OSCAR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
BINDER TWINE: in Com. of Sup., 3593, 4963 (ii).
——— SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Blain*) 410, 618, 885, 1429 (i).
B.C., CHIEF JUSTICESHIP, APPNMT., &c.: Remarks (*Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 611 (i).
B.C. PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3619 (ii).
C. P. R. *vs.* ROY, PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT: M. for copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 499 (i).
COMMUTATIONS FOR ARSON, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 419 (i).
COUNTY COURT JUDGES, COMPULSORY RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
——— *See* 'Judges,' &c.
CRAIG, JUDGE, INTERVIEW *re* YUKON IRREGULARITIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Bennett*) 972 (i).
DAWSON, MR., INSPECTOR OF PENITENTIARIES, SALARY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
DUGAS, JUDGE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST FROM MRS. COLLINET: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
EILBECK, MR., APPNMT. AS SHERIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745 (i).
EXCHEQUER COURT: in Com. of Sup., 229 (i).
FAREWELL, J. C., ACCOUNT *re* NORTH ONTARIO ELECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
JUDGES OF COUNTY COURTS, LEGISLATION *re* COMPULSORY RETIREMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 131 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Tisdale*) 418 (i).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
JUSTICE, DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 121 (i).
KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593.
LAW BOOKS, JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, JR. JUDGE, PROVISION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— APPNMT. OF JR. JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4701 (ii).
LEGAL AGENTS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
LITIGATION EXPENSES, JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3620, 4266 (ii).
LUSSIER ARBITRATION *re* PENITENTIARY LAND, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).
MAN. JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4265 (ii).
MANITOBA PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).
NIPISSING ELECTIONS, PAYMENTS, EXPENSES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
O'REGAN, JAS., SUPREME COURT: in Com. of Sup., 4965 (ii).
PENITENTIARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 4267 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT JAIL, LANDS PURCHASED: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
QUEEN'S AND KING'S COUNSEL APPOINTED SINCE 1896: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3154 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i)
——— COAL SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— CONDUCT OF EMPLOYEES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 153, 1445 (i).
——— INDEMNITY TO MR. NANTEL: M. for Ret.*, 2471 (i).
——— LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 3617.
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF WARDEN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— VET. SURGEON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).
STATUTES, REVISION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3622.
STRONG, CHIEF JUSTICE SIR HENRY, AMOUNT PAID *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1986 (i).
SUPREME COURT ACT, AMT. *re* MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 410 (i).
——— AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4264.
——— JUDGES, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2224 (i).
——— POWER, APPEALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214, 217 (i).
——— QUEBEC, WRITS ISSUED, &c., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 442 (i).
YUKON, CROWN PROSECUTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).
——— JUDGES, LIVING AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES: in Com. of Sup., 3583, 4190 (ii).
——— *See* 'Dugas,' &c.
——— LAW LIBRARY, FREIGHT ON BOOKS: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).
——— LEGAL ADVISER: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).
——— PRISONERS, TRANSPORT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).
——— SHERIFF'S FEES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
——— TERRITORIAL COURT CLERK, LIVING ALLOWANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3587 (ii).
——— WITNESS AND JURY FEES: in Com. of Sup., 3590, 4267 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
KAMLOOPS, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
KAMOURASKA, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
KAULBACH, MR., POSTMASTER AT MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
KEITH POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
KELLY, DOUGLAS & CO.'S TENDER *re* YUKON SUPPLIES: in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).
KEMP, ERNEST, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).
KENNEDY LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
KING'S BIRTHDAY, OFFICIAL OBSERVANCE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2226 (i).
KING BROS., CLAIM *re* DAMAGES BY I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. *Lavergne*) 3307 (ii).
KINGSTON, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
—— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 4702 (ii).
—— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
—— *See* 'Justice,' &c.
KINGSVILLE PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
KINKORA RY. ACCOMMODATION, RES. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).
Klondike Mines Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 66.)
Knapp Tubular Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2607; 3°*, 2607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 67.)
KNAUFF, H., PROMOTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4313.
LABORATORY, CUSTOMS: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).
LABOUR DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
—— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 213.
—— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Mulock*) 121 (i).
—— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).
Labour Disputes Bill: *See* 'Railway Labour.'
LABOUR DISPUTE BILL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii).
LABOUR IN MAN. *re* GRAIN, &C., CABLE: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 247 (i).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRIC PLANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4299 (ii).
—— LOCK REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4035 (ii).
—— MILL ST. PAVING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4307.
—— WASTE WEIR: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER DREDGING; in Com. of Sup., 3285, 4213 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3131 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 68.)
Lake Erie and Detroit River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 55 (Mr. *Sutherland, Essex*) 1°*, 1323; 2°*, 1624 (1); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 69.)
LAND GRANTS TO CONTINGENTS IN S. A., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1446 (i).
—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
LANDRY, P.: *See* 'Circular,' &c.
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. No. 149 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3919; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4357 (ii). (2 *Edward VII.*, *c.* 17.)
LAPRAIRIE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF A. THOMAS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).
LAROSE, JOS., INDEMNITY FOR DAMAGE AT CÔTE ST. LUC: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
LAVAL, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
LAW BOOKS, JUSTICE DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).
LEDUC, MR. J. D., INSPECTOR *re* LIQUOR LICENSES AND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061 (ii).
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, APPNMT. OF JR. JUDGE: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4701 (ii).
—— PROVISION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
LEGAL AGENTS, DEPT. OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
—— *See* 'Justice,' &c.
LEGISLATION, B.C., DISALLOWANCE OF ACTS, &C.: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).
LEGISLATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: in Com. of Sup., 234 (i), 4326 (ii).
LESUEUR, MR., SUPERANNUATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3904 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3867 (ii).
LÉVIS, ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3810 (ii).
—— CATTLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
—— LOCAL SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297.
—— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 669 (i).
LEWIS, MR., POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
LIBRARY OF PARLT., COM.: M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 128 (i).
—— BOOKS, &C., RETENTION BY MEMBERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 4644 (ii).
—— MESSENGERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4966.
—— PRINTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4327 (ii).
—— REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 7 (i).
—— 2ND REP. OF COM.: M. (Mr. *Scott*) to conc., 4644 (ii).
LIFE-SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 514 (i).
—— AT PORT CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 544 (i).
—— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup. 517 (i), 4222 (ii).
—— REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).
LIGHTKEEPERS' SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 518.
—— *See* 'Marine,' &c.

LIME KILN CROSSING : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).

LINDSAY AND FENELON FALLS, ROAD BUILDING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270 (ii).

LINGAN BEACH, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

LINSEED OIL, IMPORTATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2932, 3299 (ii).

LIQUOR TRAFFIC, SUPPRESSION, LEGAL EXPENSES, *re* INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3049, 3061 (ii).

LISGAR, CENSUS ENUMERATORS, PAYMENT, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4113, 4429-31 (ii).

——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

——— Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 881 (i).

——— REVISING OFFICER, DATE OF APPNMT., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 3152 (ii).

L'ISLET, ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

LITIGATION EXPENSES, INTERIOR : in Com. of Sup., 4119 (ii).

——— JUSTICE : in Com. of Sup., 3620, 4266 (ii).

LITTLE BRAS D'OR WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

LIVINGSTONE'S COVE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1004.

Loan B. 157 (Mr. *Fielding*) Res. prop., 3925 ; in Com. on Res., 4127 ; 1°* of B., 4129 ; 2°*, 4357 ; in Com., 4357 ; 3°*, 4361 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 18.)

LOCKEPORT HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).

LOCOMOTIVES FOR I.C.R., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3426, 3816 (ii).

LOCOMOTIVES AND RY. CARS PURCHASED FROM 1896 TO 1902 : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1108 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 445 (i).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' &c.

LOG SORTING, SLIDES AND BOOMS : in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

LONDON, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).

——— ALLOTMENT OF ARMOURIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1446 (i).

LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE. *See* 'Halifax.'

LONGUEUIL GOVT. FARM, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2455 (i).

LOWER COVE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

LUMBER BOUGHT FOR WHARFS, N.B.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1027 (i).

LUNENBURG, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).

——— DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).

LUSSIER ARBITRATION *re* PENITENTIARY, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).

'McCORMICK' BINDER, CUSTOMS VALUATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche*) 441 (i).

McDONALD'S CORNER, N.B., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).

McDOUGALL, CAPT., LIFE-SAVING REWARD, APPLICATION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Report of Speech, 962 (i).

McFARLANE, W. J., APPNMT. AS CENSUS COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).

MACKENZIE & MANN, EXCHEQUER COURT AWARD : in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).

McKINNON, MR. W. A., FRUIT INSPECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 2587, 2622 (ii).

MACLEOD COURT HOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).

McMANUS, LETTER *re* I.C.R. PURCHASES : in Com. of Sup., 3502-4, 3568 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.

McNISH, DONALD, LETTER *re* ONT. POLITICS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3567 (ii).

MACPHERSON, MR. D. F., INVESTIGATION *re* CENSUS OF 1891 : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).

McPHERSON, WM., CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).

MABOU TO PORT HAWKESBURY TELEGRAPH LINE : in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).

MACHINERY, TOOLS, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).

——— *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.

MAGAZINES, &c. IMPORTED FROM G.B. AND U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2679 (ii).

MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).

——— CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4769 (ii).

——— POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).

——— STEAM COMMUNICATION, &c., STR. 'AMELIA' : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).

MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY : in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).

MAIL CONTRACTS : in Com. of Sup., 3881, 3910 (ii).

MAIL SERVICE, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

——— *See* 'Post Office,' &c.

MAIL STEAMERS BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B., RATE OF SPEED, &c. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 130 (i).

MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).

MAJOR'S HILL PARK, GREENHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. No. 162 (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1° m., 4245 ; 2° m., 4354 ; in Com., 4355, 4486 ; 3° m., 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 19.)

Manitoba and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 96 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 2146 (i) ; 2°*, 2676 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 70.)

Man. and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 16 (Mr. *Douglas*) 1°*, 530 ; 2°*, 851 (i) ; in Com., 2667 ; 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 11.)

MANITOBA :

BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 4613 (ii).

CENSUS, DESCRIPTION OF METIS : Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1674 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Davis*) 1902 (i).

——— LISGAR CHEQUES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4429 (ii).

——— *See* 'Lisgar,' &c.

CYR, MR., CLERK OF WORKS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).

DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).

——— VESSELS, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4763 (ii).

FARM HANDS : Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 247 (i).

GRAIN INSPECTION, CHANGES IN STANDARD : Ques. (Mr. *Douglas*) 2857 (ii).

GRIST AND SAW MILLS FOR INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).

MANITOBA—*Con.*
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 604, 1275 (i), 4642 (ii).
HORSES IMPORTED IN MAN. AND N.W.T., CUSTOMS DUTY: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 1206 (i).
JUDGES, TRAVELLING ALLOWANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4265 (ii).
LABOUR *re* CROPS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 247 (i).
LIQUOR ACT, CONSTITUTIONALITY OF REFERENDUM, LETTERS, &C. FROM MAN. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *McCreary*) 1682 (i).
——— PET. FROM PROHIBITION ALLIANCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 785 (i).
LISGAR, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 881 (i).
——— REVISING OFFICER, DATE OF APPNMT., &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 3152 (ii).
——— CENSUS ENUMERATORS, PAYMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4113, 4429 (ii).
MANITOBA LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
MAPLE CREEK P.O., CHANGE OF LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2853 (ii).
MOSSEY RIVER: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
——— *See* 'Winnipegosis.'
PENITENTIARY, LAND PURCHASED, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).
ROSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— AMOUNT VOTED AND SPENT, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 440 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 406.
ST. FRANCIS LAKE OUTLET, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SCHOOL LANDS: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
SCHOOL LANDS FUND, REDUCTION OF INTEREST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2941 (ii).
——— REP. *re* INVESTIGATION: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 3035 (ii).
——— SALE, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 154 (i).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4768 (ii).
SUPREME COURT ACT, AMT. *re* MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 410 (i).
TIMBER LIMITS, SALE, NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1133.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 885 (i).
WINNIPEG, BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* RY. MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 2942 (ii).
——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 833 (i), 4616 (ii).
——— ISOLATION HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 4613 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAKE, SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 528.
WINNIPEGOSIS, MOSSY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
WINNIPEG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 3868 (ii).
——— ELECTRIC RY. MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPNMT., 1896-1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).

MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3041.
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 131 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 72.)
MANUFACTURES OF CAN., AGGREGATE AMOUNT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 747 (i).
MAPLE CREEK P.O., CHANGE OF LOCATION: Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2853 (ii).
MAPS, ENGRAVING, LITHOGRAPHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (ii).
MARANDA, ALFRED, EMPLYMT. OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
MARBLE ROCK P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3880 (ii).
MARCONI, CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3908, 4338, 4772 (ii).
——— AGREEMENT *re* P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Mackinnon*) 1684 (i).
MARCONI WIRELESS TEL. CO.'S BILL: Remarks (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 530 (i).
MARGAREE FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).
MARIA ISOLATED WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (i).
MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
Marine Insurance Co.: *See* 'Royal.'
MARINE:
AIDS TO NAVIGATION IN B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5024 (ii).
BIOLOGICAL MARINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).
BRONTE HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE, ERECTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
COASTING TRADE: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
'EUREKA' TUG, FURNISHING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 567 (i).
GANANOQUE LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Red Horse.'
GOVT. STEAMERS, MAINTENANCE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 527, 533 (i).
LIFE-SAVING REWARDS: in Com. of Sup., 514 (i).
——— AT PORT CREDIT: in Com. of Sup., 514 (i).
LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 517 (i), 4222 (ii).
MCDOUGALL, CAPT., LIFE-SAVING REWARD, APPLICATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) *re* Report of Speech, 962 (i).
MAGNETIC OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527.
MARINE ENGINEERS ASS'N., PET. *re* STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 513, 534 (i).
MARINE AND FISHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 4957.
MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 513 (i).
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
'NEWFIELD,' STR.: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
RED HORSE SHOAL LIGHT, KEEPER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque.'
REPORT: Presented (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) 129 (i).
'ROTHESAY,' STR., REMOVAL OF WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION, AIDS TO: in Com. Sup., 518 (i), 5024 (ii).
SANDHILLS, P.E.I., RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 527.
'STANLEY,' STR., REPAIRING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 520 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, AND PET. FROM MARINE ENGINEERS NATIONAL ASS'N.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 513, 534 (i).
STEAMERS CONSTRUCTED IN SCOTLAND, OUTFITTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
TIDAL SERVICE, BAY OF FUNDY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 515 (i).
TIDAL WATERS, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Farquharson*) 1861 (i).
'TIVERTON,' SS., GROUNDING, INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2856 (ii).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 527.
TYRWHITT, MR. R. E., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
UPPER LAKES LIGHTHOUSES: in Com. of Sup., 519 (i).
WHARFAGE, RATES AND CHARGES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4634–5 (ii).

Maritime Stock Breeders' Association B. No. 159 (Mr. *Fisher*) 1°*, 4344; 2° m., 4612; in Com., 4612; 3°*, 4612 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 73.)

MARKET GARDENERS, PROTECTION *re* FOREIGN COMPETITION: prop. Res. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3639; Neg. (Y. 33; N. 71) 3666 (ii).
MARTINIQUE AND ST. VINCENT, RELIEF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).
MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 513 (i).
MATHESON, MR., SUPERANNUATION: in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
MEAT SHIPMENTS IN COLD STORAGE: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT, I.C.R., REPORTS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3813 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
MEDALS *re* MILITIA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4262.
MEDALS TO 'ROTHESAY BLUES' AND COLCHESTER REGIMENTS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698-9 (ii).
MEDICAL ATTENDANCE, INDIANS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4247 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3051 (ii).
——— ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3053 (ii).

Medical Council in Canada Establishment B. No. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) 1° m., 408; 2° m., 1110; ref. to Sel. Com., 1131 (i); in Com. of the Whole, 2474; (remarks) 4245; in Com., 4438; 3° m,, 4441; Agreed to (Y. 76; N. 16) 4463; Sen. Amts., 4803 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 20.)

MEDICAL COUNCIL IN CAN. ESTABLISHMENT B. NO. 11 (Mr. *Roddick*) 2° m., 1110 (i).
Debate: (Mr. *Macdonald*, *East Huron*) 1118; (Mr. *Roche*, *Marquette*) 1122; (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 1126; (Mr. *Monk*) 1129; (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1129; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1129; (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1130; (Mr. *Hughes*, *Ontario*) 1131; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1131; (Mr. *Ross*, *N.S.*) 1132 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 3925 (ii).

Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. *Davis*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 74.)

Medicine Hat Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 88 (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 75.)

MEMBERS, ADDRESSING THE CHAIR: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) 113 (i).
——— N RODUCED, 3, 4, 68, 121, 610 (i).
——— NEW, CERTIFICATE OF ELECTIONS: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
——— REMARKS CHECKED: (Mr. *Speaker*) 3924 (ii).
MESS. FROM HIS EX., 121, 154, 785 (i), 3918, 4354, 5030 (ii).
MESSENGERS, &C., H. OF C., TRANSPORTATION TO HOMES: *See* 'Employees,' &c.
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
METHYLATED SPIRITS, SALE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 175 (i).
MÉTIS, DESCRIPTION IN CENSUS BULLETIN: Remarks (Mr. *LaRivière*) 1674 (i).
——— *See* 'Census, &c.
METRICAL INSTRUMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1201 (i).
METRIC SYSTEM, WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: in Com. of Sup., 4961 (ii).

Metropolitan Bank incorp. B. No. 144 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 3725; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 76.)

MIDDLETON, GEN., REP. *re* REBELLION OF 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 239 (i).
MIDLAND, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i).
——— POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

MILITIA:
ABRAHAM, PLAINS OF, RIGHTS RESERVED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3409 (ii).
ANNUAL CAMPS, DRILLS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2532, 4260 (ii).
ARMOURIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i), 4259.
ARMS AND AMMUNITION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).
ARSENALS IN THE DOM.: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).
BEDFORD RIFLE RANGE: conc., 5032 (ii).
CANADIAN CASUALTIES IN S.A., TELEGRAM READ (Mr. *Borden*, *King's*) 2191 (i).
CAN. CONTINGENT, PAR. IN 'LA PATRIE': Remarks (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1762 (i).
CARTRIDGE FACTORY, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
COLCHESTER REGIMENT, PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4699 (ii).
COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, CADET CORPS: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 240 (i).
COLONIAL TROOPS IN DEFENCE OF THE EMPIRE: Par. in Ottawa *Citizen*, 785 (i).
COMMISSIONS, TO CAN. OFFICERS IN BRITISH ARMY: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 419 (i).
——— ON DISBURSEMENTS FOR IMP. AUTHORITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 1065 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1063 (i).
——— S.A. CONSTABULARY, APPLICATIONS, SELECTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 243 (i).

MILITIA—*Con.*

CONDUCT OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS, PAR. IN 'DAILY NEWS': Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2069, 2088 (i).

CONTINGENTS FOR S.A., EXPENSE OF EQUIPMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1684 (i).

CORONATION CONTINGENT: in Com. of Sup., 4262.

——— MILITIA APPOINTMENTS: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 4647 (ii).

——— REPRESENTATIVES, &C., ON M. FOR COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Porter*) 3835 (ii).

——— prop. Res. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2459; Amt. (Mr. *Monk*) 2469 (i).

COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, INDEMNITY TO J. LAROSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).

COURTS MARTIAL IN CAN. MILITIA, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 740 (i).

DUNDAS ARMOURY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).

ESQUIMALT DEFENCES: in Com. of Sup., 2565, 4261 (ii).

FENIAN RAID MEDALS, ISSUE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1109 (i).

G.O.C., INCREASE IN SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 614 (i).

——— RIGHT TO REP. TO IMP. GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).

HALIFAX PROVISIONAL GARRISON: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W. CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1989 (i).

——— FOURTH CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2679 (ii).

HURDMAN, MAJOR, ALLOWANCE *re* S.A. WAR: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).

HUTTON-HUGHES, RET. ORDERED BY HSE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO S. A. CONTINGENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1446 (i), 3831 (ii).

LONDON DRILL SHED, ALLOTMENT OF ARMOURIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1446 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).

MEDALS *re* MILITIA SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 4262 (ii).

MIDDLETON, GEN., REP. *re* REBELLION OF 1885: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).

MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 1132 (i), 4259, 4947 (ii).

——— CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 2562.

——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Borden, King's*) 1322 (i).

——— PROPERTIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2549, 4260 (ii).

——— SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 2548 (ii).

——— STORES: in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).

MONTREAL RIFLE RANGE, AMOUNT EXPENDED, TENDERERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).

MUSKETRY AND CLOTHING STORES: in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).

OFFICERS OF MILITIA, TRAINING, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2682 (ii).

PAY AND ALLOWANCE FOR MILITIA FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i), 2498 (ii).

PENSIONS TO CANADIANS *re* S. A. WAR, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2459 (i).

——— BRITISH ARMY: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2629.

PERMANENT FORCE AND ACTIVE MILITIA CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

——— TOTAL COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 409 (i).

"PETERS" TARGET AT LONDON CAMP, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).

PROMOTIONS IN MILITIA FORCE: in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).

RECRUITING OF TROOPS, &C., COR. BETWEEN HIS EX., CAN. GOVT., AND G.B.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).

REMOUNTS, SUPPLIES, &C. FOR MILITIA: in Com. of Sup., 2559 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

RIFLE ASSOCIATION, GRANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2561 (ii).

——— REGULATIONS, PAMPHLET, FRENCH TRANSLATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 2223 (i).

RIFLE PRACTICE FOR CANADIAN SCHOOL BOYS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3155 (ii).

RIFLE RANGES, LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 2566 (ii).

——— *See* 'Bedford,' &c.

ROSS RIFLES, FREE ENTRY, &C.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4973 (ii).

——— *See* 'Ross Rifle Bill.'

'ROTHESAY BLUES,' PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698 (ii).

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 2562; conc., 5033 (ii).

——— APPLICATION *re* CORONATION CONTINGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 3637 (ii).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4261 (ii).

——— GYMNASIUM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 729.

——— REP. OF BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 443 (i).

SIEVERT, PRIVATE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).

SMALL-POX OUTBREAK AMONG TROOPS IN S.A.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Ontario*) 1446 (i).

SOCKS FOR THIRD CONTINGENT IN S.A., CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3638 (ii).

STAFF COURSE AT KINGSTON: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).

SUSSEX ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 862, 866 (i).

TARGET SHOOTING: *See* 'Rifle Practice.'

TASSIE, MAJOR, RETIREMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 241 (i).

VALLEYFIELD RIOTS, MILITIA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4260 (ii).

VANCOUVER, B.C., DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii),

VANWAGNER, LT.-COL., REMOVAL, INVESTIGATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616.

WINDMILL, BATTLE, PENSIONS GRANTED FOR: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 3724 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 238 (i).

——— *See* 'S.A. War,' &c.

MILL COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1008 (i).

MILLER CREEK CONCESSIONS, &C., TEL. READ (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426-7 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).

MILTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).

MINERS, DEASE AND LIARD, RELIEF TO, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).

MINISTERIAL CHANGES, EXPLANATION: Remarks on M. to adjn. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 155 (i).

MINISTERS AT THE CORONATION: *See* 'Coronation,' &c.

MINT: *See* 'Royal.'

MINUDIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).

MIRAMICHI BRIDGE, I. C. R., NEW SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4794 (ii).

Molsons Bank Pension Fund incorp. B. No. 109 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 3304; 2°*, 3547; in Com., and 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 77.)

MONCTON AND CHARLOTTETOWN RY. SHOPS, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 614 (i).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4797 (ii).

——— SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

'MONITOR,' SS., QUARANTINE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
MONTAGUE, LOWER, ATKIN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
MONTGOMERY, GENERAL, ERECTION OF MONUMENT, &c. AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).
Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2054; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 85) 2064 (i).
——— **No. 148** (Mr. *Bickerdike*) 1°*, 3919; 2°*, 4578 (ii).
MONTREAL, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 708 (i).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 670.
——— HARBOUR BOARD, APPNMT. OF MR. DORAN: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3920 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, STE. MARY'S CURRENT: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. *Belcourt*) 1° m., 2714; 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3342; recom., 4412; 3°*, 4423. (2 *Edward VII*, c. 79.)
——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3869 (ii).
——— BRANCH P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).
——— RIFLE RANGES, AMOUNT EXPENDED, TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
——— *See* 'Coté St. Luc.'
——— ST. JAMES ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
Montreal and St. Lawrence Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 48 (Mr. *Madore*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 78.)
Montreal Subway Co.'s incorp. B. No. 98 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2676; in Com., 4423, 4515, 4568; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 80.)
MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST COMMISSION, REVENUE RECEIVED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 481 (i).
Moosonee, Bishop of, incorp. B. No. 126 (Mr. *Clarke*) 1°*, 3407; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4124 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 81.)
MORTON P. O., ABSTRACTION FROM RPGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
MOSSEY RIVER, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1275½(i).
MULGRAVE IMPROVEMENTS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
MULGRAVE AND POINT TUPPER FERRY, SERVICE, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden*, *Halifax*) 1683 (i).
——— *See* 'N.S.', &c.
MUNCEY INDIANS, GRANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup. 3048.
MURRAY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 3830, 3862, 3996, 4282, 4292, 4918]; conc., 5039 (ii).
MUSKETRY AND CLOTHING STORES; in Com. of Sup., 2532 (ii).
MUSQUODOBOIT, MIDDLE: *See* 'Kaulbach.'
MUTCH, W.: *See* Wellington.
MUTTON SHIPMENTS BY SS. HALIFAX, INDEMNITY TO MR. WHEATLEY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695.
NANTEL, TREFFLÉ, INDEMNITY TO, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2471 (i).
NATIONAL ART GALLERY, OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii),
Naturalization Act Amt. B. No. 154 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1°*, 4121; 2°*, 4484; in Com., 4484; 3°*, 4484 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 23.)
NEGRO POINT, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1031.
NEIL'S HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 860 (i).
Nepigon Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 1985 (i).
——— **B. No. 101** (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2146; 2°*, 2474 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3865 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 82.)
NEWBORO POSTMASTER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3908.
NEW BRUNSWICK:
ALMA PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
BATHURST, COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, CHARGES *re* NEGLIGENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).
BAXTER, GEO. E., ANDOVER, CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
BAY DU VIN WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i), 4178 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).
CAPE TORMENTINE, CREOSOTED TIMBER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— MEMORIAL *re* COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).
——— REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CARAQUET WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CHANCE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
CHARLOTTE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
DIPPER HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
DIVORCE COURT: in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY, SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
EEL RIVER STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
FISH HATCHERIES: in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
GRAND ANSE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i), 4626 (ii).
HOPEWELL CAPE PIER, DATE OF COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1444.
HUMPHREY, HIRAM, POSTMASTER AT MCDONALD'S CORNERS, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).
INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
LUMBER BOUGHT FOR WHARFS: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1027 (i).
MARYSVILLE POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 636.
MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4794 (ii).
MONCTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4797 (ii).
——— SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 614 (i).

NEW BRUNWICK—*Con.*

NEGRO POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
NORTH HEAD BREAKWATER, ESTIMATED COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1441 (i).
OROMOCTO RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4213 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628.
OYSTER CULTURE IN SHEDIAC HARBOUR: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 746, 1444, 2473 (i).
PARTRIDGE ISLAND PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4628.
POINT WOLFE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
RAILWAY LINES IN N.B., TRACINGS, &c.: M. for Plans* (Mr. *Costigan*) 961 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE INDIANS, INVESTIGATION *re* COMPLAINTS, REP. OF INSPECTOR: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fowler*) 2473 (i).
RICHIBUCTO PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).
——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1439.
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
ROUND HILL POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1987 (i).
ST. JOHN, DOM. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— AND HALIFAX, ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup. 3516 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612, 883 (i).
——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i), 4178 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4628–9 (ii).
ST. JOHN RIVER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1030.
SALMON RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4628 (ii).
SUSSEX ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 862, 866 (i).
——— ENGINE HOUSE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3829 (ii).
WILSON BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).

NEWCASTLE P.O., ONT., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER RICHARD: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697 (ii).

NEWFOUNDLAND AND CONFEDERATION WITH CAN., NEGOTIATIONS *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698 (ii).

NEW HARROUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004.
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).

NEW MACHINERY, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812.
NEWSPAPERS, AMOUNTS PAID TO BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 158, 615 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 810 (i).
——— POSTAGE: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).

NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 50 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 83.)

NICKEL EXPORTATIONS, &c.: on M. for Com of Sup. (Mr. *Charlton*) 3030 (ii).

NICOLET STATION: in Com of Sup., 4796 (ii).

NIPISSING ELECTIONS, PAYMENTS, EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).

Nipissing and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1241; in Com., and 3°*, 2473 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 84.)

NOBLE BROS., AWARD *re* FISHERIES: in Com of Sup., 4228, 4957 (ii).
——— PAPERS *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Bennett*) 3926 (ii).

NORTH BAY, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).

NORTH BAY PIER, N.S., COST, &c., AMOUNT OF WORK DONE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1443.

NORTH CHANNEL DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4034 (ii).
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

Northern Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 66 (Mr. *Lemieux*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 55.)

NORTH HEAD, N. B., BREAKWATER, ESTIMATED COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1441 (i).

NORTH POLE EXPEDITION, ASSISTANCE TO CAPT. BERNIER: on M. for Com. of Sup., Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 3951 (ii).

North Shore Power Ry. and Navigation Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 3131; 3°*, 3150 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 85.)

NORTH SYDNEY IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— *See* 'Sydney,' &c.

N. W. Mounted Police (ass't commissioner) Act Amt. B. No. 147 (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) Res. prop., 3308; in Com. on Res., 3510; 1°* of B., 3734, 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 4247 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 21.)

——— **Pensions B. No. 40** (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) prop. Res., 779; in Com. on Res., 806; 1°* of B., 962 (i); 2°*, 2484; in Com., 2484, 3311; 3°*, 3410 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 22.)

N. W. MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 174 (i), 4247 (ii).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 212.
——— REPORT: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1063.

North-west Ter. Act (road allowances, &c.) Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3127; 2°*, 3773; in Com., 3773; 3°*, 3773 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 24.)

NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:

AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES, AID TO: in Com. of Sup., 343 (i).
BANFF NATIONAL PARK, MAINTENANCE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4118 (ii).
——— MUSEUM BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4953.
BELLY RIVER BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 835, 849 (i), 4185, 4613 (ii).
CARNDUFF COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 835.
COAL OIL INSPECTION *re* N.W. TER. AND MAN.: Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) 5055 (ii).
——— Memorandum read (Mr. *Bernier*) 5074 (ii).
COURT HOUSE, POLICE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 849 (i).
EDMONTON JAIL: in Com. of Sup., 849, 853 (i).
INDIANS, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 3054 (ii).
LETHBRIDGE IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852.
N.W.T. GOVT., REGISTRARS: in Com. of Sup., 4251 (ii).

NORTH-WEST TERRITORY—*Con.*
POSTAL FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 4942 (ii).
PRINCE ALBERT JAIL. LANDS PURCHASED: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).
PROV. AUTONOMY, SUBSIDIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3064-3118 (ii).
——— *See* 'Subsidy,' &c.
RAILWAY LANDS, ACREAGE PATENTED, UNPATENTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2677 (ii).
——— *See* 'Town Sites.'
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852 (i), 4613 (ii).
RED DEER VALLEY IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 853 (i).
ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN SETTLERS, RELIEF TO: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
SASKATOON, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
SCHOOLS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
SEED GRAIN, &C. TO INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
SUBSIDY TO N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4251, 4948 (ii).
——— *See* 'Prov.', &c.
TOWN SITES, LAND GRANTS AND GOVT. POLICY: Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA:
AMAGANDUS POND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
ARICHAT, CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635.
ARNOLD'S BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 989.
BADDECK ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
BAILEY'S BROOK BREAKWATER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4620 (ii).
BARBOUR, JOHN, DISMISSAL: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2853 (ii).
BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTION, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BEDFORD RIFLE RANGES: conc., 5032 (ii).
BIG POND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BLACK POINT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
BOULARDERIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 997 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 635, 642 (i).
CANSO FERRY SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4294 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mulgrave.'
CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CHARLESVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CHETICAMP POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CLARK'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
COLCHESTER REGIMENT, PETS. *re* MEDALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4699 (ii).
COMEAUS HILL BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
COPPER CROWN WORKS AND I.C.R. CONTRACTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).
COW BAY BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CRIBBON'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
DRUM HEAD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
EASTERN EXTENSION RY., REFUNDS FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 781 (i).
——— in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
ECUM SECUM WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4210.
FRIAR'S HEAD HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1002.
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
GRAND RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4622.

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*
GUNNING COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
HALIFAX, BRANCH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
——— CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
——— ELEVATOR: *See* 'N.B., St. John,' &c.
——— HARBOUR LIGHTHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4225 (ii).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4790 (ii).
——— LONGSHOREMEN'S STRIKE, SETTLEMENT, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) 2859 (ii).
——— PROVISIONAL GARRISON: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
——— AND S. WESTERN RY. EXTENSION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5064 (ii).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 4210, 4616 (ii).
HAWBOLD'S COVE, COST OF BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
HERRING COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
HERRINGS SLAUGHTERED: in Com. of Sup., 4223.
INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3050, 3081 (ii).
INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4211.
IONA WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
KAULBACH, MR., POSTMASTER AT MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
LA HAVE RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3285, 4213 (ii).
——— *See* 'Lunenburg.'
LARRY'S RIVER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
LINGAN BEACH: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LITTLE BRAS D'OR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i)
LOCKEPORT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
LOWER COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LUNENBURG BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007.
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
——— *See* 'La Have.'
MABOU TO PORT HAWKESBURY, TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
MARGAREE FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 550 (i).
MILL COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1008.
MINUDIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
MULGRAVE, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).
——— POINT TUPPER FERRY SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1683 (i).
——— *See* 'Point Tupper,' 'Canso,' &c.
NEIL'S HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NORTH BAY, N.S., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1443 (i).
NORTH SYDNEY, I.C.R., IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
——— *See* 'Sydney.'
PARKER'S COVE, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
PETIT RIVIÈRE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).
PICTOU, I.C.R., INCREASED ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
——— ISLAND, WHARFS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).
POINT ST. PIERRE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).

NOVA SCOTIA—*Con.*

POINT TUPPER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— *See* 'Mulgrave.'
PORT DUFFERIN WHARF, COST OF SHED, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
PORTER'S LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
PORT GEORGE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4624 (ii).
PORT MOUTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
REDHEAD, BOAT HARBOUR: on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
ROCKINGHAM IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
'ROTHESAY BLUES' AND COLCHESTER REGIMENTS, MEDALS, PETS. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698–9 (ii).
ROUND BAY BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBOURG AND SCATARIE ISLAND TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).
STEWART, CAPT. D.C., QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
SYDNEY, CUSTOMS FORFEITED GOODS, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 783 (i).
——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 3996, 4789 (ii).
——— AND LOUISBURG BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
TANTRAMAR MARSH WASHOUT, I.C.R., REPAIRS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1108 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
TRURO ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., REBUILDING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii)
WASHABUCK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).
WINDSOR BRANCH, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).
WINDSOR HARBOUR, SHEAR DAMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).

OAKVILLE HARBOUR, CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 135 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
Oaths of Office: *See* 'Administration.'
O'BRIEN, MR. S. E., SALARY, INCREASE: in Com. of Sup., 4535 (ii).
OBSERVATORY, ASTRONOMICAL AT OTTAWA: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i),
——— METEOROLOGICAL: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
OFFICIALS I.C.R., NUMBER, SALARIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 132 (i).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.' &c.
O'KEEFE, MAGISTRATE, PET. *re* FRENCH LANGUAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 2857 (ii).
Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 23 (Mr. *Dyment*) 1°*, 632; 2°*, 851 (i).
Ontario Power Co. of Niagara Falls B. No. 57 (Mr. *German*) 1°*, 1438; 2°*, 1680 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2669 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 86.)

ONTARIO:

ADDINGTON ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY: in Com. of Sup., 4184 (ii).
ALLANDALE STATION, MAIL TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 884 (i).
AMHERSTBURG, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
——— *See* 'Limekiln,' &c,
ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1681.
AULTSVILLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
AUTOMOBILES *re* POSTAL SERVICES: in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).
——— *See* 'Toronto P.O.' &c.
BARRIE, MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3910.
——— WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BAYFIELD PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BELLEVILLE, HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, DISMISSALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 449 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).
——— NAMES, DISMISSALS, SUPERANNUATION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).
BIG BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BLIND RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1222 (i).
BOUNDARY LINE THROUGH DETROIT RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Cowan*) 242 (i).
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 4182.
BRONTE HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133, 134 (i).
BRUCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i), 4182 (ii).
BURKE'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, BRIDGE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
CALLENDAR, WHARF REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
CLINTON, MR. D., POSTMASTER AT WELLINGTON, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 719.
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 721 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (i), 4638 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
CORNWALL, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
——— CANAL, REPAIRS, LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4294, 4310 (ii).
——— CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3038 (ii).
CORRY & LAVERDURE, MESSRS., CLAIM AGAINST GOVT. *re* TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4007 (ii).
——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
COUTTS, MR., AMOUNTS PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
CRATHIE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
CREDITON P.O., DECEASE OF POSTMASTER, VACANCY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 3308 (ii).
DEPOT HARBOUR, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
DESERONTO PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup. 728 (i).
DRESDEN CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 2925.
DUNDAS ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716, 863 (i).
DURHAM CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
FARRAN'S POINT ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

FISH HATCHERIES, GEORGIAN BAY: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
FORT WILLIAM, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 574, 578 (i).
GALOPS CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com of Sup., 4021, 4300 (ii).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) 5020 (ii).
——— *See* 'Gilbert,' &c.
GANANOQUE, DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup. 867.
——— LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER, DISMISSAL, &C., M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Red Horse.'
GEORGIAN BAY, CANAL SURVEYS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4298 (ii).
——— POINTE AU BARIL ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
GILBERT DREDGING CO.: in Com. of Sup., 4021.
——— *See* 'Galops,' 'North Channel,' &c.
GILMOUR P.O., DISMISSAL OF T. RICKETTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
GODERICH HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
GRAIN IMPORTATIONS THROUGH WESTERN PORTS, QUANTITY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 246, 782.
HAMILTON AND GUELPH MAIL CONTRACTS, TENDERS, &C.: M. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) for Copy,* 3721 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).
HAMILTON WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4566.
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i), 4217, 4637 (ii).
HILTON, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. Joseph.'
HOLSTEIN, POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3875 (ii).
——— MEMORANDUM READ: (Mr. *Sproule*) in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
HUNTSVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS ON THE LAKES: in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).
INDIANS, ONT. AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
——— SCHOOLS: in Com. of Sup., 3043-5 (ii).
JACKSON, MR. WM., DISMISSAL, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 809 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque,' &c.
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
KINGSTON, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
——— LOCOMOTIVE WORKS, STRIKE, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) on M. for Sup., 4702 (ii).
——— PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
——— ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE, GYMNASIUM, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
——— REP. OF BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 443 (i).
——— STAFF COURSE: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).
KINGSVILLE PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
LEEDS AND GRENVILLE, JR. JUDGE, PROVISION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 4701 (ii).
LIFE SAVING REWARDS AT PORT CREDIT, &C: in Com. of Sup., 533, 544 (i).
LIME KILN CROSSING: in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
LINDSAY AND FENELON ROAD BUILDING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4270 (ii).
LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
——— ALLOTMENT OF ARMOURIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 1446 (i).

ONTARIO—*Con.*

MCDOUGALL, CAPT.: *See* 'Life Saving,' &c.
MANITOULIN ISLAND INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3041 (ii).
MARBLE ROCK P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3880 (ii).
MEAFORD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
MIDLAND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i), 4641 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
MILTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
MORTON, P. O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
MUNCEY INDIANS, GRANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3048 (ii).
NEWBORO POSTMASTER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
NEWCASTLE P. O., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER RICKARD: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697 (ii).
NIPISSING ELECTION, EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).
NORTH BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
NORTH CHANNEL, DAM: in Com. of Sup., 4034.
——— ENLARGEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 4300 (ii).
——— *See* "Gilbert."
OAKVILLE HARBOUR, CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 135 (i).
——— PIER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 527, 560 (i).
ONTARIO CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
ONTARIO LEGISLATURE, EXTENSION OF DURATION: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 131 (i).
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY, AMOUNTS PAID, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Henderson*) 2473 (i).
ORILLIA WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i), 4641 (ii).
OTTAWA CITY, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4188 (ii).
——— ADDITIONAL ROOM, COST, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4137 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 1442 (i).
——— ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
——— ELEVATORS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4137, 4615 (ii).
——— ENGINEERS' SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4138 (ii).
——— EXPERIMENTAL FARM, OTTAWA, NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 152 (i).
——— GREENHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4189, 4616 (ii).
——— MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
——— NATIONAL ART GALLERY: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— RENTALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i), 4138.
——— RIDEAU HALL, IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4188, 4566 (ii).
——— TELEPHONES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 986, 989.
——— VENTILATION, HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).
——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 564 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works.'

ONTARIO—*Con.*

OTTAWA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : AMOUNT VOTED : Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
——— HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i.)
OXFORD ELECTORAL DIVISION : Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
PELEE ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4217.
PENETANGUISHENE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH DAM, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
——— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
——— POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4943.
'PETERS' TARGET AT LONDON CAMP, REP. *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).
PETEWAWA RIVER NARROWS, DREDGING, &C : in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DELAY IN OPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 1490 (i).
POLLY, MR., AMOUNT PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR : Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
POONAMALIE BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR, BREAKWATER AND DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
——— COAL OIL INSPECTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1148 (i), 2931, 3300 (i).
PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i).
——— BUILDING, HEATING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
——— ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4306.
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (ii).
——— OBSTRUCTIONS, REMOVAL, &C,: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
——— *See* "Welland," &c.
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i),
PORT DALHOUSIE ENTRANCE : in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).
——— *See* "Welland," &c.
PORT ELGIN PIER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PORT HOPE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PRESQU'ISLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
RAPIDE PLAT CANAL, ENLARGEMENT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).
——— GILBERT BROS.: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
——— *See* "Galops," &c.
RED HORSE SHOAL LIGHT, KEEPER'S SALARY: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque.'
RIDEAU HALL: *See* 'Ottawa.'
RIORDON PAPER CO., WATER PRIVILEGES ON WELLAND CANAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 745 (i).
——— *See* 'Welland,' &c.
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 715 (i), 4567 (ii).
——— WATER SUPPLY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 883, 1860 (i).
——— *See* 'Welland,' &c.
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON : in Com. of Sup , 1247 (i).
——— *See* 'Hilton.'
ST. LAWRENCE CANAL EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, &C., 1896-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2222 (i).
ST. LAWRENCE AND GREAT LAKES WATERWAYS, COMMISSION, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 886 (i).
ST. MARY'S RIVER, IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).
ST. THOMAS CUSTOMS COLLECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 2930, 3295 (ii).
SARNIA, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup.. 1224.

ONTARIO—*Con.*

SAULT STE. MARIE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i), 4001, 4298, 4763 (ii).
——— P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 731 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
SEELEY'S BAY P. O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
SIMCOE, ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
——— CENSUS, SIMCOE, N. AND E., COST IN 1891-1901 : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2224 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1245.
SOUTH NATION RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SPRINGBANK POST OFFICE, MAIL SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
SYDENHAM RIVER DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i),
TAY CANAL, 1896 TO 1901, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 2067 (i).
TEMISCAMINGUE, LAKE, DREDGING AND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
TOBERMORY HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).
TORONTO, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 732 (i).
——— APPNMT. OF MECHANICAL ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 884 (i).
——— DRILL SHED : in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).
——— POST OFFICE, ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— P. O. BRANCH OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4182, 4565 (ii).
——— LOCOMOBILES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automobiles,' &c.
TORONTO JUNCTION, BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 733 (i).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 4004 ; conc., 5047 (ii).
——— *See* 'Peterborough,' &c.
——— DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
TRENT VALLEY AND RICE LAKE CANALS, REP. OF ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
WATERLOO, S., CENSUS ENUMERATORS, NAMES, AMOUNT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1066 (i).
——— COMMISSIONER : Ques. (Mr. *Clare*) 1861 (i).
WELLAND CANAL : in Com. of Sup., 4306, 4798.
——— LOCK WALLS : in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).
——— ST. CATHARINES WATER SUPPLY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1683, 1860 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Catharines,' &c.
——— WATER PRIVILEGES, RENTALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 745 (i).
——— *See* 'Port Colborne.'
WIARTON HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT VOTED : Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
WILLIAMSTOWN POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).
WINDMILL, BATTLE, PENSIONS GRANTED FOR : M. for Pet.* (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 3724 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 238 (i).
WINDSOR INSPECTOR : in Com. of Sup., 1154 (i).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL : in Com. of Sup., 1242.
UPPER LAKES LIGHTHOUSES : in Com. of Sup., 519 (i).
YORK, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3.

OPERATING EXPENSES, &C., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 4510 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.
ORDER IN THE HOUSE : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) in Com. of Sup., 4149 (ii).

O'Regan, Jas., Supreme Court: in Com. of Sup., 4965 (ii).

Orford Mountain Ry. Co.'s B. No. 10 (Mr. *Parmelee*) 1°*, 408; 2°*, 570; in Com., and 3°*, 1107 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 87.)

Oriental Immigration, Rep. of Commission: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 444 (i).

——— Rep.: Presented (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 451 (i).

——— *See* 'Chinese,' 'Japanese,' &c.

Original Construction, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii).

——— *See* 'I. C. R.', &c.

Orillia Wharf, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i), 4641 (ii).

Oromocto River, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 4213.

——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).

Orthodox Greek Church. *See* 'Greek Catholic.'

Ottawa, Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. No. 74 (Mr. *Logan*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 88.)

Ottawa Buildings, electric lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4189, 4616 (ii).

——— engineers' salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4138, 4219 (ii).

——— gas, electric lighting, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).

——— rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i), 4138 (ii).

——— repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188 (ii).

——— telephones, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 986, 989 (i).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Ont. Ottawa,' &c.

Ottawa City, Controverted Election, Judges' Certificate: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Ottawa City Improvement Act Amt. B. No. 164 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 4344; 2°*, 4604; 3°*, 4607 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 25.)

——— Govt. Greenhouse: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

——— Grounds, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 987.

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 125 (Mr. *Champagne*) 1°*, 3509; 2°*, 3637; in Com., and 3°*, 4578 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 89.)

Ottawa Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

Ottawa River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

Ouelle Rivière Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 4796.

Outside Service, P. O. Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3867, 4940 (iii.)

Owen Sound Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

——— Amount voted: Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).

Oxford Electoral Division: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

Oyster Beds in Shediac Bay, Licenses issued, Names, Dates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2473 (i).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).

——— Culture in Shediac Harbour: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 746, 1444 (i).

——— Fishing in P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).

——— Protection Regulations: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co's incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. *Morrison*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2669; 3°*, 2670 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 90.)

Pan-American Exposition: in Com. of Sup., 358 (i), 4967 (ii).

Paper Combine, Rep. of Commission: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 3128 (ii).

Parcel Service, P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).

Paris Exposition: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).

Parker's Cove, N.S., Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).

Parliament Buildings, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

——— Elevator Attendants: in Com. of Sup., 4137, 4615 (ii).

——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' 'Ont. Ottawa,' &c.

Partisanship in Federal Elections by Govt. Employees: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 618 (i).

Partridge Island Pier: in Com. of Sup., 4628 (ii).

Paspebiac, Ocean Port: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000 (ii).

Passes issued on Govt. Rys., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 810 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120 (ii).

——— (Mr. *Clarke*) 4403 (ii).

Patent Act Amt.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 329 (i).

Patents, Classifying Can. and Exchange with U. S.: in Com. of Sup., 349 (i).

'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 329 (i).

Patent Relief: *See* 'Depew,' 'Westren.'

Pay and Allowance for Militia Force: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i), 2498 (ii).

——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.

Pedley: *See* 'Immigration.'

Pelee Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).

Penalties: *See* 'Remission.'

Penetanguishene, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).

Penitentiaries: in Com. of Sup., 3617, 4267 (ii).

——— B. C., Land purchased, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3619 (ii).

——— Manitoba, Land purchased, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3618 (ii).

——— *See* 'Justice,' &c.

Penny Bank incorp. B. No. 95 (Mr. *Osler*) 1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2676 (ii).

Pensions granted in British Army to wounded: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2679 (ii).

Pensions to Canadians, *re* S. A. War, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2459 (i).

Pensions to N. W. Mounted Police: in Com. on Res., 806 (i).

——— *See* 'N. W. M. P. Bill.'

PERCIVAL RIVER, P.E.I., SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
PERIBONKA, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
PERMANENT FORCE AND ACTIVE MILITIA CORPS: in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).
—— TOTAL COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 409 (i).
—— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
PERRY, MR. C. B., CUSTOMS OFFICER: in Com. of Sup., 2923 (ii).
PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) *re* FIGURES QUOTED IN BUDGET SPEECH, 1763 (i).
—— *re* 'YEAR-BOOK': (Mr. *Bell*) 2731 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH DAM, TRENT CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
—— *See* 'Trent,' &c.
—— POST OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
'PETER JETSON,' STR., QUANTITY OF COAL CARRIED: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 884 (i).
'PETERS' TARGET AT LONDON CAMP, REP. *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 446 (i).
PETEWAWA RIVER, NARROWS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
PETITIONS, IRREGULARITY OF, RULED OUT OF ORDER (Mr. *Speaker*) 2145, 2218 (i).
Petition of Right Act Amt. B. No. 135 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 3306; 2°*, 3935; in Com., 3936; 3°*, 3939 (ii).
PETIT RIVIERE BREAKWATER, N.S.; in Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).
PICTON, PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DELAY IN OPENING: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 1490 (i).
PICTOU, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
PICTOU ISLAND WHARFS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1009.
PIG IRON, &c., FREIGHT RATES: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 782 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 76 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 1673 (i); 2°*, 2495; in Com., 2495; 3°*, 3309 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 27.)
PINTSCH GAS EQUIPMENT, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812 (ii).
POINT FORTUNE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
POINT ST. PIERRE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
POINT TUPPER, &c., I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3828.
—— *See* 'I. C. R.,' 'N.S.,' &c.
POINT WOLFE, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
POLE CONTRACT *re* YUKON TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4162 (ii).
—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
POLLY, MR., AMOUNT PAID AS CENSUS ENUMERATOR: Ques. (Mr. *McGowan*) 3155 (ii).
POONAMALIE CAUSEWAY, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).
PORT ARTHUR, BREAKWATER AND DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
PORT COLBORNE, BUILDING, HEATING, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
—— ENTRANCE, WELLAND CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i), 4019, 4306 (ii).
—— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4557 (ii).
—— OBSTRUCTIONS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
PORT DALHOUSIE ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 4306.
PORT DUFFERIN WHARF, COST OF SHED, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 132.
PORT ELGIN PIER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PORTER, DR. ANDREW, CLAIMS, &c.: conc., 5033 (ii).
PORTER'S LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4622.
PORT GEORGE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1907.
PORT HOPE HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4624 (ii).
PORT MOUTON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
PORT SIMPSON TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4178, 4779 (ii).
—— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
POSTAGE RATE *re* DROP LETTERS: in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).
POSTAL CONTRACTS, PET. OF RIGHT, &c. *re* CANCELLATION: in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
POSTAL FACILITIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4942.
Post Office (Letter Carriers) Act Amt. B. No. 106 (Mr. *Mulock*) 1° m., 2482; 2°*, 4036; in Com., 4036; 3°*, 4075 (ii). (2 *Edward VII. c.*, 28).
POST OFFICE:
ADDITIONAL CLERKSHIPS, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
ALBERTON P. O., P.E.I., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER KEITH: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (ii).
ALLANDALE STATION, MAIL TRANSFER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 884 (i).
ANTEN MILLS AND HENDRIE MAIL CONTRACT, AMOUNT PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 1681.
AUTOMOBILES, TORONTO P. O.: in Com. of Sup., 3872, 4186 (ii).
BAIN, MR., P. O. INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3872 (ii).
BARRIE MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3910 (ii).
BATES, MR. E. B., ASS'T. POSTMASTER, OTTAWA, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
BATHURST POSTMASTER, CHARGES *re* NEGLIGENCE: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 4700 (ii).
BAXTER, GEO. E., ANDOVER, N.B., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).
BELLEVILLE POST OFFICE, REDUCTION OF SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4945 (ii).
—— NAMES, DISMISSALS, SUPERANNUATIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wilson*) 153 (i).
BRANCH AND DISTRICT POST OFFICES: in Com. of Sup., 3884 (i).
B.C. MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
CACOUNA AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2225 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).
CRATHIE POSTMASTER, RESIGNATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

CREDITON P. O., DECEASE OF POSTMASTER, VACANCY, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 3308 (ii).
DAWSON AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).
DORCHESTER COUNTY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4934 (ii).
FORT WILLIAM POST OEFICE : in Com. of Sup.,728.
GILMOUR P. O., DISMISSAL OF T. RICKETTS : Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
HALIFAX BRANCH POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 3882 (ii).
HAMILTON AND GUELPH MAIL CONTRACT, TENDERS, &C. : M. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) for Copy *, 3723 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Hfx.*) 4465.
HOLSTEIN POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup.. 3875, 4925 (ii).
ISLE OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
JOLIETTE POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C., CHARGES AGAINST : Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068, 2856 (ii).
KAULBACH, MR., POSTMASTER AT MIDDLE MUSQUODOBOIT, DISMISSAL, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4928 (ii).
KEITH POST OFFICE, QUE., CHANGE OF LOCATION : in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
KNAUF, H., PROMOTION, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF A. THOMAS, &C. : M. for Cor.,* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).
LETTER CARRIERS, SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3867 (ii).
——— *See* 'P. O. Bill,' &c.
MCDONALD'S CORNER, N.B., DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER : Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 2676 (ii).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
MAIL CONTRACTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 3881, 3910 (ii).
——— SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail,' &c.
MAPLE CREEK P. O., CHANGE OF LOCATION : Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 2853 (ii).
MARBLE ROCK P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 3880 (ii).
MARYSVILLE, N.B., POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 636 (i).
MATHESON, MR., SUPERANNUATION : in Com. of Sup., 3909 (ii).
MIDLAND POSTMASTER : in Com. of Sup., 3916.
MILTON POSTMASTERSHIP, VACANCY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
MONTREAL BRANCH POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).
MORTON P.O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
MUSQUODOBOIT, MIDDLE : *See* 'Kaulbach.'
NEWBORO POSTMASTER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
NEWCASTLE P.O., ONT., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER RICKARD : Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697.
NEWSPAPER POSTAGE : in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).
PARCEL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3911 (ii).
PETERBOROUGH POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4943 (ii).
POSTAGE RATE *re* DROP LETTERS : in Com. of Sup., 3915 (ii).
POSTAL CONTRACTS, PET. OF RIGHT, &C. *re* CANCELLATION : in Com. of Sup., 3917 (ii).
——— FACILITIES, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4942 (ii).
POSTMASTERS, RURAL, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3874.
——— SECURITIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3876.
POST OFFICE, DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 179 (i), 4313 (ii).
——— BOXES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 988 (i), 3897 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

POST OFFICE, CLERICAL ASSISTANCE : in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP. : Presented (Mr. *Mulock*) 121.
——— EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
——— OUTSIDE SERVICE, SALARIES : in Com. of Sup., 3867, 4940 (ii).
——— PROVISIONAL ALLOWANCE : in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
RY. MAIL CLERKS, ADDITIONAL : in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
——— SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4313 (ii).
RICKARD, MR.: *See* 'Newcastle.'
RICKETTS, MR.: *See* 'Gilmour.'
ROUND HILL POSTAL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup.,3916
——— ARMSTRONG'S CORNERS, MAIL CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1987 (i).
ST. EUGÈNE DE GRANTHAM MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).
STE. HENEDINE MAIL CARRIER, CONTRACT : Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).
ST. JEROME POSTMASTER, INTERFERENCE IN POLITICAL MEETINGS : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159.
STE. ODILON, POSTMASTER, DORCHESTER CO., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4350 (ii).
SAMPLES SENT BY SAMPLE POST, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 617 (i).
SAULT STE. MARIE P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 731.
SEELEY'S BAY P.O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS : Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
SHEPPARD, POSTMASTER AT JOLIETTE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).
SPRINGBANK MAIL SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
STAMPERS AND SORTERS, P.O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
SUPERANNUATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).
THEREIN, MR. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER FROM GRANDS PILES, PET., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ball*) for Copy,* 3724 (ii).
THOMAS, MR.: *See* 'Laprairie.'
TIGNISH AND MAIL POINT MAIL CONTRACT : in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).
TORONTO POST OFFICE, BRANCH OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— LOCOMOBILES, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).
——— *See* 'Automobiles.'
VADNAIS, FRANCOIS, CONTRACTOR FOR MAIL SERVICE : Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).
WELLINGTON, POSTMASTER D. CLINTON, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).
——— COR. &C. *re* DISMISSAL : M. for Ret.*(Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (ii).
WILLIAMSTOWN POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).
WINNIPEG P.O., ELECTRIC RY. MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).
——— OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPNMT., 1896-1901 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).
WINTER MAIL SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 516.
POULTRY FATTENING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2640 (ii).
——— *See* 'Agriculture.'
PRECEDENCE IN CAN. AT OFFICIAL FUNCTIONS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 429 ; wthdn., 439 (i).
PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE : on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Maclean*) 2733 (ii).
Debate : (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 2739 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2743 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2746 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 2749 ; (Mr. *Northrup*) 2755 ; (Mr. *Kemp*) 2760 ; (Mr. *Sifton*) 2768 ; (Mr. *Bennett*) 2773 ; (Mr. *German*) 2776 ; (Mr. *Brock*) 2779 ; (Mr. *Flint*) 2783 ; (Mr. *Gourley*) 2786 ; (Mr. *Fraser*) 2798 ; (Mr. *Paterson*) 2802 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 2809 ; (Mr. *Speaker*) Ques. of Order (ruling) 2807, 2809 (ii).

PREFERENTIAL TRADE WITH THE EMPIRE, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) 2942 (ii).

——— RES. FROM BOARDS OF TRADE: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 3153 (ii).

——— *See* 'Intercolonial Conference.'

Presbyterian College (Halifax) Board B. No. 22 (Mr. *Fraser*) 1**, 632; 2**, 851; in Com., and 3**, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 92.)

PRESQU'ISLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).

PREVENTIVE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3297 (ii).

PRINCE ALBERT JAIL, LANDS PURCHASED: in Com. of Sup., 3620 (ii).

PRINCE COUNTY FISHING LICENSES, NUMBER ISSUED: Ques. (Mr. *Haekett*) 1065 (i).

PRINCE, PROF., REMARKS *re* FISH CANNERS IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Béland*) 449, 613 (i).

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:

ALBERTON P.O., RESIGNATION OF POSTMASTER KEITH: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (ii).

——— RY. STATION, LOCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1441 (i).

ATKINS' WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).

BLACK BROOK WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1023.

CANOE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3831 (ii).

CAPE TRAVERSE, MEMORIAL *re* DAILY COMMUNICATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 1018 (i).

CARLETON POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1021.

CASCUMPEC HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

——— RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).

CHAPEL POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).

CHARLOTTETOWN, CUSTOMS PORT: in Com. of Sup., 2932 (ii).

——— INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).

——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3870 (ii).

CHICKEN-FATTENING STATIONS, LOCATIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).

CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER, EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS *re* TAX LEGISLATION: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1010 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).

CREOSOTED TIMBER IN WHARFS: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

DOUGLAS, GEO. C., CHICKENS PURCHASED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3408 (ii).

FISHERY AWARDS AND P. E. I. PREMIER'S SPEECH: Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) 3859 (ii).

FISHING GEAR CONFISCATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1440 (i).

——— HATCHERIES, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4222.

——— LICENSES, PRINCE CO., NUMBER ISSUED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1065 (i).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i), 4211, 4625 (ii).

HILLHOUSE, A. P., CHICKENS PURCHASED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3409 (ii).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3862: conc., 5039 (ii).

INDIANS, MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3053 (ii).

KINKORA RY. ACCOMMODATIGN, RES. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).

MARCONI SYSTEM OF WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY, AGREEMENT *re* P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Maekinnon*) 1684 (i).

——— *See* 'Telegraphic.'

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—*Con.*

MCNTAGUE, LOWER, ATKIN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3830, 3862, 3996, 4282, 4292, 4918; conc., 5039 (ii).

——— TENDERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695.

MUTCH, W.: *See* 'Wellington.'

MUTTON SHIPMENTS: *See* 'Wheatley.'

NEW LONDON BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4212.

OYSTER FISHING: in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).

——— PROTECTION REGULATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 135 (i).

PERCIVAL RIVER, SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).

P.E.I. AND MAINLAND TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).

——— *See* 'Tel. Lines,' &c.

P.E.I. RYS., EMPLOYEES, REVENUE AND CAPITAL ACCOUNT FOR 1901, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).

——— RYS., GOVT., EXPENDITURES *re*: M. *re* Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., 3235; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281 (ii).

——— RYS., ROLLING STOCK, &c., CONDITION, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 3724 (ii).

QUEEN'S ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

RAILWAYS: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 4282 (ii).

——— BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

SANDHILLS RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).

SOURIS ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).

SOURIS KNIGHT'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).

SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).

——— *See* 'Marconi,' &c.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4212, 4626 (ii).

TIGNISH AND MAIL POINT MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).

TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).

WELLINGTON MUTCH, ELDON, PAYMENTS TO, BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr *Taylor*) 3152 (ii).

WEST POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (il).

WHEATLEY, MR., INDEMNITY TO *re* MUTTON SHIPMENTS BY COLD STORAGE: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).

——— PETS., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 160, 170 (i).

PRINTING BUREAU PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4119, 4956 (ii).

PRINTING, STATIONERY, INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3060 (ii).

——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: In Com. of Sup., 199.

——— PAPER, BINDING, &c.: conc., 4343 (ii).

PRINTING OF PARLT., 4TH REP. OF COM.: M. (Mr. *Flint*) to conc., 4644 (ii).

——— AMT. (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) *re* C. S. Act, 4644 (ii).

——— *See* 'Com,' &c.

PRISONERS IN THE YUKON, TRANSPORT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).

——— *See* 'Justice,' 'Yukon,' &c.

PRIVATE BILLS AND GOVT. BUSINESS : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3920 (ii).
PRIVATE BILLS, EXTENSION OF TIME : M. (Mr. *Flint*) 780 (i), 4464 (ii).
——— Remarks, 4567-8 (ii).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
PRIVATE CARS, I.C.R., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3828.
PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 173 (i).
PROCEDURE *re* BILLS : Remarks (Mr. *Costigan*) 611 (i).
PRODUCE CO : *See* 'Bull, Chas. A.'
PROMOTIONS IN MILITIA FORCE : in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).
PROPERTY AND CIVIL RIGHTS, UNIFORMITY OF LAW, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Russell*) 1067 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Flint*) 1083 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1089 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1092 ; (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1096 ; (Mr. *Carroll*) 1100 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1103 ; (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 1106 (i).
PROROGATION, LETTERS FROM GOV. GEN.'S SEC.: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 5032 (ii).
——— Remarks, 4968, 5081 (ii).
PROV. AUTONOMY, N.W.T. GOVT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3064-3118 (ii).
——— *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES AND B.N.A. ACT : Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 441 (i).
PROVISIONAL ALLOWANCE, P.O. SERVICES : in Com. of Sup., 4925 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COM., ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN : Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3920 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. *Taylor*) for Ret., 3995 (ii).
——— MEETINGS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 439 (i).
——— M. to print Evidence *re* Gaudry (Mr. *Kemp*) 4343 (ii).
——— M. to ref. Accts. to Sel. Com. (Mr. *Fraser*) 198 (i).
——— Pub. Accts.: Presented (Mr. *Fielding*) 121 (i).
——— REPS., 1ST AND 2ND : Presented (Mr. *Fraser*) 810 (i).
——— REP., 3RD : M. to conc, (Mr. *Fraser*) 1108 (i).
——— M. (Mr. *Bell*) to ref. back for instructions *re* P. S. Archibald, 1395 (i).
Debate : (Mr. *Blair*) 1399 ; (Mr. *Haggart*) 1404 ; (Mr. *Fielding*) 1407 ; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1410 ; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1413 ; (Mr. *Northrup*) 1415 ; (Mr. *Flint*) 1418 ; (Mr. *Lennox*) 1422 ; (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1427 ; (Mr. *Ingram*) 1431 ; (Mr. *Maclean*) 1436 ; (Neg. Y. 56 ; N. 101) 1436 (i).
——— WITNESSES *re* YUKON CHARGES : in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
PUBLIC HEALTH QUARANTINE IN ORGANIZED DISTRICTS : in Com. of Sup., 371 (i).
——— HEALTH ACT : in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
PUBLIC WORKS :
ALEXANDRIA REFORMATORY : in Com. of Sup., 4184 (ii).
ALMA PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
AMAGANDUS POND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
AMHERSTBURG, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
——— *See* 'Limekiln'
ANDERSON'S HOLLOW, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
ANDERSON LAKE, OUTLET : in Com. of Sup., 4642.
ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4769.
——— *See* 'Bryon,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
ARCHITECTS, FEES, PLANS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 666 (i).
ARMOURIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 872 (i).
——— CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 2549 (ii).
ARNOLD'S BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i).
ASHCROFT TO DAWSON, TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4151, 4781 (ii).
——— COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1986 (i).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
ASSAY OFFICE, VANCOUVER, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (ii).
ATKIN'S WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
AULTSVILLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
BADDECK ARMOURY : in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
BAILEY'S BROOK BREAKWATER, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4620 (ii).
BARRIE WHARF, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BATISCAN CHANNEL, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
BAY DU VIN WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i).
BAYFIELD PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i).
BEAR RIVER, OBSTRUCTION, PIERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BELLEVILLE HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS, DISMISSALS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Porter*) 449 (i).
BELLY RIVER BRIDGE, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
BIG BAY, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BIG POND, WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
BLACK BROOK WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
BLACK POINT CANAL, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 990.
BLIND RIVER WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 1222 (i).
BOULARDERIE WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 997 (i).
BRAE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
BROCKVILLE DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 4182.
BRONTE HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
——— AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 133 (i).
BRYON ISLAND TO ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.
BUILDINGS, B.C., RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
——— GENERALLY : in Com. of Sup., 560, 728, 835, 849 (i), 4181, 4186, 4613 (ii).
——— CARETAKERS, ENGINEERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i).
——— *See* 'Engineers,' &c.
——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS, FURNITURE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 974 (i).
——— *See* 'Immigrant,' &c.
——— LIGHTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup,, 4615 (ii).
——— RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Yukon,' &c.
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 4613 (ii).
——— MAR. PROVS., RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 636 (i), 4178 (ii).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4185, 4613 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 635 (i).
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 719 (i), 4182 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

BUILDINGS, QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup.,642 (i), 4179.
——— RENEWALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 4536 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
BURKE'S FALLS, MAGANETAWAN RIVER, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4637 (ii).
BURLINGTON CHANNEL, BRIDGE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 999 (i).
CALLENDAR WHARF, REPAIRS: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
CAMPBELLTON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4626.
CAMPOBELLO BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4626 (ii).
——— *See* 'Wilson's Beach,' &c.
CANOE COVE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i).
——— AMOUNT EXPENDED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 3831 (ii).
CAPE COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CAPE TORMENTINE, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (i).
——— CREOSOTED TIMBER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 4627 (ii).
——— *See* 'Creosoted,' &c.
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
CARAQUET WHARF, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1023.
CARLETON POINT WHARF, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1021 (i).
CARNDUFF COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 835.
CASCUMPEC HARBOUR, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
CEMENTS, CANADIAN AND FOREIGN, TESTS BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1442, 1444 (i).
CHAMBLY CANAL, WHARF, &C., MAINTENANCE BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2068.
CHANCE HARBOUR, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1024.
CHAPEL POINT PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
CHARLESVILLE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CHARLOTTE, N.B., TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
CHETICAMP POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1000.
CHEVERIE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621.
CHURCH POINT BREAKWATER EXTENSION: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CIRCULAR *re* PUBLIC WORKS ISSUED BY MR. MULOCK: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 843 (i).
CLARK'S HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 990 (i).
CLEGG, SAMUEL, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4699 (ii).
CLERKS OF WORKS ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
CLINTON, PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 719.
COBOURG, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 721 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4638 (ii).
COLLINGWOOD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1227 (i), 4638 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
COLUMBIA RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i).
COMEAUS HILL BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).
CORNWALL ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
COURT HOUSES, N.W.T., POLICE ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 849 (i).
COW BAY BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1000 (i).
CRANE ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CREOSOTED TIMBER PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 4779.
——— *See* 'Cape Tormentine,' &c.
CREOSOTED TIMBER IN WHARFS, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).
CRIBBON'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4621 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

CROSS POINT, ISOLATED PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CYR, MR., CLERK OF WORKS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).
——— *See* 'Clerks,' &c.
DAY LABOUR AND CONTRACT SYSTEM ON PUBLIC WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 674–708, 836–880.
DEPOT HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
DESERONTO PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
DESROCHERS, R. C., SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 4535 (ii).
DIPPER HARBOUR, N.B., BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
DREDGES BUILT AND OWNED BY GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
DREDGING, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (ii).
——— GENERAL VOTE, PLANT: in Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4763 (ii).
——— *See* 'Snag-boat.'
——— ST. LAWRENCE CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
DRUM HEAD BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
DRUMMONDVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180.
DUNDAS ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 863 (i).
ECUM SECUM WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4210, 4211 (ii).
EDMONTON JAIL, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 849, 853 (i).
ENGINEERS, &C., PUBLIC WORKS, SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
——— *See* 'Caretakers,' 'Ottawa,' &c.
EXPERIMENTAL FARM BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 875 (i).
FRENCH RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 574, 578 (i).
FRIAR'S HEAD HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
GANANOQUE DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 867.
GASPÉ PENINSULA, REMOVAL OF ROCK IN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 4782.
GEORGIAN BAY, POINTE AU BARIL ROUTE: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
GLACE BAY, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
GODERICH HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
GOVT. POLICY *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 636–733, 836–880 (i).
GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).
GRAND ANSE BREAKWATER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
GRAND RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4622.
GRAND VALLEE PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031.
GRAVING DOCKS, LEVIS, KINGSTON AND ESQUIMALT, WORKING EXPENSES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4220 (ii).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 982 (i).
GUNNING COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
HALIFAX CUSTOM HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 635.
HAMILTON WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4566.
HARBOURS AND RIVERS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1276 (i), 4642 (ii).
——— GENERALLY: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
——— FOREMEN, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
——— MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 604, 1275 (i), 4642 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

HARBOURS AND RIVERS, MAR. PROVS.: in Com. of Sup., 4142, 4213 (ii).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1022 (i), 4626 (ii).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 4210, 4616.
——— ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1217 (i), 4217, 4637 (ii).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1010 (i), 4211, 4625 (ii).
——— QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i), 4213, 4629 (ii).
——— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 3283 (ii).
HARDY BAY, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4643 (ii).
HAWBOLD'S COVE, COST OF BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
HEATING, LIGHTING, &C., DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4189 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
HERRING COVE BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
HILTON, ST. JOSEPH'S ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4640 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. Joseph.'
HOPEWELL CAPE PIER, DATE OF COMPLETION, &c.: Ques. (Sir *Charles Hibbert Tupper*) 1444.
HOUSE OF COMMONS, ADDITION TO CENTRAL BLOCK, &C., COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lennox*) 1442 (i).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
HUDSON WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
HUNTSVILLE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
IMMIGRATION BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4616 (ii).
——— *See* 'Buildings,' &c.
INGONISH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4211.
IONA WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
ISLE AU COUDRE WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 3409 (ii).
ISLE AUX GRUES WHARF, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
JACQUES CARTIER CO., DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
KAMINISTIQUIA RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
KAMLOOPS, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
KENNEDY LAKE OUTLET: in Com. of Sup., 4642.
KINGSVILLE PIER, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 1236.
LA HAVE RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 3285, 4213 (ii).
——— *See* 'Lunenburg.'
LAKE ST. JOHN DISTRICT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
LARRY'S RIVER BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1002 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
LETHBRIDGE, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 669.
LEVIS CATTLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
LIME KILN CROSSING, ONT.: in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
LINGAN BEACH, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LITTLE BRAS D'OR WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LIVINGSTONE'S COVE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
LOCKEPORT HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 991 (i).
LOG SORTING, SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
LONDON DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).
LOWER COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004.
LUMBER BOUGHT FOR WHARFS, N.B.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1027 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

LUNENBURG, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
——— DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
——— *See* 'La Have.'
MABOU TO PORT HAWKESBURY TELEGRAPH LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
MACLEOD COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852.
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
——— CABLE SERVICE; in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4769 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bryon,' &c.
MAJOR'S HILL PARK, GREENHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' &c.
MANITOBA LAKE, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
MARCONI CONSTRUCTION OF TELEGRAPH, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4338 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marconi.'
MARIA ISOLATED WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630.
MARIA STREET BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 3289.
——— *See* 'Ottawa, &c.'
MEAFORD HARBOUR, DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
MIDLAND HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i), 4641 (ii).
MILL COVE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1008.
MINUDIE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
MONTAGUE, LOWER, ATKIN'S WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4625 (ii).
MONTREAL, BUILDINGS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 708 (i).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
——— P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 3869 (ii).
——— HARBOUR, ST. MARIE'S CURRENT; in Com. Sup., 608 (i).
MOSSEY RIVER, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
MURRAY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
NEGRO POINT, N.B., WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
NEIL'S HARBOUR, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NELSON POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 860 (i).
NEW HARBOUR BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 1004 (i).
NEW LONDON BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4212 (ii).
NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C., PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4185 (ii).
NORTH BAY N.S., PIER, COST, &C., AMOUNT OF WORK DONE: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1443 (i).
NORTH BAY, ONT., HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 579 (i).
NORTH HEAD, N.B., BREAKWATER, ESTIMATED COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1441 (i).
OAKVILLE HARBOUR, CONSTRUCTION OF DOCKS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 135 (i).
——— PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
ORILLIA WHARF, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i), 4641 (ii).
OROMOCTO RIVER, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4213 (ii).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).
OTTAWA, GOVT. BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i), 4188 (ii).
——— ADDITIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
——— ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).
——— CLEANING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— EASTERN BUILDING, REPAIRS TO WALLS: in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— ELEVATOR ATTENDANTS: in Com. of Sup., 4615 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

OTTAWA, GOVT. BUILDINGS, &c., ENGINEERS' SALARIES, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4138 (ii).
——— GREENHOUSE : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— GROUNDS, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 987 (i), 4188 (ii).
——— LIGHTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4189, 4616.
——— POST OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4565 (ii).
——— RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 964 (i), 4138 (ii).
——— TELEPHONES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).
——— VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM: in Com. of Sup., 564 (i).
——— *See* 'Architects,' 'Buildings,' 'House,' 'Heating,' 'Maria St. Bridge,' 'Rideau Hall.'
OTTAWA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
OWEN SOUND HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 1239.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
PARKER'S COVE, N.S., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1006 (i).
PARTRIDGE ISLAND PIER : in Com. of Sup., 4628.
PELEE ISLAND WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4217 (ii).
PENETANGUISHENE, DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PERCIVAL RIVER, P.E.I., SURVEYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3292 (ii).
PERIBONKA, IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
PETEWAWA NARROWS, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
PETIT DE GRAT HARBOUR, REMOVAL OF WRECK : in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).
PETIT RIVIÈRE BREAKWATER, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 4210 (ii).
PICTON PUBLIC BUILDINGS, DELAY IN OPENING : Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 1490 (i).
PICTOU ISLAND WHARFS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).
POINT FORTUNE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4631.
POINT ST. PIERRE BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
POINT WOLFE, N.B., BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
PORT ARTHUR, BREAKWATER AND DREDGING : in Com. of Sup., 599 (i).
PORT COLBORNE: in Com. of Sup., 609 (i), 4557 (ii).
——— OBSTRUCTIONS, REMOVAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4798 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ont', &c.
——— BUILDING, HEATING, &c.: in Com of Sup., 4616 (ii).
PORT CREDIT HARBOUR, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
PORT DUFFERIN WHARF, COST OF SHED, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 132 (i).
PORT ELGIN PIER, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4641 (ii).
PORTER'S LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4622 (ii).
PORT GEORGE BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 1007 (i).
PORT HOPE HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup. 1239 (i).
PORT LATOUR BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 990 (i), 4624 (ii).
PORT MOUTON BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 990.
PORT SIMPSON TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4178 (ii).
——— TO ABERDEEN TEL. SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
PRESQU'ISLE WHARF, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1239 (i).
P. E. I. AND MAINLAND TEL. LINES : in Com. of Sup., 3293 (ii).
——— TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND : Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 178, 635, 964, 1217 (i), 4535 (ii).
——— CONTINGENCIES : in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Tarte*) 121.
——— EMPLOYEES, NON-PAYMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) 3777 (ii).
——— PRINTING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).
——— SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4136 (ii).
QUARANTINE STATION BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— *See* 'Levis'
QUEBEC, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS : in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT SHED : in Com. of Sup., 709 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 709.
QUESNELLE TO ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).
——— AND HORSEFLY TEL. LINE : in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.
RED DEER COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 852 (i), 4613 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 853 (i).
REDHEAD, N.S., BOAT HARBOUR : on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
RICHIBUCTO PIER, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1439 (i).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
RIDEAU HALL, DRAIN, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4565.
——— IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188.
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
ROADS AND BRIDGES : in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
ROBERVAL IMMIGRANT BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup. 861.
ROUND BAY, BEACH PROTECTION : in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS BAY, PIER : in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, IMPROVEMENT : in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 440 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).
STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, TIMBER USED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2858 (ii).
ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 406.
ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 715 (i), 4567 (ii).
ST. FRANCIS LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
ST. FRANÇOIS BREAKWATER : in Com. of Sup., 4 32 (ii).
STE. GENEVIEVE PIERS, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4215 (ii).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL : in Com. of Sup., 710 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4564.
ST. IRÉNÉE WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. JEROME, IMMIGRANT BUILDING, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
ST. JOHN DE CHAILLONS, HARBOUR : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. JOHN, DOM. BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
——— IMMIGRANT SHED : in Com. of Sup., 641 (i), 4178 (ii).
——— RIVER, WORKS : in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).
ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON : in Com. of Sup., 1247 (i).
——— *See* 'Hilton,' &c.
ST. LAURENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
——— WHARF : in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con*,
ST. LAWRENCE, GULF TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bryon,' 'Telegraphs,' &c.
——— LOWER CHANNEL, REMOVAL OF ROCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
ST. MARY'S RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).
ST. MAURICE, DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i), 4782 (ii).
——— SLIDES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4218, 4220, (ii).
——— *See* 'Slides,' &c.
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBOURG AND SCATARIE ISLAND TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraphs,' &c.
STE. THERÈSE ISLAND DAM, PETS. AGAINST: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Demers*, *Iberville*) 3724 (ii).
SALMON RIVER, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4628 (ii).
SARNIA, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1224.
SASKATOON, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i), 4763 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 731.
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
'SCOTIA,' STR., CONTRACT PRICE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1440 (i).
SHAWINIGAN BOOMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4218.
SHEWEN, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 449 (i).
SIMCOE ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
'SIR HECTOR' DREDGE, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER, DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4142, 4218, 4782 (ii).
SNAG BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4768 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).
——— GOVT. WORKSHOPS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 674 (i).
——— AND MONTREAL WHARF, CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
SOURIS, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
SOURIS, KNIGHTS POINT, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1245.
SOUTH NATION RIVER, IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
SURVEYS AND INSPECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4780.
SYDENHAM RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1226 (i).
TELEGRAPH LINES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 4779.
——— B.C. AND TERS., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
——— AND CABLE LINES, PUBLIC WORKS OR P.O. CONTROL: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).
——— GOVT. CONTROL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4770 (ii).
——— GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 3291, 4143 (ii).
TELEPHONE COS. OF CANADA, MILEAGE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3150 (ii).
TEMISCAMINGUE, LAKE, DREDGING AND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
THETFORD MINES ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).
TIDAL WATERS, ST. JOHN RIVER, WHARFS: In Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
G

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
TIGNISH HARBOUR, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4212, 4626 (ii).
TOBERMORY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).
TORONTO, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 732.
——— APPNMT. OF MECHANICAL ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 884 (i).
——— DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— HARBOUR, DREDGING EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup, 1274 (i).
——— POST OFFICE ALTERATIONS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— BRANCH OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4182.
TORONTO JUNCTION, BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 733 (i).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO: in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
TRANSPORTATION ON ST. LAWRENCE, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 565-604 (i).
'TYRIAN,' SS., CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4143, 4219 (ii).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564.
VANCOUVER, DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 876.
——— POST OFFICE, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
VICTORIA HARBOUR, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286.
WALES, PRINCE OF, ILLUMINATIONS IN OTTAWA, COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 615 (i).
WASHABUCK WHARF, N.S.: in Com. of Sup,, 1009 (i).
WEST POINT PIER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4211.
WIARTON, HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS, AMOUNT VOTED: Ques. (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).
WILLIAM'S HEAD QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4614 (ii).
WILSON BEACH BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).
WINDSOR, N.S., HARBOUR, SHEAR DAMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).
WINNIPEG, IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 833 (i), 4616 (ii),
——— ISOLATION HOSPITAL: in Com. of Sup., 4613 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 3868 (ii).
WINNIPEG LAKE SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 528.
WINNIPEGOSIS, MOSSY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1242.
YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).
YUKON, BUILDINGS, RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4542, 4949 (ii).
——— CONTRACTS AND CIVIL SERVANTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).
——— COURT HOUSE, ALLOWANCE TO MATRON, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).
——— EMPLOYEES, CHARGES, &c., MEMO. OF MR. FULLER: Read (Mr. *Tarte*) 4536 (ii).
——— JUDGES' RESIDENCES, RENTALS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4190 (ii).
——— POLE CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4162 (ii).
——— ROCHESTER'S CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii),
——— SUPPLIES *re* BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4538-9, (ii).
——— TELEGRAPH SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 4781 (ii).
——— CONSTRUCTION, &c.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes*, *Victoria*) 2859 (i).
——— WAGON ROADS, REFUNDS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4147 (ii).
——— WOOD, &c. FOR YUKON BUILDINGS, PAR. IN DAWSON PAPER: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 4540.

PULLMAN CARS, REPAIRS IN U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2459 (i).

QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 2899 (i).
——— PHYSICIANS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 372 (i).
——— PUBLIC HEALTH: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (ii).
——— SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i); conc., 5033 (ii).
——— STATION BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 980 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s B. No. 26 (Mr. *Malouin*) 1°*, 734; 2°*, 882; in Com., 1622; 3°*, 1623 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 93.)

Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 87 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 1986; 2°*, 2201 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4577 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, c. 94.)

QUEBEC:
ABRAHAM, PLAINS OF, RIGHTS RESERVED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3409 (ii).
ANTICOSTI CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.
AUGER, I. A., CONTRACT *re* SPRUCE PLANKS, QUANTITY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2483, 2676 (ii).
BATISCAN CHANNEL, DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).
BEAUCE ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
BEAUCHAMP, OSCAR, EMPLYMT. BY GOVT., &c.: (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Vincent,' &c.
BEAUHARNOIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 610.
BOUILLON, DR. ALFRED, DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).
BRYON ISLAND TO ANTICOSTI, CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4769 (ii).
BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 642 (i), 4179 (ii).
CACOUNA AND RY. STATION, MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2225 (i).
CANALS, QUEBEC, BOUNDARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (ii).
CARILLON CANAL, GUIDE PIER, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (ii).
CHAMBLY CANAL, WHARF, &c., MAINTENANCE BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 2068.
CHAUDIÉRE JUNCTION, I.C.R. ENGINE HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).
CHICOUTIMI ELECTORAL DISTRICT, DISMISSAL OF PET. (Mr. *Speaker*) 2219 (i).
COTE ST. LUC RIFLE RANGE, INDEMNITY TO J. LAROSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 622 (i).
——— *See* 'Montreal,' &c.
CRANE ISLAND WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630.
CROSS POINT, ISOLATED PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
CULBUTE CANAL, DAMAGES BY FLOODING: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4309 (ii).
DESCARY, DR. C. A., VET. SURGEON AT ST. VINCENT DE PAUL: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).
DES JOACHIMS BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4219 (ii).
DORCHESTER COUNTY POSTMASTER, DISMISSAL, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4934 (ii).
DRUMMOND CO. RY., RECEIPTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).
DRUMMONDVILLE, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 643 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180.
GASPÉ PENINSULA, REMOVAL OF ROCK IN CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
GATINEAU RIVER SLIDES: in Com. of Sup., 4782.
GRANBY POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 644 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
GRAND VALLEE PIER, QUE.: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i).
GROSSE ISLE, QUARANTINE BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 644, 982 (i).
HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 1031 (i), 4213, 4629 (ii).
HAY PURCHASED FOR WAR OFFICE IN QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
HUDSON WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1046 (i).
INDIANS, ONT. AND QUE., MEDICAL ATTENDANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3037 (ii).
ISLE AUX COUDRES WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1046.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Angers*) 3409 (ii).
ISLE AUX GRUES, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1047.
ISLE OF ORLEANS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
JACQUES CARTIER COUNTY, DREDGING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3285 (ii).
JOLIETTE P.O., DISMISSAL OF J. J. SHEPPARD: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2856 (ii).
KAMOURASKA ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
KEITH POST OFFICE, CHANGE OF LOCATION: in Com. of Sup., 4937 (ii).
LACHINE CANAL, ELECTRIC PLANT, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4299 (ii).
——— LOCK REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4035.
——— MILL ST. PAVING, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).
——— WASTE WEIR: in Com. of Sup., 4307 (ii).
LAKE ST. JOHN DISTRICT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
LAPRAIRIE POST OFFICE, DISMISSAL OF A. THOMAS, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).
L'ASSOMPTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
LAVAL ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).
——— BALLOT PAPERS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
LEVIS, CATTLE QUARANTINE STATION: in Com. of Sup., 667 (i).
——— I.C.R. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3810 (ii).
——— PUBLIC BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 669.
L'ISLET ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
LONGUEUIL GOVT. FARM, SALE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2455 (i).
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
——— CABLE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4769 (ii).
——— POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3903 (ii).
——— STEAM COMMUNICATION, &c., STR. 'AMELIA': Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).
MARANDA, ALFRED, EMPLYMT. OF: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
MARIA, ISOLATED WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4630 (ii).
MONTREAL, BRANCH POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).
——— EXAMINING WAREHOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 670 (i).
——— GRAIN INSPECTION, CERTIFICATES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 450 (i).
——— HARBOUR, STE. MARIE'S CURRENT: in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).
——— HARBOUR BOARD, APPNMT. OF MR. DORAN: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 3920 (ii).
——— P. O.: in Com. of Supply., 3869, 4564 (ii).
——— RIFLE RANGES, AMOUNT EXPENDED, TENDERERS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2223 (i).
——— *See* 'Cote St. Luc,' &c.
——— ST. JAMES, ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES DIVISION, BALLOTS, PRINTING, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).
——— TURNPIKE TRUST COMMISSION, REVENUE RECEIVED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Leonard*) 481 (i).
MURRAY BAY WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
NICOLET STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
OUELLE RIVIERE, I.C.R. SPUR LINE: in Com. of Sup.. 4796 (ii).
PASPEBIAC, OCEAN PORT: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 5000.
PERIBONKA, IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).
POINT FORTUNE, WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4631.
QUEBEC, CARTRIDGE FACTORY: in Com, of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
——— IMMIGRANT SHED: in Com. of Sup., 709 (i).
——— MILITARY BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 709.
——— MONTGOMERY, GENL., ERECTION OF MONUMENT, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 129 (i).
——— SHOE WORKERS' UNION, PET. TO GOVT., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Puttee*) 2473 (i).
RESTIGOUCHE BRIDGE, I. C. R., AID TO: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 5070 (ii).
RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE SHOPS, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— FREIGHT YARD: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
——— *See* "Temiscouata."
RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4631 (ii).
ROBERVAL IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
ST. ALEXIS BAY PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, TIMBER USED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2858 (ii).
ST. EUGÈNE DE GRANTHAM, MAIL SERVICE, CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).
ST. FRANCOIS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4632 (ii).
STE. GENEVIEVE PIERS, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4215 (ii).
STE. HENEDINE MAIL CARRIER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).
ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 710 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564.
ST. IRENEE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. JEROME, IMMIGRANT BUILDING, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).
——— POSTMASTER, INTERFERENCE IN POLITICAL MEETINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
ST. JOHN DE CHAILLONS, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. LAURENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE, GULF TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
——— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.
——— LIGHTS, BUOYS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 518.
——— LOWER CHANNEL, REMOVAL OF ROCK, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
——— TRANSPORTATION ON ST. LAWRENCE, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 565–604.
——— M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3674–5 (ii).
ST. MAURICE DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i), 4782 (ii).
——— SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4218, 4220 (ii).
STE. MONIQUE STATION, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 744 (i).
ST. OCTAVE STATION, I. C. R., COST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).

QUEBEC—*Con.*
STE. ODILON, POSTMASTER, DORCHESTER CO., DISMISSAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4350 (ii).
STE. THÉRÈSE ISLAND DAM, PETS. AGAINST: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 3724 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— COAL SUPPLIES, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— EMPLOYEES ORGANIZING POLITICAL MEETINGS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
——— INDEMNITY TO TREFFLÉ NANTEL: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2471 (i).
——— LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 3617.
——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE OF WARDEN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— LETTER *re* MISCONDUCT OF OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 1445 (i).
——— LUSSIER ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).
——— RELATIONS BETWEEN WARDEN AND DEP. WARDEN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 1445 (i).
——— VET. SURGEON, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831 (ii).
ST. VINCENT, W.I., RELIEF TO SUFFERERS: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).
SHAWINIGAN BOOMS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4218.
SHEPPARD, J. J., CHARGES AGAINST, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2855 (ii).
——— *See* 'Joliette,' &c.
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).
——— GOVT. WORKSHOPS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 674 (i).
——— AND MONTREAL WHARF CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4304 (ii).
——— WATER POWERS, &c., REPS. OF ENGINEERS, LEASES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 631.
SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC, WRITS ISSUED, &c., NUMBER, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 442 (i).
TELEGRAPH SERVICE, GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 4143 (ii).
——— *See* 'St. Lawrence,' &c.
TEMISCOUATA FARM LANDS, DAMAGES *re* I.C.R. DITCHING: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).
TEMISCOUATA RY. AND I. C. R., TRAFFIC FACILITIES, PRICES PAID 1900-1: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).
TERREBONNE CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
THEREIN, MR. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER FROM GRANDES PILES, PET., &c.: M. (Mr. *Ball*) for Copy*, 3724 (ii).
THETFORD MINES, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).
THREE RIVERS, INSPECTOR GRAVEL, AMOUNTS PAID, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
——— CERTIFICATE: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1323 (i).
VALLEYFIELD, DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564.
——— RIOTS, MILITIA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 4260 (ii).
QUEEN'S AND KING'S COUNSEL, APPOINTED SINCE 1896; Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 3154 (ii).
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.) ELECTORAL DIVISION: Notification of Vacancy (Mr. *Speaker*) 3 (i).

QUESNEL FORKS AND HORSEFLY TEL. LINE: in Com. of Sup., 4779 (ii).

QUESNELLE TO ATLIN TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).

——— *See* 'Telegraphs,' &c.

Ry. Act (cattle guards) Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1° m., 68; 2° m., 451; ref. to Sel. Com. on Rys., agreed to (Y. 90; N. 50) 481 (i); M. for Com., 3158; in Com., 3164 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Lancaster*) 2480 (i).

——— **(drainage) Amt. B. No. 4** (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 121; 2° m., 626 (i).

——— **(drainage) Act Amt. B. No. 6** (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 1° m., 238; 2° m., 789 (i).

——— **B. No. 25** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 632 (i).

——— **B. No. 42** (Mr. *Scott*) 1°*, 1063 (i).

——— **(fire damages) Amt. B. No. 56** (Mr. *Demers, St. John and Iberville*) 1°*, 1323 (i).

——— **(safety of employees) Amt. B. No. 92** (Mr. *Smith, Vancouver*) 1°*, 2064 (i).

——— **Consolidation B. No. 104** (Mr. *Blair*) 1° m., 2431 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

——— **Incorporation Companies B. No. 110** (Mr. *Guthrie*) 1° m., 2847 (ii).

——— **Labour Disputes Settlement B. No. 146** (Mr. *Mulock*) 1° m., 3725; wthdn., 4970 (ii).

——— **(expropriation) Amt. B. No. 155** (Mr. *Blair*) 1° m., 4126; 2°*, 4580; in Com., 4580; 3°*, 4604 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 29.)

——— Remarks (Mr. *Blair*) 4404 (ii).

RAILWAYS:

ACCIDENTS THROUGH CATTLE ON TRACK, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Erb*) 883 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Erb*) 2472 (i).

——— *See* 'Employees.'

ADDITIONAL SIDINGS, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3811, 4792; conc., 5037 (ii).

AIR BRAKES, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812.

ALBERTON RY. STATION, LOCATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1441 (i).

BRIDGES, STRENGTHENING, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3809, 4792 (ii).

——— P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

BRITISH YUKON RY.: *See* 'Yukon.'

C.P.R., INCREASE IN CAPITAL STOCK: Papers laid on Table (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 129 (i).

——— LANDS TAXATION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Oliver*) 5055 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) 5070 (ii).

——— *See* 'N.W.T.'

CAR COUPLERS, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).

CEMENTS, PORTLAND, TESTS, &C. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Osler*) 1442, 1444 (i).

CHARLOTTETOWN, P.E.I., INCREASED RY. ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).

COAL PURCHASED IN CAN.: Ques. (Mr. *Kendall*) 883 (i).

COPPER CROWN WORKS AND I.C.R. CONTRACTS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3492 (ii).

CROSSEN MFG. CO.: *See* 'Trucks,' &c.

DITCHING: *See* 'Temiscouata.'

DIXON, F. A., PROMOTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4534, 4782 (ii).

DOM. SECURITIES CO., PROSPECTUS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3466, 3533 (ii).

——— PAR. IN N.Y. PAPER: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4428 (ii).

DRUMMOND COUNTY RY., RECEIPTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

EASTERN EXTENSION, ARBITRATION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).

——— REFUNDS FOR RIGHT OF WAY: Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 781 (i).

EEL RIVER STATION: In Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

EMPLOYEES, CAN. RYS., KILLED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 410 (i).

——— *See* 'Accidents,' &c.

EMPLOYEES, I.C.R., NUMBER, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bell*) 440 (i).

——— CLASSIFYING OF EMPLOYEES, SALARIES, &C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).

ENGINEERS, &C., I.C.R., SALARIES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).

EXPENDITURES *re* GOVT. RYS.: M. *re* Inquiry by Pub. Accts. Com., 3235; (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281 (ii).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. *Haggart*) 3126 (ii).

FIRE INSURANCE ON LOCOMOTIVES, I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2854 (ii).

FREIGHT RATES, I.C.R., ON PIG IRON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 782 (i).

FREIGHT RATES, REP. OF PROF. MCLEAN: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 448 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. *Kemp*) 1205 (i).

GENERAL STATEMENT (Mr. *Blair*) in Com. of Sup., 2866, 3411 (ii).

GOVT. POLICY: Amt. to Address in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (Mr. *Bourassa*) 65, 68; wthdn., 119 (i).

G.T. RY., RENTALS BY I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3515 (ii).

HALIFAX AND S. WESTERN RY. EXTENSION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) 5064 (ii).

HILLSBOROUGH BRIDGE, P.E.I. RY.: in Com. of Sup., 3862; conc., 5039 (ii).

HORNE, MR. R. T., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2068 (i).

I.C.R.: IN COM. OF SUP.: Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) 3410 (ii).

I.C.R. AND P.E.I. RYS., ACCOUNTS, VOUCHERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).

JOUGHINS, MR., REP. *re* I.C.R. LOCOMOTIVES: in Com. of Sup., 3416 (ii).

——— *See* 'Mechanical,' &c.

JOUGHINS TRUCK: *See* 'Truck.'

KINKORA RY. ACCOMMODATION, RES. *re*: in Com. of Sup., 3863 (ii).

LÉVIS LOCAL SERVICE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4297 (ii).

LOCOMOTIVES FOR I.C.R., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3426, 3816 (ii).

——— BOUGHT, RENTED, &C. BY GOVT. RYS.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 1108 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 2681 (i).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 445 (i).

MACKENZIE & MANN, EXCHEQUER COURT AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).

MCMANUS LETTER *re* I.C.R. TIES: in Com. of Sup., 3502-4 (ii).

——— *See* 'Ties,' &c.

MACHINERY, TOOLS, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3812, 4297 (ii).

MECHANICAL SUPERINTENDENT, REPORTS, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3813 (ii).

——— *See* 'Joughins.'

MIRAMICHI BRIDGE SPANS: in Com. of Sup., 4794 (ii).

MURRAY HARBOUR BRANCH RY., P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 3996, 4282, 4292, 4918; conc., 5039 (ii).

——— SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR, TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).

N.B., RAILWAY LINES, TRACINGS, &C.: M. for Plans* (Mr. *Costigan*) 961 (i).

NICOLET STATION: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
N.W.T., Lands patented, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 2677 (ii).
——— *See* 'C.P.R.,' &c.
Operating Expenses, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4310 (ii).
Original Construction, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii).
Ouelle Rivière Spur Line: in Com. of Sup., 4796 (ii).
Passes issued on Govt. Rys. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Clarke*) 810 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4120 (ii).
Pintsch Gas Equipment, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup. 3812 (ii).
P.E.I. Rys.: in Com. of Sup., 3862, 3996, 4282.
Private Cars, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).
Pullman Cars, Repairs in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2459 (i).
Rails, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3781; conc., 5035.
——— Quantity purchased, Clergue's Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781, 1439 (i).
——— Rails, Rolling Stock, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 885 (i).
Railways and Canals—Civil Govt., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3779, 4782 (ii).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. *Blair*) 129.
——— Deptl. Vote: in Com. of Sup., 4534 (ii).
Railway Commission, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4305.
——— Appnmt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Robinson, Elgin*) 131 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Davis*) 883 (i).
——— Bill: Remarks (Mr. *Blair*) 4404 (ii).
——— Com.: M. to add Names (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 1278 (i).
——— Subsidies paid since 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 448 (i).
——— Remarks (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 4970, 4972.
Revenue and Capital Account for 1901, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 529 (i).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3813, 4297, 4783; conc., 5037 (ii).
——— Rolling Stock, &c., Condition, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 3724 (ii).
——— *See* 'Rails,' 'Rolling Stock,' &c.
St. John and Halifax Elevators, Grain, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).
——— Quantity of Grain, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612 (i).
St. Octave Station, I.C.R., Tenderer, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).
Shims purchased in 1901, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1438 (i).
Station Expenses, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3496.
Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'
Sydney, Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 3996, 4789, 4796 (ii).
Sydney and Louisburg Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).
Temiscouata and I.C.R., Traffic Facilities, Prices paid, 1900-1: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).
——— Ditching: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).
Ties, I.C.R., Purchases, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 444, 2065 (i).
Trackmen's Wages, Govt. Rys.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Logan*) 3702; neg. (Y. 54; N. 23) 3824.
Transportation, Distances, Cost, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 578 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 135 (i).
Trucks, I.C.R., purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2852 (ii).
Truro Roundhouse: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352.
Truro Station, &c., Rebuilding: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Webb and Sunday Travelling over P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4700 (ii).
Windsor Branch Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 4292.
Yukon, British, Ry., Tolls and Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3638 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.', &c.
Rapide Plat Canal, Enlargement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4304 (ii).
——— Gilbert Bros.: in Com. of Sup., 4021 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
Reciprocity in Trade: prop. Res. (Mr. *Charlton*) 248.
Red Deer, Court House: in Com. of Sup., 852 (i), 4613 (ii).
——— Immigrant Building: in Com. of Sup., 853.
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 86 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2201 (i); M. to ref. back to Sel Com., 3202; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 53) 3234 (ii).
Redhead, N.S., Boat Harbour: on M. for Com. of Sup., 4994 (ii).
Red Horse Shoal Light, Keeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 442 (i).
——— *See* 'Gananoque.'
Referendum: *See* 'Manitoba Liquor Act.'
Regina Law Library B. No. 19 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 530; 2°m., 1205; in Com., and 3°*, 1205 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 30.)
Registrars, N.W.T. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 4251. (ii)
Religious Precedence in Can.: *See* 'Precedence.'
Remission of Penalties B. No. 151 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1°*, 4036; 2°*, 4579; in Com., 4579; 3°*, 4579 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 26.)
Remounts, Supplies, &c. for Militia: in Com. of Sup., 2559 (ii).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
Representation in House of Commons by Provs. *re* Census, 1901: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 2677 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 2854 (ii).
——— *See* 'Yukon Bill 134.'
Restigouche Bridge, I.C.R., Aid to: Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 5070 (ii).
Restigouche Indians, Investigation *re* Complaints, Rep. of Inspector: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Fowler*) 2473 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for (Mr. *Bell*) 3239, 4036 (ii).
——— (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 3862, 4120 (ii).
Richibucto, Pier, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (i).
——— tenderers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1439 (i).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).
Rickard, Wm., Resignation as Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 4697 (ii).
Ricketts, T., Postmaster at Gilmour, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Carscallen*) 2224 (i).
Rideau Canal, Poonamalie Bridge, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4270, 4917 (ii).
——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.
Rideau Hall, Drain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4565.
——— Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4188.
Rifle Association, Grants, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2561 (ii).

RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS' REGULATIONS, PAMPHLET, FRENCH TRANSLATION, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 2223 (i).

RIFLE PRACTICE FOR CANADIAN SCHOOL BOYS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 3155 (ii).

RIFLE RANGE, BEDFORD: conc., 5032 (ii).

RIFLE RANGES, LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 2566 (i).

RIORDON PAPER CO. AND WATER PRIVILEGES ON WELLAND CANAL, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 745.

——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

RIVIÈRE AUX RENARDS PIER: in Com. of Sup., 4631.

RIVIÈRE DU LOUP, ENGINE SHOPS: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (ii).

——— FREIGHT YARD, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3828 (i).

ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3289 (ii).

——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).

ROBERVAL IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

ROCHESTER'S CONTRACT *re* YUKON TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

ROCKINGHAM IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4798.

Rocky Mountain Park Act (extension) Amt. B. No. 133 (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3305; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774; 3°*, 3774 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 31.)

ROLLING STOCK, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3813, 4297, 4783; conc., 5037 (ii).

ROSEAU RIVER INDIAN RESERVE: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247 (i).

ROSSLAND MINERS' UNION AND ALIEN LABOUR ACT: LETTERS, &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Smith Vancouver*) 2471 (i).

ROSSLAND PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 861.

Ross Rifle Co.'s B. No. 70 (Mr. *Thompson*) 1°*, 1673; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., 2671; 3°*, 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 96.)

ROSS RIFLES, FREE ENTRY, &c.: in Com. on Ways and Means, 4973 (ii).

'ROTHESAY BLUES,' MEDALS, PETS. *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4698 (ii).

'ROTHESAY,' STR., REMOVAL OF WRECK: in Com. of Sup., 4221 (ii).

ROUND BAY BEACH PROTECTION: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).

ROUND HILL TO ARMSTRONG'S CORNERS, MAIL CONTRACT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Fowler*) 1987 (i).

ROUND HILL POSTAL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3916 (ii).

Royal Marine Insurance Co.'s B. No. 167 (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) 1°*, 4568; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4643 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 97.)

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 2562; conc., 5033 (ii).

——— ELECTRIC LIGHTING: in Com. of Sup., 4261.

——— GYMNASIUM, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 729 (i).

——— REP. OF BOARD OF VISITORS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 443 (i).

ROYAL MINT BRANCH: in Com. of Sup., 560 (i).

ROYAL VISIT: *See* 'Wales.'

ROY VS. C.P.R., PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENT: M. for Copy (Mr. *Lemieux*) 499 (i).

RURAL POSTMASTERS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).

Russo-Greek Church: *See* 'Greek Catholic.'

ST. ALEXIS BAY PIER: in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

ST. ANDREW'S RAPIDS, AMOUNT VOTED AND SPENT, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 440 (i).

——— EXPENDITURE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *LaRivière*) 247

——— IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).

STE. ANNE RIVER WORKS, TIMBER USED, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2858 (ii).

ST. BONIFACE HOSPITALS: in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).

ST. CATHARINES, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 715 (i), 4567 (ii).

——— WATER SUPPLY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 883, 1860 (i).

——— *See* 'Canals,' &c.

St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. *Tisdale*) 1°*, 1278; 2°*, 1438; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 98.)

St. Clair River Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 15 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 530; 2°* 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII* *c.* 95.)

ST. EUGÈNE DE GRANTHAM MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).

ST. FRANCIS LAKE, OUTLET, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).

ST. FRANCOIS BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4632.

STE. GENEVIEVE PIERS, PROTECTION, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4215 (ii).

STE. HENEDINE MAIL CARRIER, CONTRACT: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 447 (i).

ST. HYACINTHE, DRILL HALL: in Com. of Sup., 710.

——— PUBLIC BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 4564 (ii).

ST. IRENÉE WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

ST. JEROME, IMMIGRANT BUILDING, REPAIRS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4180 (ii).

——— POSTMASTER, INTERFERENCE IN POLITICAL MEETINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).

ST. JOHN AND HALIFAX ELEVATORS, QUANTITY OF GRAIN, REVENUE, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 612, 883 (i).

——— remarks in Com. of Sup., 3516 (ii).

——— *See* "I. C. R." &c.

——— BUILDINGS, IMPROVEMENTS, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i).

——— IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 641 (i), 4178 (ii).

——— INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4786 (ii).

ST. JOHN DES CHAILLONS, HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).

ST. JOHN LAKE DISTRICT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4179 (ii).

ST. JOHN RIVER WORKS: in Com. of Sup., 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).

ST. JOSEPH'S WHARF, LAKE HURON: in Com. of Sup., 1247 (i).
——— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.
ST. LAURENT, PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 656 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 4634 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Adirondack Ry. Co.'s B. No. 153 (Mr. *Pringle*) 1°*, 4121 (ii).
ST. LAWRENCE AND GREAT LAKES WATERWAYS, COMMISSION, &C.: prop. Res. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 886 (i).
St. Lawrence and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. *Bureau*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 2193; 3°*, 2194 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 99.)
ST. LAWRENCE, CANAL EMPLOYEES, AMOUNTS PAID, COLLECTED, &C.: 1896-1901: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 2222 (i).
——— GULF TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3291 (ii).
——— LOWER CHANNEL, REMOVAL OF ROCK, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
——— NAVIGATION, AIDS TO: in Com. of Sup., 518 (i), 5024 (ii).
——— SHIP CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 565 (i).
——— TRANSPORTATION BETWEEN QUEBEC AND MONTREAL: M. (Mr. *Davis*) for Ret., 3674-5 (ii).
ST. LOUIS AND JAPAN EXPOSITIONS: in Com. of Sup., 4966 (ii).
ST. MARY'S RIVER IMPROVEMENT: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i).
ST. MAURICE DISTRICT SLIDES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4218, 4220 (ii).
——— DREDGING CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1053, 4782 (ii).
STE. MONIQUE STATION, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 744.
ST. OCTAVE STATION, I.C.R., TENDERER, COST, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2222 (i).
STE. ODILON, POSTMASTER, DORCHESTER CO., DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morin*) 4350 (ii).
——— *See* "Dorchester."
ST. PETERS TO LOUISBOURG AND SCATARI ISLAND TELEGRAPH: in Com. of Sup., 4770 (ii).
STE. THÉRÈSE ISLAND DAM, PETS. AGAINST: M. for for Copies* (Mr. *Demers, Iberville*) 3724 (ii).
ST. THOMAS, CUSTOMS COLLECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 2930, 3295 (ii).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL, APPNMT. OF PHYSICIAN: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159 (i).
——— COAL SUPPLIES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 159.
——— EMPLOYEES ORGANIZING POLITICAL MEETINGS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 158 (i).
——— INDEMNITY TO TREFFLÉ NANTEL: M. for Ret.* 2471 (i).
——— LAND PURCHASES: in Com. of Sup., 3617 (ii).
——— LEAVE OE ABSENCE OF WARDEN: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 2472 (i).
——— LETTER *re* MISCONDUCT OF OFFICIALS: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 1445 (i).
——— LUSSIER ARBITRATION: in Com. of Sup., 4268 (ii).
——— VET. SURGEON, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 3831.
ST. VINCENT, W.I., RELIEF TO SUFFERERS: in Com. of Sup., 5031 (ii).
SABBATH OBSERVANCE *re* MILITARY PARADES: Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) 4646 (ii).
SALMON AND LOBSTER HATCHERIES, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4222 (ii).
SALMON RIVER BREAKWATER: in Com. of Sup., 4628.
SAMPLES SENT BY SAMPLE POST, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Brock*) 617 (i).
SANDHILLS, P.E.I., RANGE LIGHTS, REMOVAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1064 (i).
SARNIA DREDGING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1224 (i).
SASKATCHEWAN SETTLERS, RELIEF: in Com. of Sup., 4257 (ii).
SASKATOON IMMIGRANT BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
SAULT STE. MARIE, CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 600 (i), 4001, 4298, 4763 (ii).
——— POST OFFICE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 731 (i).
——— WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).
SCHOOL LANDS, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4252 (ii).
——— SALE, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 154.
SCHOOLS, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 4948 (ii).
——— ONT., &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3045 (i).
SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR SOUTH AFRICA, INFORMATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 962 (i).
SCIENTIFIC INSTITUTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
'SCOTIA,' STR., CONTRACT PRICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 1440 (i).
SECRETARY OF STATE:
CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINERS: in Com. of Sup., 4315 (ii),
PRINTING BUREAU, PLANT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4119, 4956 (ii).
PRINTING AND STATIONERY: in Com. of Sup., 174 (i).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
SEC. OF STATE, DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 173 (i).
——— CLERICAL ASSISTANCE: in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
——— DEPTL. REP.: Presented (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 451 (i).
Securities Bank of Can. B. No. 166 (Mr. *Calvert*) 1°*, 4464; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 100.)
SECURITIES, POSTMASTERS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3876.
SEED GRAIN FOR INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3050, 3056 (ii).
SEELEY'S BAY P.O., ABSTRACTION FROM REGISTERED LETTERS: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 1986 (i).
SEINE LICENSES ISSUED IN B.C., NUMBER, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Earle*) 2680 (ii).
SESSIONAL CLERKS EMPLOYED AS CIVIL SERVANTS: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 619 (i).
SHAWINIGAN BOOMS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
SHEPPARD, MR., POSTMASTER AT JOLIETTE, DISMISSAL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2068 (i), 2855 (ii).
SHERIFF'S FEES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).
SHEWEN, MR., EMPLYMT. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 449 (i).
SHIMS PURCHASED IN 1901, PRICE PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1438 (i).

SHIPPING COMBINE (ATLANTIC), PAR. IN 'CITIZEN': on M. for Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
SHOE WORKERS' UNION, QUEBEC, PET. TO GOVT., &C.: M. for Copy* (Mr. *Puttee*) 2473 (i).
SIDINGS, ADDITIONAL, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4792 (ii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.,' &c.
SIEVERT, PRIVATE, ALLOWANCE TO FAMILY: in Com. of Sup., 4947 (ii).
SIMCOE, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
SIOUX INDIANS: in Com. of Sup., 3056 (ii).
'SIR HECTOR,' DREDGE, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3284 (ii).
SKEENA RIVER, DREDGING AND IMPROVEMENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 1277 (i).
SLIDES AND BOOMS: in Com. of Sup., 3287, 4782 (ii).
——— QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 4218 (ii).
——— REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4142 (ii).
SMALLPOX, ON SCHR. 'JEANIE MYRTLE': Remarks (Mr, *Kaulbach*) 5015 (ii).
——— OUTBREAK AMONG TROOPS IN S. A.: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1446 (i).
SNAG-BOAT, SELF-PROPELLING, MAN.: in Com. of Sup., 4768 (ii).
SOREL, DEEP WATER WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1053.
——— ELEVATOR: in Com. of Sup., 1062 (i).
——— GOVT. WORKSHOPS: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 674 (i).
——— AND MONTREAL WHARF CONTRACTS, SPECIFICATIONS, &C.: M. for Copies* (Mr. *Monk*) 2473 (i).
SOULANGES CANAL, CONSTRUCTION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4019, 4304 (ii).
——— WATER POWERS, &C., REPS. OF ENGINEERS, LEASES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bennett*) 631 (i).
SOURIS, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
——— KNIGHT'S POINT WHARF: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
SOUTH AFRICAN WAR:
CANADIAN BEEF EXCLUSION FROM IMP. CONTRACTS: Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) to Com. of Sup., 3840; neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Boyd*) 746 (i).
CONDUCT OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS, PAR. IN 'DAILY NEWS': Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2069, 2088 (i).
CONSTABULARY, APPLICATIONS, SELECTIONS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 528 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Mouk*) 243 (i).
CONTINGENTS, EXPENSE OF EQUIPMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1684 (i).
——— COR. BETWEEN HIS EX., CAN. GOVT., AND G. B., *re* RECRUITING TROOPS, &C.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 137 (i).
——— PAR. IN 'LA PATRIE': Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1762 (i).
HORSES PURCHASED IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 1989 (i), 2679 (ii).
LAND GRANTS TO S. A. CONTINGENTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 1446 (i), 3831 (ii).
PENSIONS TO CANADIANS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Oliver*) 2459 (i).
SCHOOL TEACHERS, IMFORMATION *re*: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 962 (i).
SMALL-POX OUTBREAK AMONG TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 1446 (i).
SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—*Con.*
SOCKS FOR THIRD CONTINGENT, CONTRACT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 3638 (i).
VOLUNTEERS, LAND GRANTS TO, MEMORIALS FROM N. W. TER.: Ques. (Mr. *Scott*) 3831 (ii).
See 'Militia,' &c.
SOUTHAMPTON HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).
SOUTH NATION RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).
SOUTHPORT TO MURRAY HARBOUR, P. E. I. RY., TENDERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).
——— *See* 'Murray Harbour,' &c.
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85 (Mr. *Geoffrion*) 1°*, 1985; 2°*, 2473 (i); in Com., 4569; 3°*, 4569 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 101.)
Sovereign Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 29 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 781; 2°*, 882; in Com., and 3°*, 2023 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 102.)
SPEECH FROM THE THRONE: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 4 (i).
——— M. (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 6 (i).
Sprague's Falls Manufacturing Co.'s Limited incorp. B. No. 37 (Mr. *Emmerson*) 1°*, 961; 2°*, 1242; in Com., 1675, 2021, 2192; 3°*, 2193 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 103.)
SPRINGBANK POST OFFICE, MAIL SERVICE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Sherritt*) 2678 (ii).
SPRUCE PLANKS FOR TIES, &C., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
STAFF COURSE AT KINGSTON: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 239 (i).
——— *See* 'Militia,' &c.
STAMPERS AND SORTERS, P. O. DEPT.: in Com. of Sup., 4940 (ii).
'STANLEY' STR., REPAIRING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 520 (i).
STATIONERY, HOUSE OF COMMONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4326 (ii).
——— *See* 'H. of C.,' &c.
STATION EXPENSES, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3496 (ii).
STATISTICS, GENERAL: in Com. of Sup., 339 (i), 2827.
STATUTES, REVISION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3622 (ii).
STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT, AND PET. FROM MARINE ENGINEERS' NATIONAL ASS'N.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 513, 534 (i).
STR. 'NEWFIELD': in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
——— *See* 'Marine,' &c.
SS. COMPANIES, SUBSIDIES: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4466 (ii).
STEAMSHIPS CONSTRUCTED IN SCOTLAND, OUTFITTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).
STEAMSHIPS FITTED WITH COOLING FANS, NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616, 882 (i).
——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.
STEEL RAILS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3781; conc., 5035.
——— Ques. (Mr. *Ganong*) 746, 781, 1439 (i).
——— I.C.R., ROLLING STOCK, &C., PURCHASED IN 1901, O. C's. CONTRACTS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Barker*) 885, 886 (i).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.,' 'Rys.,' &c.
STELLARTON, INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (ii).

STEWART, CAPT. D. C., QUARANTINE SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2845, 2909 (ii).

Stock Breeders: *See* 'Maritime.'

Strait of Canso Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 46 (Mr. *McLennan*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1438; in Com., 2194, 2219; 3°*, 2220 (i). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 104.)

STRONG, CHIEF JUSTICE SIR HENRY, AMOUNT PAID *re* JUDICIAL COMMITTEE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1986 (i).

SUBSIDIES TO RYS: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'

SUBSIDY TO N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 4251, 4298 (ii).

SUGAR, REFINED, IMPORTED INTO CAN. FROM 1900 TO 1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Madore*) 809 (i).

——— TESTING, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 2927 (ii).

SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER, P. E. I.: in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).

SUPERANNUATIONS, POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 3906 (ii).

SUPERIOR COURT, QUEBEC, WRITS ISSUED, &C., NUMBER, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Lemieux*) 442 (i).

SUPPLIES *re* TELEGRAPH SERVICE, YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).

——— BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 4538-9 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c,

Supply B. No. 168 (Mr. *Fielding*) 1° m., 5073; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 5074 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 1.)

SUPPLY:

(Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head).

AMTS. AND REMARKS TO MS. FOR COM.: Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bourassa*) Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Letter from Sir L. H. Davies (read) 811; Remarks (Mr. *Sproule*) Official Report of Speech, 962; Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) Horses, Duty on, imported into the N. W. T., 1206; Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) Telegraphic Communication with P. E. I. and Mainland, 2721; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Bell*) *re* Blue Books Statistics, 2731; Remarks (Mr. *Maclean*) Preferential Trade with the Empire, 2733, 2942; Remarks (Mr. *Russell*) Halifax Longshoremen, Strike, &c., 2859; Remarks (Mr. *Wilson*) Immigration, Agents, &c., 2946; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*), Nickel Exports, 3030; Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) Man. School Lands, 3035; Amt. (Mr. *Haggart*) Public Accounts Com., I. C. R. Expenditures, &c., 3240; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 91) 3281; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) S. A. War, Terms of Peace with Boers, &c., 3316, 3343; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Atlantic Shipping Combine, 3513; Remarks (Mr. *Taylor*) Public Works Employees, Delay in Payments to, 3777; Remarks (Mr. *Porter*) Coronation Contingent of Militia, 3835; Amt. (Mr. *Boyd*) Canadian Beef excluded from Imperial Contracts, 3840; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 98) 3857; Remarks (Mr. *Barker*) Fishery Awards, Statement of P. E. I. Premier, 3859; Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) North Pole Expedition, &c., 3951; Remarks (Mr. *Bourassa*) Cattle Embargo by G. B., 3980; Amt. (Mr. *MacLaren, Perth*) Transportation Problem, 4361; Neg. (Y. 43; N. 93) 4402; Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) N. W. Town Sites, 4404; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Intercolonial Conference, 4427; Miller Creek, Concessions, 4427; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Dom. Securities Co., Par. in New York paper, 4428; Remarks (Mr. *Clarke*) Kingston Locomotive Works, Strike, &c., 4702; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Intercolonial Conference, Cor., &c., with Hon. Jos. Chamberlain, 4704; Remarks (Mr. *Monk*) Bull, Charles A., Produce Co., *re* Letter from High Commissioner's Office, 4805; Amt. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Financial Review, 4810; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 84) 4859; Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) Treadgold Concessions, &c., 4977; Remarks (Mr. *Marcil, Bonaventure*) Paspebiac as an Ocean Port, 5000; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Small-pox Outbreak on SS. 'Jeanie Myrtle,' 5015; Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) Fishery Award, 5015; Coasting Trade, 5015; Personal Explanation (Mr. *Blair*) *re* Galops Rapids, 5020 (ii).

MESS. FROM HIS EX.: Transmitting Estimates for 1903, 120; Suppl, 785 (i), 3918, 4353, 5030 (ii).

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice.'

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
- Aid to Agricultural Societies, 343 (i).
- Archives, 321 (i).
- Census, 3365, 4076, 4429 (ii).
- Cold Storage, &c., 2568, 2622 (ii).
- Compiling Historical Data of Acadian Families, 356 (i).
- Criminal Statistics, 335 (i).
- Dairying Interests, Promotion of, 2657 (ii).
- Experimental Farms, 344 (i), 2867, 2889, 4966 (ii).
- Farm Bulletins, Printing and Distribution, 345 (i).
- Fumigating Stations, 353 (i).
- General Statistics, 339 (i), 2827 (ii).
- Imperial Institute, London, Improving Can. Exhibit, 364 (i).
- Japan, Osaka Exposition, 4966 (ii).
- Pan-American Exposition, 4967 (ii).
- Paris Exposition, 4967 (ii).
- Patents, Classifying Canadian, 349 (i).
- *Patent Record*, 329 (i).
- St. Louis Exposition, 4966 (ii).
- *Year Book*, 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

Charges of Management, 171 (i).
- Additional Amount for Dom. Notes, 4317 (ii).
- Clerical Assistance *re* Redemption of Notes, 4324, 4533 (ii).

Civil Government:
- Agriculture, 177 (i).
  - Chittick, F. C., First Class Clerkship, 4964 (ii).
- Auditor General's Office, 175 (i).
- Contingencies:
  - Agriculture, 205 (i).
  - Auditor General's Office, 204 (i), 4535 (ii).
  - Board of C. S. Examiners, 4315 (ii).
  - Customs, 208 (i), 4264 (ii).
  - Finance, 204 (i), 3303 (ii).
  - High Commissioner's Office, 209 (i), 4326 (ii).
  - Indian Affairs, 3037 (ii).
  - Inland Revenue, 207 (i).
  - Interior, 202 (i), 3062, 4248 (ii).
  - Justice, 4264 (ii).
  - Labour, 213 (i).
  - Marine and Fisheries, 204 (i).
  - N. W. M. P., 212 (i).
  - Post Office, 211 (i).
  - Printing and Stationery, 199 (i).
  - Public Works, 209 (i), 4136 (ii).
    - Cleaning Deptl. Buildings, &c., 214 (i).
  - Secretary of State, 199 (i).
  - Trade and Commerce, 532 (i).
- Finance, 175 (i).
- Governor General's Secretary's Office, 172 (i).
- High Commissioner's Office, 180 (i).
- Indian Dept., 3035 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government—Con,
Inland Revenue, 175 (i).
Interior, 3061 (ii).
Labour Gazette, 181 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 177 (i).
Tyrwhitt, R. E., Salary, 4958 (ii).
North-west Mounted Police, 174 (i).
Post Office, 179 (i), 4313 (ii).
Employees, Inside Service, Salaries, 4925 (ii).
Provisional Allowance, Clerk, Victoria, B.C., 4925 (ii).
Second Class Clerkships, Salaries, 4925 (ii).
Privy Council Office, 173 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 174 (i).
Public Works, 178 (i), 4535 (ii).
Railways and Canals, 3779, 4534, 4782 (ii).
Secretary of State, 173 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 530 (i), 4534 (ii).
Customs:
Laboratory Expenses, &c., 2927 (ii).
Miscellaneous, 3296 (ii).
Preventive Service, 3297 (ii).
Salaries, Contingencies, &c., 2921, 3295 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Capital:
Fontaine, L. E., Amount *re* Injuries, 4256 (ii).
Surveys, 4252, 4953 (ii).
Dominion Lands—Income:
General Vote, 4117 (ii).
Dominion Police, 233 (i).
Excise:
Expenses, &c., 4258 (ii).
Further Amounts, 4961 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 1147 (i).
To provide for Extra Duty Pay at Distilleries, &c., 1184 (i).
Weights and Measures:
Metrical System, &c., 4961 (ii).
Fisheries:
Can. Fishery Exhibit, 553 (i).
Cold Storage for Bait for Deep-sea Fishermen, 556 (i).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 550 (i), 4222, 4959 (ii).
Fisheries Protection Service, B.C., &c., 552 (i).
Fishing Bounty Cheques, 553 (i).
Noble Bros., Award, &c., 4228 (ii).
Oyster Culture, 555 (i).
Salaries, &c., of Fishery Officers, 533 (i), 4228 (ii).
Geological Survey:
General Vote, 4116 (ii).
Maps, Printing, &c., 4948 (ii).
Salary of Geologist to International Boundary Survey, 4250, 4948 (ii).
Govt. of North-west Territories:
General Vote, 3064 (ii).
Registrars, Additional Amount, 4251 (ii).
Schools, &c., Additional Amount, 4251, 4948.
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
Rents, Heating, &c, 4949 (ii).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 2988 (ii).
Contingencies, Agencies, &c., 3029 (ii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Industrial Schools, &c., 3059 (ii).
Medical Attendance, 3058, 4247 (ii).
Generally:
Inspector of Agencies, &c., 3060 (ii).
Printing, &c., 3060 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—Con.
Manitoba and N. W. T.:
Agricultural Implements, 3054 (ii).
Field and Garden Seeds, 3056 (ii).
General Expenses, 3057 (ii).
Grist and Saw Mills, 3057 (ii).
Sioux, 3056 (ii).
Supplies, &c., 3056 (ii).
New Brunswick:
Medical Attendance, 3052 (ii).
Nova Scotia, 3050 (ii).
Ontario and Quebec:
Liquor Traffic, Suppression, 3049 (ii).
Medical Attendance, 3037, 3041 (ii).
Munceys, Agricultural Grant, 3048 (ii).
Schools, Generally, 3043 (ii).
Prince Edward Island:
Medical Attendance, 3053 (ii).
Inspection of Staples:
Binder Twine, Inspection, 4963 (ii).
Insurance:
General Vote, 4117 (ii).
Justice, Administration of:
Divorce Court Judge, N.B., 217 (i).
Exchequer Court, 229 (i).
To pay L. A. Audette, 231 (i).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 214 (i), 4266.
Jr. Judge, Leeds and Grenville, Salary, 4965.
Travelling Allowances to Man. Judges, 4265.
Supreme Court:
Reporter's Salary, 217 (i).
Salary of J. O'Regan, Increase, 4965 (ii).
To pay ad hoc Judges, 4264 (ii).
Yukon:
Additional Salary of Judge, 233 (i), 3583 (ii).
Clerk of Court, Salary, 3587 (ii).
Law Books, Freight Charges, &c., 3590, 4267.
Living Allowances of Judges, 3584 (ii).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 3589 (ii).
Miscellaneous Expenses, 3590 (ii).
Salary of Additional Judge, 3584 (ii).
Sheriff's Salary, 3586 (ii).
Surgeon's Salary, 3588 (ii).
Transport of Prisoners, 3589 (ii).
Witness and Jury Fees, 3590, 4267 (ii).
Legislation:
General:
Printing, Binding and distributing the Laws, 237 (i).
Printing Paper and Binding, 237 (i).
Voters' Lists, 237 (i).
House of Commons:
Ballot Designs, Gratuities *re*, 4330 (ii).
Expenses of Coms., Sessional Clerks, &c., 235 (i).
Franchise Act, 4329 (ii).
Printing Generally, 4327 (ii).
Publishing Debates, 4327, 4341 (ii).
Salaries, 234 (i).
Stationery, 4326 (ii).
Library:
Books, Binding, &c., 237 (i).
Messengers' Salaries, 4327, 4966 (ii).
Salaries, 236 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service:
Maintenance and Repairs to Lighthouses, &c., 526 (i), 4222 (ii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 517 (i).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions:
Canada and France, 4332 (ii).
Victoria, Vancouver, &c., to Skagway, 4964.
Militia—Capital:
General Vote, 4947 (ii).
Rifle Ranges, 2566 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Militia—Income :
Annual Drill, &c., 2532, 4259 (ii).
Contingencies, 2562, 4260 (ii).
Coronation Contingent, 4262 (ii).
Defences at Esquimalt, 2565, 4261 (ii).
Dominion Arsenal, 2565, 4261 (ii).
Grants to Associations, 2561 (ii).
Halifax Provisional Garrison, 4947 (ii).
Hurdman, Major, Allowance *re* S. A. War, 4262 (ii).
Medals, 4262 (ii).
Military Properties, 2549, 4260 (ii).
Pay and Allowances, 1133 (i), 2498 (ii).
Provisions, Supplies aud Remounts, 2559 (ii).
Royal Military College, 2562, 4261 (ii).
Salaries, &c., 2548, 4259 (ii).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitration *re* Ont. and Que. Accts., 4119 (ii).
Assay Office, B.C., 4117 (ii).
Banff, Maintenance of Roads, &c., 4118 (ii).
Museum Building, 4953 (ii).
Bank of Commerce, Services in Yukon, 4339.
Boundary Surveys, Further Amount, 4953 (ii).
Browning and Senkler, Costs *re* Nipissing Election, 4339 (ii).
Butcher, N.R., Evidence *re* Klock *vs.* Baring, 4339 (ii).
Cabinet Ministers' Expenses to London, 4332.
Chinese and Japanese Commission, 4340 (ii).
Consolidation of Statutes, 3622 (ii).
Destitute Miners, Dease and Liard Rivers, 4257 (ii).
Destitute Settlers in Saskatchewan District, 4257 (ii).
Eastern Extension Arbitration, 4340 (ii).
Farewell, J. F., K.C., Costs *re* North Ont. Recount, 4269 (ii).
Half-breed Claims Commission, Salaries, &c., 4954 (ii).
Labour Dept., 4119 (ii).
Litigation of Interior Dept., 4119 (ii).
Litigation of Justice Dept., 3620 (ii).
Marconi System of Telegraphy, 4338 (ii).
Prime Minister's Expenses to Coronation, 4332 (ii).
Printing Bureau, Additional Plant, 4119, 4956.
Printing Maps, &c., 4954 (ii).
St. Vincent, W.I., &c., Aid *re* Volcanic Eruption, 5031 (ii).
To pay Estate of late Capt. W. H. Smith. R.N.R., 4240 (ii).
To pay Gratuity to Widow, late Nathan White, 4256 (ii).
York, Duke of, Expenses *re* Visit, 4331 (ii).
Mounted Police :
General Vote, 4247 (ii).
Ocean and River Service :
Cattle Inspection, 517 (i).
Furnishing Crews to bring out New Steamers, 4958 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs, 506 (i), 4221 (ii).
Marine Biological Station, 516 (i).
Masters and Mates, Examination, 513 (i).
Removal of Wrecked Schooner, Petit de Grat Harbour, 4221 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 514 (i).
St. Lawrence Navigation, Aid, &c., 5024 (ii).
Steamer to replace the *Newfield*, 4958 (ii).
Tidal Service, &c., 515 (i).
Winter Mail Service, 516 (i).
Penitentiaries :
B. C., 3619 (ii).
Dorchester, 3617 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Penitentiaries—Con.
Generally, 3593 (ii).
Lussier Arbitration, 4268 (ii).
To pay G. W. Dawson, 4267 (ii).
Kingston, 3593 (ii).
Manitoba, 3618 (ii).
Prince Albert Jail, 3620 (ii).
St. Vincent de Paul, 3617 (ii),
Post Office :
Additional Sorters, Letter Carriers, &c., 4940.
Bates, E. B., Salary Increase, 4940 (ii).
General Vote, 3867, 4314 (ii).
Gingras, J. N. A., Salary, 4313 (ii).
Mail Service, 3911 (ii).
For Second Class Ry. Mail Clerkship, 4940.
Outside Service, Salaries, Increases, 4940 (ii).
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Ottawa, Astronomical Observatory, 560 (i).
Parliament Buildings, Addition, &c., 560 (i), 4137 (ii).
Royal Mint, 560 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 564 (i).
Yukon, Govt. Buildings, 4144, 4536 (ii).
Roads and Bridges, 4147 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Quesnelle-Atlin, 4150 (ii).
Port Simpson-Hazelton, 4178 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers :
Port Arthur, Breakwater, 599 (i).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 609 (i), 4557 (ii).
Quebec, Harbour Improvements, 4549 (ii).
River Kaministiquia, 599 (i), 4563 (ii).
St. Andrews Rapids, 604 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 565 (i).
Ste. Marie's Current, Montreal Harbour, &c., 608 (i).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue :
Graving Docks, 4220 (ii).
Slides and Booms, 4142, 4220, 4782 (ii).
Telegraph Lines :
Ashcroft to Dawson, 3293, 4781 (ii).
Gulf of St. Lawrence, &c., 4143 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland, 3293 (ii).
SS. *Tyrian*, Marconi System, &c., 4219 (ii).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
General Repairs, 857 (i).
Kamloops, Public Building, 4185 (ii).
Nelson, Public Building, 860 (i).
New Westminster, Public Building, 4185.
Rossland, Public Building, 861 (i).
Vancouver, Drill Hall, 4186 (ii).
William's Head, Quarantine Station, 4614.
Generally :
Construction of Armouries, 861 (i).
Experimental Farms, Generally, 875 (i).
Public Buildings, Generally, 876 (i), 4186.
Salaries to Resident Clerks of Works, &c., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).
Manitoba :
General Repairs, 831 (i).
Winnipeg, Immigrant Building, 4613 (ii).
Maritime Provinces :
Dom. Public Buildings, Repairs, &c., 642.
New Brunswick :
Marysville, Public Building, 636 (i).
Richibucto, Public Building, 641 (i).
St. John, Public Building, 641 (i).
Immigrant Building, 641 (i), 4178 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
North-west Territories :
Carnduff, Court House, 835 (i).
Court-houses, Police Accommodation, &c., 849 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 849 (i).
General Repairs, 849 (i).
Lethbridge, Immigrant Building, 4185 (ii).
Macleod, Court-house, &c., 852 (i).
Red Deer, Court-house, &c., 852 (i), 4613.
Red Deer Valley, Immigrant Building, 853 (i).
Saskatoon, Immigrant Building, 856 (i), 4614 (ii).
Yorkton, Court-house, &c., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).
Nova Scotia :
Arichat, Public Building, 635 (i).
Halifax, New Public Building, 635 (i).
Ontario
Alexandria, Reformatory, 4184 (ii).
Brockville, Drill Hall, 4182 (ii).
Clinton, Public Building, 719 (i).
Cobourg, Armoury, 721 (i).
Deseronto, Public Building, 728 (i).
Fort William, Public Building, 728 (i).
General Repairs, 728 (i), 4181 (ii).
Hamilton, Examining Warehouse Extension, 4566 (ii).
Kingston, Royal Military College, 729 (i).
London, Drill Hall, &c., 729 (i).
Ottawa, Major's Hill Park, Greenhouse, 4180 (ii).
P. O., and Custom House, 4565 (ii).
Public Buildings, Repairs to Walls, 4565.
Rideau Hall, Drains, 4565 (ii).
St. Catharines, Drill Hall, 4567 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Public Building, 731 (i).
Toronto, Dom. Public Buildings, 732 (i).
Post Office, 4566 (ii).
P. O. Branch Office, 4182, 4565 (ii).
Toronto Junction, Public Building, 733 (i), 4566 (ii).
Quebec :
Drummondville, Public Buildings, 643 (i), 4180 (ii).
General Vote, 642 (i).
Granby, Public Building, 644 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 644 (i).
L'Assomption, Public Building, 656 (i).
Lévis, Cattle Quarantine Station, 667 (i).
Public Building, 669 (i).
Montreal, Examining Warehouse, 670 (i).
P. O., Branch Office, 4564 (ii).
Public Building, 708 (i).
Peribonka, Immigrant Building, 4179 (ii).
Quebec, Immigrant Building, 709 (i).
Military Buildings, 709 (i), 4180 (ii).
Roberval, Immigrant Building, 4180 (ii).
St. Hyacinthe, Drill Hall, 710 (i).
Public Building, 4564 (ii).
St. Jerôme, Public Building, 4180 (ii).
Thetford Mines, Public Building, 716 (i).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 717 (i), 4564.
Rents, repairs, &c.:
Dom. Immigration Buildings, 974 (i), 4616.
Dom. Public Buildings, Caretakers, &c., 987 (i), 4615 (ii).
Lighting, 4189, 4615 (ii).
Dom. Quarantine Stations, 980 (i).
Ottawa :
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 964 (i), 4615 (ii).
Furniture, Heating, &c., 4138 (ii).
Grounds, 987 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, repairs, &c.—*Con.*
Ottawa—*Con.*
Lighting, 4189, 4616 (ii).
Rideau Hall, Maintenance, &c., 4188.
Telephones, 986 (i).
Port Colborne, Heating Apparatus, Pub. Building, 4616 (ii).
Toronto, P.O., Locomobiles, 4186 (ii).
Winnipeg, Immigrant Building, Heating, 4616 (ii).
Yukon, 967 (i).
Rents, Heating, &c., 4190 (ii).
Dredging, 3283 (ii).
B. C., 3286 (ii).
Man., Repairs, &c., 4763 (ii).
Self-propelling Snag Boat, 4768 (ii).
Repairs, 1277 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
British Columbia :
Anderson and Kennedy Lakes, Clearing Outlets, 4642 (ii).
Columbia River, Improvements, &c. between Upper and Lower Arrow Lakes, 1276 (i).
Hardy Bay, Wharf, 4643 (ii).
Skeena River, 1277 (i).
Manitoba :
General Repairs, 1275 (i).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, Guide Piers, &c., 4642 (ii).
Winnipegosis, Dredging Mossy River Mouth, 4642 (ii).
Maritime Provinces :
General Repairs, &c., 4142, 4213 (ii).
New Brunswick :
Anderson's Hollow, Wharf Repairs, 4626.
Bay du Vin, Wharf, 1022 (i).
Black Brook, Wharf, 1023 (i).
Campbellton, Wharf, 4625 (ii).
Campobello, Breakwater Repairs, &c., 4626 (ii).
Cape Tormentine, Creosoted Timber Cribwork, 4627 (ii).
Repairs to Breakwater, 1023 (i).
Caraquet, Wharf, 1023 (i).
Chance, Breakwater, 1024 (i).
Dipper Harbour, Breakwater, 1025 (i).
Grand Anse, Breakwater Extension, 1025 (i).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 4628 (ii).
Little Salmon River, Beach Protection Works, 4628 (ii).
Partridge Island, Eastern Pier Repairs, 4628 (ii).
Point Wolfe, Breakwater, 1025 (i).
Richibucto, North Piers, &c., 1026 (i).
River St. John, Oromocto Wharf, 1030 (i), 4628 (ii).
Wharfs on Tidal Waters, &c., 4629 (ii).
St. John Harbour, Negro Point Harbour, 1031 (i).
Upper Salmon River, Alma Pier, 1031 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Amagandus Pond, Wharf, 4616 (ii).
Arnold's Point, Breakwater, 989 (i).
Bailey's Brook, Breakwater Wharf, 4620.
Bear River, Removal of Obstructions, &c., 4621 (ii).
Big Pond, Wharf, 4621 (ii).
Boularderie Centre, Wharf, 997 (i).
Burlington, Wharf, 999 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Cape Cove, Restoration of Breakwater, 4621 (ii).
Charlesville, Breakwater, 4621 (ii).
Cheticamp Point, Wharf, 1000 (i).
Cheverie, Breakwater Extension, 4621 (ii).
Church Point, Breakwater Repairs, 4621.
Comeaus Hill, Breakwater Repairs, &c., 4621 (ii).
Cow Bay, Breakwater, 1000 (i).
Cribbon's Point, Wharf Repairs, 4621 (ii).
Drumhead, Breakwater, 1001 (i), 4621 (ii).
Ecum Secum, Wharf, 4210 (ii).
Friar's Head, Boat Harbour, 1002 (i).
Gabarus Bay, Breakwater, 4210 (ii).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 4622.
Grand River, Channel, 4622 (ii).
Herring Cove, Breakwater, 1002 (i).
Ingonish, Breakwater Strengthening, 4211.
Iona, Wharf, 1002 (i).
Larry's River, Breakwater, 1002 (i).
Lingan, Beach Protection, 1004 (i).
Little Bras d'Or, Wharf, 1004 (i).
Livingstone's Cove, Wharf, 1004 (i).
Lower Cove, Breakwater, 1004 (i).
Lunenburg, Dredging, 4622 (ii).
Minudie, Wharf, 1004 (i).
Neil's Harbour, Breakwater, 1004 (i).
New Harbour, Breakwater, &c., 1004 (i).
Parker's Cove, Pier Extension, 1006 (i).
Porter's Lake, Completion of Outlet, 4622.
Port George, Breakwater, 1007 (i).
Port La Tour, Breakwater Additions, 4624.
Round Bay, Beach Protection, 4624 (ii).
Washabuck Centre, Wharf, 1009 (i).
Windsor Harbour, Shear Dams, &c., 4624.
Ontario :
Amherstburg, Dredging, 4637 (ii).
Barrie Wharf, Construction, 1217 (i).
Bayfield, Extension of South Pier, 1217 (i).
Big Bay, North Keppel, Wharf Repairs, 4637 (ii).
Blind River, Wharf, 1222 (i).
Bronte, Harbour Improvements, 1226 (i).
Burke's Falls, Maganetawan River, 4637 (ii).
Burlington Channel, Repairs to Piers, 1226 (i), 4637 (ii).
Callander, Wharf Repairs, 4638 (ii).
Cobourg, Pier, Repairs and Dredging, 4638.
Collingwood, Dredging, 4638 (ii).
Harbour Improvements, 1227 (i).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 1231 (i).
Georgian Bay, Point au Baril Route, Improvements, 4640 (ii).
Goderich, Harbour, 1232 (i), 4640 (ii).
Hilton, St. Joseph's Island, Wharf Repairs, 1247 (i), 4640 (ii).
Huntsville, New Wharf, 4641 (ii).
Kingsville, Wharf Repairs, &c., 1236 (i).
Meaford Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1236 (i).
Midland Harbour, Dredging, 1237 (i).
Wharf, 4641 (ii).
Oakville, East Pier Repairs, 1239 (i).
Orillia, New Wharf, 4641 (ii).
Owen Sound Harbour, Dredging, &c., 1239.
Penetanguishene, Repairs and Dredging, 4641 (ii).
Port Elgin, Repairs, Dredging, &c., 4641.
Port Hope, Pier Repairs, 1239 (i).
Presqu' Isle, Purchase of Wharf, 1239 (i).
River Ottawa, Petawawa Narrows, Improvement, 1239 (i).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
River St. Lawrence, Channel Dredging at Wolfe Island, 1242 (i).
St. Joseph, Wharf, 1247 (i), 4640 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Improvements, 1242 (i).
Southampton, Harbour Improvements, 1245 (i).
South Nation River, Improvements at the Pitch-off, 4642 (ii).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, &c., 1274 (i).
Prince Edward Island :
Brae Breakwater, Repairs, &c., 4625 (ii).
Canoe Cove, Breakwater, 1010 (i).
Cascumpec Harbour, Closing Breach, 1013.
Chapel Point Pier, Repairs, 4625 (ii).
Creosoted Timber for General Wharf Repairs, 1015 (i).
Lower Montague, 4625 (ii).
New London, Breakwater Repairs, 4212.
Point Pelee Island Wharf, 4217 (ii).
Souris, Knight's Point, Breakwater, 1017.
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 1017.
Tignish Harbour, Rebuilding Northern Breakwater, 4626 (ii).
Repairs to Breakwater, 4212 (i).
West Point, Pier Extension, 4211 (ii).
Quebec :
Batiscan River, Dredging at Mouth, 4629.
Crane Island, South Side, Wharf Repairs, 4630 (ii).
Cross Point, Isolated Landing Pier, 4630.
Grand Vallée, Pier, 1046 (i).
Hudson, Wharf, 1046 (i).
Isle aux Coudres, Wharf, 1046 (i).
Isle aux Grues, Wharf Repairs on South Side, 1047 (i).
Lake Temiscamingue, Improvements, 1047.
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 1047 (i).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater, 4631 (ii).
Maria, Isolated Block, 4630 (ii).
Murray Bay, Wharf, 1051 (i).
Point Fortune, Wharf, 4631 (ii).
Point St. Pierre, Breakwater, 4631 (ii).
River St. Maurice, Dredging, 1053 (i).
Rivière aux Renards, Pier, 4631 (ii).
St. Alexis, Pier, 1053 (i).
St. Francois, Breakwater Wharf, South Side Island of Orleans, 4632 (ii).
St. Geneviève, Pier Protection, 4215 (ii).
St. Irenée, Wharf, &c., 4634 (ii).
St. John des Chaillons, Harbour Improvements, 4624 (ii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Island of Orleans, 4634 (ii).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf, 1053 (i).
Valleyfield, Dredging Channel in Bay, 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).
Yukon :
Lewes and Yukon, River Improvements, 3283 (ii).
Miscellaneous :
C.P.R., Freight Charges, 4219 (ii).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 4219.
Creosoting Plant, 4779 (ii).
National Art Gallery, Ottawa, 3292 (ii).
Surveys and Inspections, 3292, 4780 (ii).
Roads and Bridges :
Belly River, Pace's Crossing, Bridge, 4218.
Des Joachins, Bridge, 4219 (ii).
Ottawa :
Maria St., Bridge, 3289 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—Con.
Slides and Booms:
St. Maurice River, 3287, 4218 (ii).
Shawinigan Works, 4218 (ii).
Télegraph Lines:
B.C., 3292, 4779 (ii).
Bryon Island to Anticosti, Cable, &c., 4769.
Bryon Island to Magdalen Islands, 4769 (ii).
Gulf of St. Lawrence, &c., 3291 (ii).
Mabou to Port Hawkesbury, 4770 (ii).
St. Peter's to Louisbourg, &c., 4770 (ii).
Quarantine:
Cattle Quarantine, 2919 (ii).
Public Health, &c., Salaries, &c., 371 (i), 2899, 4967 (ii).
Public Works Health Act, 403 (i).
Slaughter of Hogs, Sheep, &c., Compensation &c., 4968 (ii).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 403 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 406 (i).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Carillon and Grenville, 4280 (ii).
Cornwall, 4310 (ii).
Culbute, Damages by Flooding, 4281, 4309 (ii).
Farran's Point, Enlargement, 4300 (ii).
Galop's Deepening Rapids, 4300 (ii).
Enlargement, 4021 (ii).
Generally, Operating Expenses, 4294 (ii).
Sunday Service, 4294, 4312 (ii).
Lachine, Electrical Installation, 4299 (ii).
Mill St., Paving, 4307 (ii).
Rebuilding Waste Weir Walls, 4307 (ii).
To repair Locks 1 and 2, 4035 (ii).
North Channel, Forming, &c., 4034, 4300 (ii).
Quebec Canals, Boundary Surveys, 4281 (ii).
Rapide Plat, Enlargement, 4021, 4304 (ii).
Rideau, 4917 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Entrance Deepening, &c., 4001, 4298 (ii).
Soulanges, Construction, &c., 4018, 4304 (ii).
Trent, Construction, 4004 (ii).
Lindsay to Fenelon Falls Road, Building, 4270 (ii).
Peterborough, Dam, 4918 (ii).
To Dredge Shoals in Otonabee River, &c., 4269 (ii).
Welland, Complete West Docking, Port Dalhousie, 4306 (ii).
Deepening Long Level, Port Colborne to Thorold, 4798 (ii).
Drainage at Port Colborne, 4306 (ii).
Montrose Bridge, Steel Swing Span, &c., 4800 (ii).
Port Colborne, Entrance Improvements, 4019 (ii).
Removing Obstructions, Port Colborne to Welland, 4798 (ii).
Strengthening wall at Head of Locks, 4306.
Miscellaneous:
Gathering Information *re* Ry. Commission, 4305 (ii).
Salaries of Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., 4292 (ii).
Railways:
Grand Trunk Ry., Rental, 3515, 3548 (ii).
Intercolonial Ry.:
Additional Sidings, 3811, 4792 (ii).
Car Couplers, 4794 (ii).
Chaudière Junction, Engine-house, 4786.
Draw-bars on Freight Cars, 3812 (ii).
Eel River, Station, &c., 4796 (ii).
Ferry Service. Strait of Canso, 4294 (ii).
General Vote, 2866, 3411, 3556, 4310 (ii).
Halifax, Increased Accommodation, 4790.

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—Con.
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial Ry.—*Con.*
Lévis, Accommodation, 3810 (ii).
Miramichi Bridge, 3812, 3828, 4794 (ii).
Moncton, Increased Accommodation, 4797.
Shops, 3828 (ii).
Mulgrave, Improvements, 4297 (ii).
New Machinery for Shops, 3812, 4297 (ii).
Nicolet, Station, 4796 (ii).
Original Construction, 3809 (ii).
Ouelle River, Spur Line, 4796 (ii).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 4795.
Pintsch Gas, &c., 3812 (ii).
Point Tupper Improvements, 3828 (ii).
Restigouche Bridge, 3828 (ii).
Rivière du Loup, Shops, 3828 (ii).
Yard, 3828 (ii).
Rockingham, Improvements, 4798 (ii).
Rolling Stock, 3813, 4297, 4783 (ii).
St. John, Accommodation, 4786 (ii).
Steel Rails, 3781 (ii).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation, 4788 (ii).
Strengthening Bridges, 3809, 4792 (ii).
Sydney Accommodation, 3805, 4789, 4796.
Raising Ry. Bridge, 4795 (ii).
Prince Edward Island Railway:
Charlottetown, Accommodation, 4918 (ii).
General Vote, 3583, 3996, 4292 (ii).
Murray Bay Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, 3830, 3862 (ii).
Yukon:
Mackenzie and Mann Award, 4860 (ii).
Scientific Institutions:
Hydrographic Surveys, 528 (i).
Meteorological Service, 527 (i).
Toronto Observatory, 527 (i).
Superannuation:
Extra Allowance to Mr. Wallace, 3303 (ii).
Trade and Commerce:
Expenditure *re* Iron and Steel Bounties Act, 4331 (ii).
Expenses *re* Commercial Agencies, &c., 4963.
Unprovided Items:
As per Aud. Gen's. Rep., 4341 (ii).
Weights and Measures, Gas, &c.:
Metrical Instruments. 1201 (i), 4961 (ii).
Salaries of Inspectors of Electric Light, &c., 1201 (i).
Salaries of Officers, Inspectors of Weights, &c., 1184 (i), 4961 (ii).
CONCURRENCE:
Additional Accommodation, I.C.R., 5037 (ii).
Charges of Management, 4342 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch, &c., P.E.I. Ry., 5039.
Printing, Paper, and Binding, 4343 (ii).
Quarantine, Salaries in Organized Districts, &c., 5033 (ii).
Rifle Ranges, 5032 (ii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R., 5037 (ii).
Royal Military College, 5033 (ii).
Steel Rails, &c., 5035 (ii).
Trent Canal, Construction, 5047 (ii).

SUPREME COURT ACT, AMT. *re* MAN.: Ques. (Mr. *La-Rivière*) 410 (i).

SUPREME COURT, AD HOC JUDGES: in Com. of Sup., 4264 (ii).

Supreme Court Assistant Judges Appnmt. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 1673 (i); wthdn., 5064 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. No. 41 (Mr. *Demers, St. Jean and Iberville*) 1° m., 1063 (i).

SUPREME COURT, JUDGES, LEAVE OF ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2224 (i).

—— POWER, APPEALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 214, 217 (i).

SURGEON, N. W. M. POLICE, ADDITIONAL SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3588 (ii).

SURVEYS AND INSPECTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 3292, 4780 (ii).

SUSSEX, ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 862, 866 (i).

—— ENGINE HOUSE, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 3829.

SYDENHAM RIVER DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 1226.

SYDNEY, ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION: in Com. of Sup., 3805, 3996, 4789, 4796 (ii).

Sydney Land and Loan Co.'s Limited incorp. B. No. 30 (Mr. *Kendall*) 1°*, 781; 2°*, 882 (i).

SYDNEY AND LOUISBURG BRIDGE: in Com. of Sup., 4795 (ii).

TANTRAMAR MARSH, I.C.R., WASHOUT, REPAIRS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 1108 (i).

TARGET SHOOTING: *See* 'Rifle Practice.'

TASSIE, MAJOR, RETIREMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 241 (i).

TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, LEGISLATION *re* P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).

—— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Kemp*) 1010 (i).

TAY CANAL, 1896 TO 1901, AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Legris*) 2067 (i).

TELEGRAPH AND CABLE LINES, PUB. WORKS OR P. O. CONTROL: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (ii).

TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH MAINLAND, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, P.E.I.*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 2721 (ii).

TELEGRAPH LINES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3292, 4150, 4779 (ii).

—— B.C. AND TERS., AMOUNT EXPENDED: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 157 (i).

—— GOVT. CONTROL: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4770 (ii).

—— GULF OF ST. LAWRENCE: in Com. of Sup., 3291, 4143 (ii).

—— YUKON: in Com. of Sup., 4150 (ii).

—— OPERATORS, PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4172 (ii).

—— TELEGRAPH RATES: in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).

Telephone Co.'s B. No. 2 (Mr. *Maclean*) 1° m., 66; on order for 2°, 625; 2° m., 786 (i).

Telegraph and Telephone Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 734; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 1206 (i); wthdn., 4970 (ii).

TELEPHONE COS. OF CAN., MILEAGE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Morrison*) 3150 (ii).

TELEPHONES IN OTTAWA GOVT. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i).

—— *See* 'Pub. Works,' &c.

TÉMISCAMINGUE LAKE, DREDGING AND HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

TÉMISCOUATA FARM LANDS, DAMAGES *re* I.C.R. DITCHING: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 2677 (ii).

TÉMISCOUATA RY. AND I.C.R., TRAFFIC FACILITIES: Ques. (Mr. *Gauvreau*) 1860 (i).

TERREBONNE, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

TERRITORIAL COURT CLERK, YUKON, LIVING ALLOWANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3587 (ii).

—— *See* 'Yukon.'

THERIEN, MR. H., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER FROM GRANDES PILES, PET., &C.: M. (Mr. *Ball*) for Copy*, 3724 (ii).

THETFORD MINES ARMOURY: in Com. of Sup., 716 (i).

THOMAS, ALPH., DISMISSAL AS POSTMASTER OF LA PRAIRIE: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2221 (i).

THREE RIVERS, INSPECTOR GRAVEL, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 2457 (i).

TIDAL SERVICE, BAY OF FUNDY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 515 (i).

TIDAL WATERS, DOM. AND PROVINCIAL RIGHTS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Farquharson*) 1861 (i),

—— ST. JOHN RIVER, WHARFS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4629 (ii).

TIES, I.C.R., PURCHASES, &C.: in Com, of Sup., 3496.

—— QUANTITY PURCHASED: Ques. (Mr. *Barker*) 444, 2065 (i).

—— *See* 'I.C.R.'

TIGNISH, BREAKWATER, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4212, 4626 (ii).

—— AND MAIL POINT MAIL CONTRACT: in Com. of Sup., 4932 (ii).

Tilsonburg, Lake Erie and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2201 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 105.)

Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. *McCarthy*) 1°*, 2064; 2°*, 2221 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 106.)

TIMBER LIMITS, SALE, NAMES OF PURCHASERS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 885 (i).

—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 1133 (i).

TITLES FOR PROPERTY, &C.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Monk*) 1042 (i).

'TIVERTON,' SS., GROUNDING, INQUIRY *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 2856 (ii).

TOBACCO DUTY, AMOUNT COLLECTED, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Henderson*) 134 (i).

TOBERMORY HARBOUR: in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).

Toronto and Niagara Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 2146 (i); 2°*, 2889; in Com., 3623; 3° m., 3636; agreed to (Y. 74; N. 18) 3637 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 107.)

TORONTO, DOM. BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 732 (i).

—— APPNMT. OF MECHANICAL ENGINEER: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 884 (i).

—— DRILL SHED: in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).

—— HARBOUR, DREDGING EASTERN ENTRANCE: in Com. of Sup., 1274 (i).

—— POST OFFICE ALTERATIONS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).

TORONTO, P. O., BRANCH OFFICE BUILDING : in Com. of Sup., 4182, 4565 (ii).
—— LOCOMOBILES, REPAIRS, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 4186 (ii).
—— *See* 'Automobiles.'
TORONTO JUNCTION, BUILDINGS : in Com. of Sup., 4566 (ii).
—— POST OFFICE : in Com. of Sup., 733 (i).
TOWN SITES, N.W.T., LAND GRANTS AND GOVT. POLICY : Remarks (Mr. *Scott*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 4404 (ii).
TRACADIE LAZARETTO : in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
TRACINGS, &c., RAILWAY LINES IN N.B. : M. for Plans* (Mr. *Costigan*) 961 (i).
TRACKMEN'S WAGES, I.C.R. : *See* 'Govt. Rys.'

TRADE AND COMMERCE :
AGENTS OF CAN. IN ENG., INCOME TAX : Ques. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 5054 (ii).
ANGLO-GERMAN COMMERCIAL TREATIES : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Monk*) 790, neg. (Y. 56 ; N. 107) 804 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617 (i).
ATLANTIC COMBINE : *See* 'Shipping Combine.'
ATLANTIC FAST SS. SERVICE : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4549 (ii).
AUSTRALIA, CAN. AND NEW ZEALAND, COR. *re* TRADE TRANSPORTATION : M. for Copies* (Mr. *Campbell*) 154 (i).
CAN. AND FRANCE SS. SUBVENTION : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
CHINESE COMMISSION, EXPENSES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4340 (ii).
COMMERCIAL AGENCIES, *re* TREATIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
CONSULAR AGENCIES, FLAGS, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 132 (i).
GERMAN TARIFF *re* NATIONS AND DEPENDENCIES, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 617 (i).
—— *See* 'Anglo-German.'
MAGDALEN ISLANDS, STEAM COMMUNICATION, &C., STR. 'AMELIA' : Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 1680 (i).
MAIL STEAMERS BETWEEN CAN. AND G.B., RATE OF SPEED, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 130 (i).
MAIL SUBSIDIES AND SS. SUBVENTIONS : in Com. of Sup., 4332 (ii).
P.E.I., TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS, LEGISLATION *re* : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 781 (i).
—— *See* 'Tax,' &c.
SHIPPING COMBINE (ATLANTIC) PAR. IN 'CITIZEN' : on M. for Com. of Sup., 3513 (ii).
SS. COMPANIES, SUBSIDIES : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4466 (ii).
—— *See* 'Trans-Atlantic,' &c.
TAX LEGISLATION *re* COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS : Remarks (Mr. *Kemp*) in Com. of Sup., 1010.
—— *See* 'P.E.I.'
TRADE AND COMMERCE DEPT. : in Com. of Sup., 4331, 4534 (ii).
—— PRINTING, STATIONERY, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 532 (i).
—— REP. : Presented (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 122 (i).
—— SALARIES, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).
TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS : Presented (Mr. *Paterson*) 122 (i).
TRANS-ATLANTIC MAILS VIA U.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Kemp*) 447 (i).
TRANS-ATLANTIC, TRANS-PACIFIC OR WEST INDIA TRADE, CONTRACTS, SUBSIDIES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 632 (i).
—— *See* 'SS. Cos.'
TREATIES, NEGOTIATION, EXPENSES *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
VICTORIA AND VANCOUVER STEAM SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).
TRANS-ATLANTIC, TRANS-PACIFIC OR WEST INDIA TRADE, CONTRACTS, SUBSIDIES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 632 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. *Talbot*) 1°*, 1763 ; 2°*, 2024 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3060 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 108.)
TRANSPORTATION, DISTANCES, COST, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 578 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 135 (i).
—— FACILITIES : in Com. of Sup., 576 (i).
—— QUESTION : Amt. (Mr. *Maclaren, Perth*) to Com. of Sup., 4361 ; neg. (Y. 43 ; N. 93) 4402 (ii).
—— ST. LAWRENCE, IMPROVEMENTS, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 565-604 (i).
—— *re* WESTERN PRODUCTS : Remarks (Mr. *Boyd*) in Com. of Sup., 4554 (ii).
See 'Marine,' 'St. Lawrence,' &c., 'Wheat,' &c.
TRAVELLING EXPENSES, EXCISE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4961 (ii).
TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
TREADGOLD CONCESSIONS : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).
—— INTERPRETATION OF O.C's., &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2456 (i).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2472 (i).
—— on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4977 (ii).
—— CONCESSIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 241 (i).
TREASURY BOARD : in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
TREATIES, NEGOTIATION, EXPENSES *re* : in Com. of Sup., 4963 (ii).
TREATY EXPENSES *re* INDIANS : in Com. of Sup., 3057 (ii).
TRENT VALLEY CANAL, CONSTRUCTION : in Com. of Sup., 4004 ; conc., 5047 (ii).
—— DREDGING, &C. : in Com. of Sup., 4269 (ii).
—— REBUILDING DAM AT PETERBOROUGH : in Com. of Sup., 4918 (ii).
—— AND RICE LAKE CANALS, REP. OF ENGINEER : Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).
TRUCKS PURCHASED : Ques. (Mr. *Haggart*) 2852 (ii).
TRURO, ROUNDHOUSE, I.C.R., REBUILDING, &C. : Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
—— STATION, REBUILDING : Ques. (Mr. *Gourley*) 4352 (ii).
TUBERCULAR TEST, RES. BY SHORTHORN BREEDERS ASS'N. : Ques. (Mr. *Bennett*) 130 (i).
TWO MOUNTAINS CONTROVERTED ELECTION. JUDGES' CERTIFICATE : Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).
—— ELECTORAL DISTRICT : Certificates, Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 1323 (i).
'TYRIAN,' SS., CABLE SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 4143, 4219 (ii).
TYRWHITT, MR. R. E., SALARY : in Com. of Sup., 4958 (ii).

United Gold Fields of B.C., Limited, Co.'s B. No. 9 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 408; 2°*, 611; (i) in Com., and 3°*, 3343 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 110.)

U.S. Imports for Home Consumption, 1901, Total Value: Ques. (Mr. *Broder*) 782 (i).

Union Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 158 (Mr. *Ingram*) 1°*, 4241; 2°*, 4578; in Com., and 3°*, 4693 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 109.)

Unorganized Districts, Quarantine: in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).

Unprovided Items: in Com. of Sup., 4341 (ii).

Upper Lakes Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 519 (i).

Vacancies: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Vadnais, François, Contractor for Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. *Leonard*) 4350 (ii).

Valleyfield, Dredging Channel: in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i), 4216 (ii).

—— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i), 4564 (ii).

—— Riots, Militia Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 4260 (ii).

Vancouver, B.C., Drill Hall: in Com, of Sup., 876 (i), 4186 (ii).

—— Post Office, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. Navigation Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1108; 2°*, 1278 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2889 (ii). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 111.)

Van Wagner, Lt.-Col., Removal, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Smith, Wentworth*) 616 (i).

Vegetables imported into the U.S., Quantity, &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Leonard*) 171 (i).

Velvet (Rossland) Mine Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 18 (Mr. *Galliher*) 1°*, 530; 2°*, 779; in Com., and 3°*, 1279 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 112.)

Venoit, Mr. P. J., Collector of Customs, Bathurst, Absence from Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Wilmot*) 4124 (ii).

Ventilation, House of Commons: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).

Victoria, B.C., Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. *Speaker*) 65 (1).

—— Judges' Certificate: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2 (i).

Victoria and Vancouver Steam Service: in Com. of Sup., 4964 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3286 (il).

Victoria Memorial Museum: in Com. of Sup., 564.

Wales, Prince of, Illuminations in Ottawa, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Monk*) 615 (i).

Washabuck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1009 (i).

Washington, Mr., Collector of Statistics: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 339 (i), 2827 (ii).

Ways and Means: Res. for Com. (Mr. *Fielding*) 120.

—— Financial Statement (Mr. *Fielding*) 1279 (i).

—— Debate: *See* 'Budget.'

—— M. (Mr. *Fielding*) for Com., 4972, 5071 (ii).

Webb and Sunday Travelling over P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4700 (ii).

—— *See* 'Dom. Securities,' &c.

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 150 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 4036 (ii).

Weights and Measures, Inspectors of, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1184 (i).

Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 4306, 4798 (ii).

—— Depth, Quantity, &c. of Water: Ques. (Mr. *Lancaster*) 1683, 1860 (i).

—— Lock Walls: in Com. of Sup., 4306 (ii).

—— Port Colborne Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 4019 (ii).

—— Water Privileges, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Holmes*) 409, 745 (i).

Wellington Mutch, Eldon, P.E.I., Paymts. to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Taylor*) 3152 (ii).

Wellington, PostmasterDavid Clinton, Cor., &c., *re* Dismissal: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Alcorn*) 2680 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Alcorn*) 613 (i).

Welsh Immigration from Patagonia: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 242 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 240 (i).

—— Mr. Chamberlain's Remarks *re* Climate of Canada: Ques. (Mr. *Hughes, Ont.*) 1441 (i).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 145 (Mr. *Copp*) 2°*, 4075 (ii).

West Point Pier, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 4211 (ii).

Westren, John, Patent Relief B. No. 49 (Mr. *Campbell*) 1°*, 1204; 2°*, 1278; in Com., and 3°*, 2221 (i). (2 *Edward VII, c.* 113.)

Wharfage, Rates and Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4634-5 (ii).

Wheat Blockade in Man. and C. P. R. Transportation Facilities, &c.: M. (Mr. *Douglas*) for Cor., 888 (i).

Debate: (Mr. *Paterson*) 895, 899; (Mr. *Davis*) 900; (Mr. *McCreary*) 903, 915, 960; (Mr. *Clarke*) 905, 940; (Mr. *Boyd*) 908, 960; (Mr. *Heyd*) 910, 914; (Mr. *Talbot*) 912; (Mr. *Edwards*) 912, 920; (Mr. *Ross, N.S.*) 916, 941; (Mr. *Roche, Marquette*) 916; (Mr. *Scott*) 919; (Mr. *Sproule*) 928; (Mr. *LaRivière*) 932; (Mr. *Tarte*) 933; (Mr. *Brock*) 942; (Mr. *Oliver*) 946, 960; (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 953; (Sir *Wilfrid Laurier*) 956 (i).

Wheatley, Mr., Indemnity *re* Mutton Shipments by Cold Storage: Ques. (Mr. *Hackett*) 4695 (ii).

White, Mrs., Gratuity: in Com. of Sup., 4256 (ii).

Wiarton Harbour Improvements, Amount voted: Ques., (Mr. *Tolton*) 747 (i).

William's Head Quarantine Station: in Com. of Sup., 4614 (ii).

Williamstown Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Pringle*) 4353 (ii).

Wilson Beach Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 844 (i), 4626 (ii).

Windmill, Battle, Pensions granted: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 3724 (ii).

—— Ques. (Mr. *Reid, Grenville*) 238 (i).

Windsor, N.S., Branch Ry., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 4292 (ii).

—— Harbour, Shear Dams, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4624 (ii).

Windsor and Detroit Union Bridge Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. *Cowan*) 1°*, 632; 2°*, 851; in Com., 1620; 3°*, 1622 (i); Sen. Amts., 2675 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 114.)

WINDSOR, ONT., INSPECTOR: in Com. of Sup., 1154.

WINNIPEG, BOARD OF TRADE, RES. *re* RY. MANAGEMENT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 2942 (ii).

——— ELECTRIC RY. MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 3874 (ii).

——— HOSPITALS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).

——— IMMIGRATION BUILDING: in Com. of Sup., 833 (i), 4613, 4616 (ii).

WINNIPEG LAKE SURVEYS: in Com. of Sup., 528 (i).

WINNIPEGOSIS, MOSSY RIVER CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 4642 (ii).

WINNIPEG POST OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 831 (i), 3868 (ii).

——— OFFICIALS, DATE OF APPMNT., 1896-1901: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *LaRivière*) 961 (i).

WINTER COMMUNICATION, P.E.I., PETS., &C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Lefurgey*) 160, 170 (i).

WINTER MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).

WIRELESS TELEGRAPH: *See* 'Marconi.'

WITNESS AND JURY FEES: in Com. of Sup., 4267 (ii).

——— *See* 'Yukon,' &c.

WOLFE ISLAND CHANNEL: in Com. of Sup., 1242 (i).

WOOD, &C. FOR YUKON BUILDINGS, PAR. IN DAWSON PAPER: Read (Mr. *Sproule*) 4540 (ii).

YARN ADMITTED DUTY FREE, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Rosamond*) 4125 (ii).

'YEAR BOOK': in Com. of Sup., 336 (i), 2814 (ii).

——— *See* 'Agriculture,' &c.

YORK, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGES' CERTIFICATE: Presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).

YORKTON COURT HOUSE: in Com. of Sup., 856 (i), 4613 (ii).

Yukon Coast Ry. Co.'s B. No. 67 (Mr. *Maxwell*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 1680 (i).

Yukon Pacific Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 65 (Mr. *McCreary*) 1°*, 1569; 2°*, 2024 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3343; Sen. Amts., 4570 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 115.)

Yukon Territory Act (appeal) Amt. B. No. 113 (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) 1° m., 2851; 2°*, 3776; in Com., 3°*, 3777 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 35).

——— **(Council) Amt. B. No. 119** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3126; 2°*, 3832; in Com., 3832, 4484, 4529; 3°*, 4533 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 34.)

——— **Representation in H. of C., B. No. 134** (Mr. *Sifton*) 1° m., 3306; 2°*, 3774; in Com., 3774, 4466, 4578: 3°*, 4579; Sen. Amts., 4971 (ii). (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 37.)

——— **Territory Act (Judges) Amt. B. No. 137** (Mr. *Fitzpatrick*) M. to introduce, 2850; Res. prop., 3238; in Com. on Res., 3309; 1°* of B., 3509; 2°*, 3939; in Com., 3939; 3°*, 3939. (2 *Edward VII*, *c.* 36.)

YUKON:

ASHCROFT TO DAWSON, TEL. LINES: in Com. of Sup., 3293, 4151, 4781 (ii).

——— *See* 'Telegraph.'

BANK OF COMMERCE, COMMISSION, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4339 (ii).

BRITISH YUKON RY., TOLLS AND CHARGES, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Clarke*) 3638 (ii).

BUILDINGS: RENTALS, REPAIRS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 967 (i), 4536, 4542, 4949 (ii).

——— SUPPLIES *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4538-9 (ii).

CLERK TERRITORIAL COURT, LIVING ALLOWANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3587 (ii).

COLLINET, MRS., MATRON, COURT HOUSE: LETTER *re* ALLOWANCE, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).

——— CHARGES AGAINST JUDGE DUGAS: Memo. of Mr. Fuller read, 4536 (ii).

CONCESSIONS, LEASES, &C., APPLICATIONS, O. Cs.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Taylor*) 154 (i).

CONTRACTS AND CIVIL SERVANTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).

COURT HOUSE, ALLOWANCES TO MATRON, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4193 (ii).

CRAIG, JUDGE, INTERVIEW *re* IRREGULARITIES: Remarks in Com. of Sup., (Mr. *Bennett*) 972 (i).

CROWN PROSECUTOR: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).

DAWSON AND VICTORIA MAIL SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4314 (ii).

DUGAS, JUDGE, COMPLAINTS AGAINST FROM MRS. COLLINET: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 4198.

——— *See* 'Collinet, Mrs.,' &c.

EILBECK, SHERIFF, LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).

——— *See* 'Sheriff,' &c.

——— APPNMT. AS SHERIFF: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 411 (i).

——— ABSENCE FROM YUKON: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745 (i).

EMPLOYEES, ALLOWANCES, &C.: in Com of Sup., 4196 (ii).

HARBOURS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 3283.

JAPANESE EMPLOYMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Puttee*) 242.

JUDGES, LIVING AND TRAVELLING ALLOWANCES; in Com. of Sup., 3583 (ii).

——— RESIDENCES, RENTS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4144, 4190 (ii).

KELLY, DOUGLAS & CO.'S TENDER *re* SUPPLIES in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).

LAW LIBRARY, FREIGHT ON BOOKS: in Com. o Sup., 3590 (ii).

LEGAL ADVISER: in Com. of Sup., 3590 (ii).

MACKENZIE & MANN, EXCHEQUER COURT AWARD: in Com. of Sup., 4860 (ii).

MILLER CREEK CONCESSIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4465 (ii).

——— Tel. read (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4426 (ii).

POLE CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPH: In Com. of Sup., 4154, 4162 (ii).

PRISONERS, MAINTENANCE: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).

——— TRANSPORT, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3589 (ii).

REPRESENTATION IN PARLT., LEGISLATION *re*: Ques. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2069 (i).

ROCHESTER'S CONTRACT *re* TELEGRAPH LINES: in Com. of Sup., 4152 (ii).

——— *See* 'Telegraph,' &c.

SHERIFF'S FEES, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 3586 (ii).

——— LEAVE OF ABSENCE, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Ward*) 745 (i).

——— *See* 'Eilbeck.'

TELEGRAPH SYSTEM: in Com. of Sup., 4150, 4781 (ii).

——— CONSTRUCTION, &C.: Remarks (Mr. *Hughes, Victoria*) 2859 (ii).

——— OPERATORS, PAY, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4154, 4172 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TELEGRAPH, RATES: in Com. of Sup., 4175 (ii).
——— SUPPLIES *re* TELEGRAPH SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 4157 (ii).
— — *See* 'Ashcroft,' &c.
TIMBER LICENSES OR LEASES ISSUED SINCE 1899, NAMES, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Monk*) 2472.
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. *Monk*) 3509 (ii).
TREADGOLD CONCESSION: on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 4977 (ii).
——— REMARKS: in Com. of Sup., 4949 (ii).

YUKON—*Con.*

TREADGOLD O. CS., PLANS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Borden, Halifax*) 2472 (i).
——— CONCESSION, INTERPRETATION OF O. CS., &C.: Ques. *Borden, Halifax*) 2456 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. *Bell*) 241 (i).
WAGON ROADS, REFUNDS, &C.: in Com. of Sup., 4147 (ii).
WITNESS AND JURY FEES: in Com. of Sup., 3590, 4267 (ii).
WOOD, &C. FOR BUILDINGS, PAR IN DAWSON PAPER: Read (Mr. *Sproule*), 4540 (ii).